## Thistle[[@Headword:Thistle]]

             is the rendering, in the A.V., of two Heb. and one Gr. word: 1. דִּרְדִּר, darddr, any thorny plant, especially of the weed-like sort; always collectively in parallelism with קוֹוֹ, kots, “thorn” (Genesis 3, 18; Hos 10:8); 2. חוֹחִ, choäch, a stronger or hook-like thorny bush (2Ki 14:9; 2Ch 25:18; Job 31:40; elsewhere “thorn,” etc.); 3. τρίβολος, a three-pronged thorn, the caltrop (Mat 7:16; “brier,” Heb 6:8). The tendency of all vegetation in Palestine to run into spines, noticeable in the merest weeds as well as in trees, is a subject of remark to all travelers (see Hackett, Illust. of Script. p. 126). The thistle (a common name for various genera, especially Carduus cirsium, etc.) grows abundantly in. most countries, and is a small plant; but in the warm air of Palestine, and in rich soils like the plain of Esdraelon, the large and luxuriant thistle will overtop the mounted horseman. On the road from Jerusalem to Ramaj Hasselquist (Travels,-p. 280) found six different sorts; and in the south of Judaea, in the course of one afternoon, Messrs. M'Cheyne and Bonar counted ten or eleven species. Miss Beaufort speaks of giant thistles of the height of a man on horseback, which she saw near the ruins of Felham (Egyptian Sep. and Syrian Shrines, 2, 45, 50). “The most common species of this weed in Palestine are, Notobasis Syriaca, a tall flowering pink thistle with powerful spines; Scolymus maculatus, a very noxious plant, with a bright-orange flower and Carthemus oxycantha,  another yellow-flowering thistle. Whose formidable spines inflict irritating wounds, like the sting of a poisonous insect” (Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 424 sq.). SEE THORN.

## Thiven, Synod of[[@Headword:Thiven, Synod of]]

             was held by Nierses, the first bishop, or catholicus, of the Armenian Church, in A.D. 536. It was called through the influence of the Persian ruler Chosroes, who desired the, separation of his Christian subjects from the Christians of the Roman Empire. At the synod the Monophysite system was confirmed, and the anathema pronounced on the Chalcedonian council. See Neander, Hist. of the Church, 1, 553.

## Tholuck, Friedrich August Gottgetreu[[@Headword:Tholuck, Friedrich August Gottgetreu]]

             one of the greatest Protestant divines of Germany, was born at Breslau, March 30, 1799, of humble parentage. He continued at school till twelve years of age, when he was set to learn his father's trade, which was that of a goldsmith. It is said that he had till late years a ring, which he himself had made. Still he bated the trade so much that he determined to get back to study. He soon found his way to the gymnasium, from which he graduated at the age of eighteen. His diligence was so great that he almost destroyed his sight, so that at times he has been on the verge of blindness. For a while he remained at the University of Breslau, but afterwards went to Berlin. In some way or other a taste for Oriental literature was awakened in him and he sought from Prof. Kosegarten (then of Greifswalde, but from 1817 till 1824 professor at Jena), who was a great Oriental scholar, the means to carry on such studies. Prelate von Dietz, another distinguished Orientalist, took such an interest in him as to adopt him as his son; and when the prelate died, Von Altenstein secured for him all needful support. He went soon after to Jena, where he studied under his benefactor, Kosegarten, and graduated as doctor of philosophy. He always looked back upon these Oriental studies with delight, and said on Dec. 1, 1870 (the evening before the fiftieth anniversary of his appointment as professor), in answer to a congratulatory address from Jena, “You may be assured, my friends, that when I look back upon these studies, it is not with feelings like those with which one recollects a forsaken love, but rather with those felt towards one that still inflames and fills my spirit with youthful enthusiasm, and, at the same time, calls up a grateful remembrance of Prof. Kosegarten of Jena, who so lovingly encouraged and helped me on in the path of these studies.”  Tholuck's progress in Oriental lore is proved by three works which he published, two of which are learned productions. The first was written in 1821, from Turkish, Persian, and Arabic MSS., and entitled Sufismus sire Theosophia Persarunm Pantheistica, quam e MSS. Bibliothecae Regiae Berolinensis Persicis, Arabicis, Turcicis eruit et illustravit (Berolini, 1821). The second was more popular, and appeared in 1825 with the title An Anthology of the Oriental Mystic Poems, with an Introduction on the Mystics Generally, and the Eastern in Particular. The third of these works appeared in 1826, and was one of learning-Speculations of the Later Orientalists respecting the Doctrine of the Trinity.

While at Berlin, the great crisis in his religious life was approaching, and actually took place. In order to understand this, it is necessary carefully to read his work Sin and Redemption, or the True Consecration of a Sceptic. This was published in 1825, and was, in effect, a refutation of De Wette's Theodore, or the Consecration of the Sceptic. It describes the conversion of two young theologians, Julius and Guido, who were, no doubt, Dr. Julius Muller and the writer himself. This work was written in three weeks, and, like many books written off-hand, it has had remarkable success. Still more insight into Tholuck's spiritual life is caught in his address on the evening preceding the jubilee of December, 1870. A few of its thoughts may here be reproduced, for they furnish the key to his extraordinary success in winning souls to Christ:

“Those whom I see around me are not merely my pupils, nor my admirers, but my friends-my friends in Christ, many of them also my children in Christ, whom I have also borne with much pain. My course has been designated a successful life among youth. I have had not merely to water like Apollos, but to plant with Paul, and introduce new life into dead, corrupt, and wayward youthful hearts. But this-can only be where the spirit of fire is the beam of a divine influence from God. ‘Nothing fills me more with adoring wonder than to think how this spirit of fire has ever been given to me since the hour when I received the baptism of fire from above. From the age of seventeen I have always asked myself, ‘What is the chief end of man's life?' I could never persuade myself that the acquisition of knowledge was this end. Just then God brought me into contact with a venerable saint who lived in fellowship with Christ, and from that time I have had but one passion, and that is Christ, and Christ alone. Every one out of Christ I look upon as a fortress which I must storm and win. I was in my eighteenth year when the Lord gave me my first convert. He was an  artillery officer, a Jew, a wild creature, without rest; but soon he became such a true follower of Christ that he put me to shame. And when I look back upon the thousands of youths whose hearts have opened up under my influence, I can only say the Lord hath done it. In working thus to save souls, my life has been one of joy rather than toil. Among the students were many frivolous, careless ones. I just now remember one whom a mother laid on my heart, but who soon fell among companions who led him astray, so that he could be found at home only at six in the morning. More than once I have visited him at that hour, and also in prison, but all seemed in vain, till one day in the sermon I said, ‘Ah, yes, we preachers should have hard work were it not that we have one in league with us in every heart, even the most careless, that says, while we are preachers, “Well, the preacher is right.” ‘The next evening I received a letter from him, in which he promised to give up evil and enter upon a new life. Alas! four or five days later a card came from him with only these words— “Tholuck is sighing, Tholuck is praying, but I am drinking like a brute.” Yet my labor was not in vain, for he is now a noted preacher of the Gospel of Christ. And what a number of those who were once my students have risen up and can now say, each one, like myself, ‘I have but one passion, and that is Christ, and Christ alone!'

Happy the veteran saint and scholar who could, in a green old age, look back upon such labors! He had all the more confidence in the power of Christianity from having felt it in his own heart. When he left the gymnasium to enter the university, his oration was on The Superiority of Mohammedanism over Christianity. He was especially prejudiced against experimental Christianity, which was then called Pietism and Mysticism. He thought it checked all vigor of action and freedom of thought, and impressed on every countenance the pale hue of death, and that all who adopted it must turn their view from the boundless magnificence of the starry heavens and dwell in the damp and gloom of a catacomb. Neander exerted a great influence on him for good, but it was especially baron von Kottwitz who was the instrument of his conversion, as well as of his friends Olshausen, Julius Muller, and Richard Rothe

On Dec, 2, 1820, Tholuck passed his examination as licentiate of theology at the Berlin University. This was a daring step, for he then suffered from a complaint which, according to three physicians whom. he consulted at the request of baron von Kottwitz, was to end in speedy death. But a young physician, without curing him, removed the imminent danger, and he could  go on in his work. Through the considerateness and liberality of the Prussian government, he went to England in 1825, and spent nearly a year there in travels undertaken for the purpose of prosecuting scientific researches. On his return to Berlin in 1826, he was called to fill the chair of ordinary theology at Halle, made vacant by the death of Dr. Knapp. Notwithstanding -his promotion to the position of extraordinary professor of theology at Berlin, so deeply was he imbued with the spirit and interested in the prosecution of the work of Francke at Halle that the daily longing of his heart was that he might be transferred to the university founded by him. “Every day,” says he, “I prayed to God that he might be pleased to call me to that place where, a hundred years before, August H. Francke had built his Orphan Asylum, and had, by his addresses both from the pulpit and from the chair, gathered a faithful community, teaching that the first stage on the way to the tree of knowledge was by the tree of life.” His prayer was answered, the mantle of Francke fell upon him, and, by a remarkable coincidence of Providence, after laboring as his successor for more than fifty years, his burial took place within one day of the 150th anniversary of the burial of Francke, and the passage selected as the text of the preacher at the obsequies of Francke served the same purpose at the funeral of Tholuck— “Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded,” from the Gospel for the Sunday (June 10) on which Tholuck died.

The state of things which he found when he went to Halle in 1826 is described by himself as follows:

“It is universally known how a dead orthodoxy had, throughout the 17th century, been predominant in German churches and universities… Almost throughout the breadth of the country the tendency to ‘rationalism,' as it was termed, about the beginning of the present century, had taken an uncontested possession of the pulpits and academical chairs... At Halle there had been but one single man (Prof. Knapp) who feebly indeed, and secretly enough, dared to resist all-powerful Rationalism. Out of nine hundred students he found five who, being revived by the aid of a Christian craftsman, believed in the divinity of Christ. They were called the idiotic orthodox they were the few, the little ones, faint-hearted, weak, and not gifted, and over against them the great multitude of the gifted, active, and assiduous students; the body of the academic teachers, in agreement with the whole mass of the students, had sent a petition to the minister of state for ecclesiastical affairs  against my appointment to a professorship at Halle. That was the most trying period of my life, in which I learned seeking and pursuing love.”

Such was the state of Germany, its Established Church, and its institutions when Tholuck was called to Halle. Hegel, who, as a philosophical lecturer, had imbibed Christian principles in the religious atmosphere of Berlin, urged Tholuck, in his parting words, that he should “deal a death-blow to the bald rationalism prevalent at Halle.” This was no easy task, considering that Gesenius and Wegscheider had such wonderful influence there.

Tholuck's position was, therefore, at first exceedingly difficult in this reign of rationalism. He was scouted, hated, and ridiculed as a pietist, mystic, fanatic, Pharisee, etc.; but he persevered, and God most richly blessed his labors. A radical revolution has been wrought in Halle, so far as theology is concerned. The Rev. L. Witte, one of his pupils, who represented him at the Evangelical Alliance, in 1873, at New York, and read the paper he had prepared on Evangelical Theology in Germany, says,

“We know that, in a great measure, the wholesome change from rationalism to faith which has been granted to our native country within the last fifty years is, next to God's grace, owing to the restless zeal of this ‘miles Christi,' a genuine good knight without fear and without reproach. In dark and dreary days he has gallantly borne disgrace for Christ's sake. He, a single man, has won the field in the University of Halle; and all his colleagues, one by one, have been forced to yield to his superiority of Christian energy and knowledge. But, more than that, thousands upon thousands call him their spiritual father, their father in Christ.”

Tholuck verified the prophetic words of Prof. Hegel, drew the sword of the Spirit, and gave bald rationalism its death-blow in the University of Halle. It was only with the change of government and ministry in Prussia in 1840 that Tholuck's influence assumed great dimensions. Frederick William IV and the minister of worship, Eichhorn. looked upon his theology as one which avoided all extremes and yet held the faith firmly. They considered it the only justifiable form. When vacancies were to be filled in the Prussian universities, his advice was always valued, whether it had been formally asked or voluntarily proposed. Under the minister Von Raumer, his influence rather declined; but under the succeeding minister, Von Müller, it acquired its old power and dimensions, and many of the  appointments of that time were suggested by him. His earnest labor for personal and experimental religion caused him to view with mildness smaller departures from ecclesiastical orthodoxy. Divine truth was in his eyes too sublime to be sharply and exactly defined in formulae. In his True Consecration of the Sceptic, he does not even stiffly demand an express belief in the personality of God if the self-consciousness and existence of the Divine Being are admitted. Sternly to insist upon creeds seemed to him a departure from the faith. In his sermons he despised all rhetoric and display of learning. There were, however, flashes of appeal that cut into the heart like lightning. And then his life, so warm and tender and loving, made him a universal favorite with his students. It is no wonder that he exerted an almost fascinating influence over them. Indeed, he looked upon personal effort among students as his peculiar calling. Every day he spent two hours in walking, and generally had one or two with him, with whom he engaged in pleasant but earnest conversation. This gave him, after a time, such an extensive psychological knowledge that he could easily find an entrance to the hearts of those whom he would save. Tholuck said himself, in the address which he delivered at his jubilee,

“Not without reason has it been said that I would rather be with candidates [for the ministry] than with pastors and rather with students than with candidates. Not without cause have they called mea studenten-professor [a professor for students, as opposed to a book professor], who everywhere had a home with students, and nowhere else would rather have had his home. I had my delight in many a sprouting shoot, and, as it were, their flower buds as they unfolded petal after petal, and in the full-developed flowers; but every blossom gradually developed, and in a different perfume and color. Yes, that is a blessed delight! and he who has once found his love and his pleasure in it, and to whom God has given the gift of being a professor, will no longer find the life of a professor to be labor, but rather joy and pleasure. And thus have I spent my life, and up to the present day my life as a professor has not been my work, but rather my joy and my delight.

“But, at the same time, the life of a professor is not all pleasure and enjoyment. If upon every word an echo would resound in the awakened heart; if upon every warning [spiritual breath green shoots would spring up; if on every bestowal of a gift there would follow its reception then it would be nothing but enjoyment. But thus it does not always happen, for there are also the silent, the dull, and the slow ones, whom one can call  again and again, but no echo resounds; where one can thrust in the spade day after day before anything is heard resounding under the earth. And to be surrounded by such, that was my lot in the beginning.

“I have seen the secrets of many hundred young men disclosed to me; I have seen them wander far, far from the real aim of human life. I have been able to show them this, and I have had the pleasure to know that many a one perceived it who now enjoys this pleasure once unknown to him.

“This, then, is the life of a student professor; he has not only easy, joy and pleasure-bringing work, but also a heavy task in youth, seeking love. But what a precious task when such young men are found that sit at the feet of Christ, who have been awakened from their slumbers, or who have returned from their erring ways! Wherever giving is also a receiving, that is a work which affords a higher enjoyment than all others that are more easily performed.”

With such a love for students, Dr. Tholuck became a very popular professor, and students flocked to Halle from all parts of the world. His thorough knowledge of the English language made him an especial favorite with American students, large numbers of whom sat at his feet. Among the most distinguished of these we may mention Drs. Hodge, Addison, Alexander, Prentiss, H. B. Smith, Park, and others. The partiality manifested for Tholuck by American students was reciprocated by him. He regarded them with more than ordinary interest, and was in the habit of calling a number of those named his “special pets.”

Besides the English, he was a master of a great many languages, and was only surpassed by cardinal Mezzofanti, who is said to have known fifty, including dialects. He was also gifted with poetic genius, and had acquired an immense store of varied learning. He was not only a master in theology, but profoundly versed in philology, philosophy, history, and poetry; in ancient and modern, Oriental and Occidental, heathen, Jewish, Mohammedan, and Christian literature. He was a voluminous writer. He commenced his literary labors as an author in 1821, and, besides the works already named, he wrote Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, the Hebrews, the Psalms, the Gospel of John: —a philosophico-theological exposition on The Sermon on the Mount: —The Credibility of the Gospel History (an antidote to Strauss's Life of Christ): —The Spirit of the Lutheran Theologians of Wittenberg in the 17th Century: —and The Academic Life of the 17th Century. In the last two productions he gives,  mostly from MS. sources, a very interesting and graphic, but by -no means favorable, picture of the palmy days of orthodox Lutheranism, for the instruction and warning of those contemporaries who would so zealously revive it as the best state of the Church, without considering that it was followed by the terrible apostasy of Rationalism. These works were forerunners of an extensive history of Rationalism. We mention the Hours of Devotion, together with several volumes of Sermons, as well as numerous articles published in. the theological journals of Germany. He also issued his miscellaneous writings in two volumes, and republished The True Consecration of the Sceptic (1823), under the changed title of The Doctrine of Sin and the Propitiator, in 1851. Most of his writings have been translated into the more widely spoken modern languages. of Europe.

Dr. Tholuck was also an able and popular preacher. He breathed and exhibited the spirit of evangelical piety in all the circles in which he. moved-domestic, social, literary, and theological. He was simple and bland in his manners, social in his disposition, and kindly affectioned towards all men. He did not eschew pleasantry, but gave it its due place in conversation, and thus furnished the matter for many relishable anecdotes. He accepted the Prussian Union as consistent with ,the catholicity of Christianity, as well as with the doctrines of the Lutheran Church as set forth in her catholic symbol, the Augustana, and hence never allied himself with the separatistic Lutherans in their attempt to revive and perpetuate the symbolic dogmatism of the Lutheran theologians of the 17th-'century. In spite of his frail physical constitution, he was permitted to celebrate his semi-centennial jubilee as a professor Dec. 2, 1870, an occasion which was graced by the presence of a great number of his former pupils from all parts of the world. In responding to one of the addresses presented to him at his semi-centennial jubilee, he referred to the bodily infirmities he had been called upon to bear, and the comparatively small number of his days in which he was in the enjoyment of health. The performance of so much unintermitted labor, and the great age which he-attained, are attributable to his abstemious habits and systematic exercise, as well as to the cheerfulness of disposition inspired by his personal piety, and his extraordinary success in doing good and glorifying Christ. On June 10,1877, Dr. Tholuck's wife sent the following telegram to Dr. Schaff, who was then at Stuttgart, announcing his death, together with his last words: “HALLE, June 10,1877.  “This day, at 4 o'clock P. M., my dear husband, Dr. August Tholuck, after long suffering, gently entered into that blessed rest for which he had been longing from the days of his youth. Through the grace of God, his life, which was often threatened with an early termination, has been prolonged in indefatigable and fruitful labors to the age of seventy-eight years, two months, and ten days. Under the heavy pressure and painful anxiety of the last year, his friends around him were permitted to observe, in various ways, the growing assurance of his faith and the victory of love in his heart. His last intelligent words were a cheerful profession of the cross of Christ in view of approaching death: ‘I am not afraid; Christ died for me'(Ich fiurchte mich nicht; denn Christus starb für mich).”

It was a fitting close of a long and useful career which was devoted to Christ. The sum and substance of his theology was that Jesus lived and died for the salvation of sinners. To him as the only Master he led his innumerable pupils. His lecture-room and his pulpit were a school of Christ. Herein lie his significance and fame in the history of German theology and religion. The New York Observer (Aug. 16, 1877) thus announced Tholuck's death to its readers: “The greatest theological light of Germany has just been extinguished;” while the Lutheran Observer (Aug. 3, 1877) winds up an article on Tholuck in the following words:

“Although Tholuck is dead, he nevertheless, like Abel, yet speaketh.” He speaks on earth through the recollection of his conversations, exhortations, and sermons; speaks in the notes taken of his lectures; speaks in his articles published in theological reviews; speaks in the printed volumes written with his own hand; speaks through the sentiments, character, and labors of his students who have finished their course; speaks through the faith, writings, and efforts of his students who still live; speaks through the molding influence exerted upon the University of Halle, and the evangelical leaven infused into the institutions of Europe: speaks through the resurrection of doctrinal orthodoxy, experimental piety, and religious activity in the Lutheran and other Protestant churches; yea, speaks in his whole life as a Christian man, as a popular writer, as a learned theologian, as an eloquent preacher; and, over and above all, ‘he yet speaketh,' and will continue to speak as the studenten-professor till time shall be no more.”

We have not as yet a complete biography of Dr. Tholuck, who will fill some chapters in the Church history of the 19th century. A sketch was  published by Dr. Schaff, in his Germany: its Universities, Theology, and Religion (Phila. 1857), p. 278 sq. Another sketch is given in the Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v. Our present article is made up from different necrologies. As to Tholuck's works, it would be useless to try to enumerate them. Zuchold alone (Bibl. Theol. 2, 1332 sq.) gives four pages. His Commentaries have been translated into English, and so also have some others of his works. The last of these, so far as we are aware, is Hours of Christian Devotion (Edinb. 1870), a work which has repeatedly been edited in Germany. (B.P.)

## Thomas[[@Headword:Thomas]]

             (θωμᾶς), one of the twelve apostles. A.D. 27-29.

1. His Name. —This is evidently a Graecized form of the Aramaic תּאֹמָא, Tomd, which means the twin; and so it is translated in Joh 11:16; Joh 20:24; Joh 21:2, ὁ Δί δυμος, which has passed into a name, Didymus (q.v.). This name occurs also on Phoenician inscriptions in a form which reminds us of the colloquial English abbreviation, viz. תאוםand תאם (Gesenius, Monumenta, “p. 356). In Heb. also (Son 7:4) it is simply תְּאֹם, feom, almost exactly our “Tom.” The frequency of the name in England is derived not from the apostle, but from St. Thomas of Canterbury. Out of the signification of this name has grown the tradition that he had a twin-sister, Lysia (Patres Apost. p. 272), or that he was a twin-brother of our Lord (Thilo, Acta Thomae, p. 94); which last, again, would confirm his identification with Jude (comp. Mat 13:55), with whom Eusebius expressly identifies him (Hist. Eccles. 1, 13; so also the Acta Thomae). This may have been a mere confusion with Thaddaeus (q.v.), who is mentioned in the extract. But it may also be that Judas was his real name, and that Thomas was a surname.

2. History and Character from the New Test. —(We here chiefly adopt Stanley's art. in Smith's Dict. of the Bible). In the catalogue of the apostles he is coupled with Matthew in Mat 10:3; Mar 3:18; Luk 6:15; and with Philip in Act 1:13.

All that we know of him is derived from the Gospel of John; and this amounts to three traits, which, however, so exactly agree together that, slight as they are, they place his character before us with a, precision which belongs to no other of the twelve apostles, except Peter, John, and Judas  Iscariot. This character is that of a man slow to believe, seeing all the difficulties of a case, subject to despondency, viewing things on the darker side, and yet full of ardent love for his Master (see Niemeyer, Charakt. 1, 108).

(a.) The first trait is found in his speech when our Lord determined to face the dangers that awaited him in Judaea on his journey to Bethany. Thomas said to his fellow-disciples, “Let us also go (καὶ ἡμεῖς), that wee may die with him” (Joh 11:16). He entertained no hope of his escape-he looked on the journey as leading to total ruin; but he determined to share the peril. “Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him.”

(b.) The second occurs in his speech during the last supper: “Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?” (Joh 14:5). It was the prosaic, incredulous doubt as to moving a step in the unseen future, and yet an eager inquiry to know how this step was to be taken.

(c.) The third was after the resurrection. He was absent-possibly by accident, perhaps characteristically from the first assembly when Jesus had appeared. The others told him what they had seen. He broke forth into an exclamation, the terms of which convey to us at once the vehemence of his doubt, and, at the same time, the vivid picture that his mind retained of his Master's form as he had last seen him lifeless on the cross: “Except I see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not, I cannot, believe” (οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω, Joh 20:25).

On the eighth day he was with them at their gathering, perhaps in expectation of a recurrence of the visit of the previous week; and Jesus stood among them. He pronounced the same salutation, “Peace be unto you;” and then, turning to Thomas, as if this had been the special object of his appearance, uttered the words which convey as strongly the sense of condemnation and tender reproof as those of Thomas had shown the sense of hesitation and doubt: “Bring: thy finger hither [ωδε as if himself pointing to his wounds] and see my hands; and bring thy hand and thrust it in my side; and do not become (μὴ γίνου) unbelieving (ἄπιστος), but believing (πιστός).” “He answers to the words that Thomas had spoken to the ears of his fellow-disciples only; but it is to the thought of his heart rather than to the words of his lips that the Searcher of hearts answers. Eye, ear, and touch at once appealed to and at once satisfied-the form, the look, the voice, the solid and actual body: and  not the senses only, but the mind satisfied too; the knowledge that searches the very reins and the hearts; the love that loveth to the end, infinite and eternal” (Arnold, Serm. 6:238).

The effect on Thomas is immediate. It is useless to speculate whether he obeyed our Lord's invitation to examine the wounds. The impression is that he did not. Be that as it may, the conviction produced by the removal of his doubt became deeper and stronger than that of any of the other apostles. The words in which he expressed his belief contain a far higher assertion of his Master's divine nature than is contained in any other expression used by apostolic lips, “My Lord, and my God f Some have supposed that κύριος refers to the human θεός to the divine nature. ‘This is too artificial. ‘It is more to the point to observe the exact terms of the sentence, uttered, as it were, in astonished awe. “It is, then, my Lord and my God!” (It is obviously of no dogmatic importance whether the words are an address or a description. That they are the latter appears from the use of the nominative ὁ κύριος. The form ὁ θεός proves nothing, as this is used for the vocative. At the same time, it should be observed that the passage is said to Christ, ειπεν αὐτῶ.) The word “my” gives it a personal application to himself. Additional emphasis is given to this declaration from its being the last incident related in the direct narrative of the gospel (before the supplement of ch. 21), thus corresponding to the opening words of the prologue. ‘“Thus Christ was acknowledged on earth to be what John had in the beginning of his gospel declared him to be from all eternity; and the words of Thomas at the end of the twentieth chapter do but repeat the truth which John had stated before in his own words at the beginning of the first” (Arnold, Serm. 6:401). The answer of our Lord sums up the moral of the whole narrative: “Because [“Thomas” (θῶμα) is omitted in the best MSS.] thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen me, and yet have believed” (20, 29). By this incident, therefore, Thomas, “the doubting apostle,” is raised at once to the theologian in the original sense of the word. “Ab eo dubitatum est,” says Augustine, “ne a nobis dubitaretur.” Winer and others find in the character of Thomas what they consider contradictory traits, viz. inconsiderate faith and a turn for exacting the most rigorous evidence. We find that a resolute and lively faith is always necessarily combined with a sense of its importance, and with a desire to keep its objects unalloyed and free from error and superstition. Christ himself did not blame Thomas for availing himself of all possible evidence, but only pronounced those blessed who would be open to conviction even if some external form of evidence should not be within their reach (comp.  Niemeyer, Akademische Predigten und Reden, p. 321 sq.). Monographs have been written in Latin on this scene in Thomas's life by Carpzov (Helmst. 1757), id. (Vim. 1765), Rost (Budiss. 1785), and Gram (Nurimb. 1618).

In the New Test. we hear of Thomas only twice again-once on the Sea of Galilee with the seven disciples, where he is ranked next after Peter (Joh 21:2), and again in the assemblage of the apostles after the Ascension (Acts 1, 13).

3. Traditions. —Thomas is said to have been born at Antioch, and (as above stated) to have had a twin-sister named Lysia (Patres Apost. ed. Coteler. p. 272, 512). The earlier traditions, as believed in the 4th century (Origen, ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles 1, 13; 3, 1; Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 1, 19), represent him as preaching in Parthia (Clement. Recogn. 9:29) or Persia (according to Jerome; see also Rufinus, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 4), and as finally buried at Edessa (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 4:18). Chrysostom mentions his grave at Edessa as being one of the four genuine tombs of apostles, the other three being Peter, Paul, and John (Hom. in Heb. 26). With his burial at Edessa agrees the story of his sending Thaddaeus to Abgarus with our Lord's letter (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 1, 13). According to a later tradition, Thomas went to India and suffered martyrdom there (Gregor. Naz. Orat. 25 ad Arian. p. 438, ed. Par.; Ambrose, in Psalms 45, 10; Jerome, Ep. 148 [59] ad Marcell.; Niceph. Hist. Eccles. 2, 40; Acta Thomae, ch. 1 sq.; Abdise Hist. Apost. ch. 9; Paulin. a S. Bartholomaeo, India Orient. Christiana [Romans 1794]). This tradition has been attacked by Von Bohlen (Indien, 1, 375 sq.). The ancient congregations of Christians in India who belong to the Syrian Church are called Thomas-Christians, and consider the apostle Thomas to be their founder (Fabricius, Lux Evangelii, p. 626 sq.; Assemani, Biblioth. Orient, III, 2. 435 sq.; Ritter, Erdkunde, V, 1, 601 sq.). -Against this tradition Thilo wrote in his edition of the Acta Thomae, p. 107 sq. (comp. Augusti, Denkwgurdigkeien, ir,. 219 sq.). This later tradition is now usually regarded as arising from a confusion with a later Thomas, a missionary from the Nestorians. His martyrdom. (whether in Persia or India) is said to have been occasioned. by a lance, and is commemorated by the Latin Church, on Dec. 21, by the Greek Church on Oct. 6, and by the Indians on July 1. (For these traditions and their authorities, see Butler, Lives of the Saints, Dec. 21.)

4. The fathers frequently quote an Evangelium secundum Thomam and Acta Thomae, the fragments of the former of which have been edited by Thilo, in his Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, 1, 275; and by Tischendorf, in his Evangelica Apocrypha (Lips. 1843); and the Acta Thomae separately by Thilo (ibid. 1823); and by Tischendorf, in his Acta Apocrypha (ibid. 1851) SEE APOCRYPHA; SEE THOMAS, WRITINGS OF.

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

             the name of several Scotch prelates.

1. Bishop of Galloway, who swore fealty to Edward I of England in 1296, and recognized king Robert Bruce's title to the crown in 1304. He was bishop here before 1309. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 273.

2. Bishop of the Isles about 1334. He died in Scotland, September 20, 1338. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, 1:303.

3. Bishop of Galloway in 1362. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 274.

4. Bishop of Ross in 1481, and founder of the collegiate church of Tain the same year. He was still bishop there in 1487. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 189.

## Thomas (St.), Christians Of[[@Headword:Thomas (St.), Christians Of]]

             a body of Syrian Christians dwelling in the interior of Malabar and Travancore, in the south-western part of Hindustan. When the Portuguese landed in India in the 16th century, they discovered what they supposed to be a Nestorian Church there, the members of which called themselves. Christians of St. Thomas. They retained the Syrian language, held the validity of only two sacraments, and were governed by bishops under a metropolitan. They rejected the authority of Peter, and did not enforce sacerdotal celibacy. They neither invoked saints nor worshipped images. These churches were soon subjected to severe persecution, and many were forced into Romanism. The inquisition, also, was established at. Goa. Dr. Claudius Buchanan found, however, a remnant of them, in 1807, near Travancore. They still retain some ecclesiastical independence. According to a. statement of some authority, the St. Thomas Christians number 70,000 individuals, and the Syro-Roman Catholics 90,000, that is, the party who have submitted to the papal jurisdiction. But the Church service in Syriac: is not understood by the people, who are ignorant and prejudiced. That their creed is not directly Nestorian may be seen from the declaration of the metropolitan of Malabar made in 1806: “We believe in the Father,. Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons in one God, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance; One in Three, and Three in One: the Father generator, the Son generated, and the Holy Ghost proceeding.. None is before or after the other; in majesty, honor, might, and power coequal; Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. The metropolitan disclaims the heresies of Arius, Sabellius, Macedonius, Manes, Manianus, Julianus, Nestorius, and the Chalcedonians, adding that in the appointed time, through the disposition of the Father and the Holy Ghost, the Son appeared on earth. for the salvation of mankind; that he was born of the Virgin Mary through the means of the Holy Ghost, and was incarnate God and man.” “They believe that the souls of departed men do not see God till the judgment day; they allow three sacraments-baptism, orders, and the  Eucharist; and they abhor auricular confession. In the consecration of the Eucharist they use small cakes made with oil and salt; instead of wine is water in which raisins have been steeped; they observe no age for orders, but admit priests at seven, eighteen, twenty, etc., who may marry as often as their wives die. Their children, unless in cases of sickness, are not baptized till the fiftieth day. At the death of any friend the relations keep an eight days fast in memory of the de-ceased. They observe the times of Advent and Lent, and many other feasts and festivals, but especially those which relate to Thomas — the Dominica in albis, or Sun-day after Easter, in memory of the notable confession of Thomas; one on June 1, which is also celebrated by Moors and Pagans. The Church of England Missionary Society has established among these people an extensive mission, occupying two or three stations; and a college has been established at Kottaytm for the instruction of candidates for the ministry, which has been liberally endowed. See Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v. SEE NESTORIANS.

## Thomas (St.), Day Of[[@Headword:Thomas (St.), Day Of]]

             a festival observed, Dec. 21, in memory of Thomas the apostle. It was held by the Greek Church on Oct. 6.

## Thomas (St.), Writings Of[[@Headword:Thomas (St.), Writings Of]]

             These are as follows:

1. THOMAE ACTA (Acts of Thomas), an Apocryphal work which belongs to a very high antiquity and was greatly esteemed among the Gnostics and Manichaeans (comp. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 3, 25; Epiphan. Haeres. 42, 1; 51, 1; 53, 2, etc.). Augustine has undoubtedly referred to them in three places, viz. Cont. Faust. 22:79; Adimant. 17; De Sermnone Domini, 1, 20. In the Hist. Apostol. Abdiae, 9:1 (Fabricius, Codex Apocryph. 1, 689) these Acts are especially referred to. They were first edited by Thilo, in Codex Apocryphus Nov. Test. (Lips. 1832), vol. 1; afterwards by Tischendorf, in Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha (ibid. 1851), p. 190-234; see also the appendix to Apocalypses Apocrypha (ibid. 1856), p. 156-161. Connected with the Acta is the-

2. THOMAE CONSUMMATIO (Consummation of Thomas), which, like the former, was the source for the Hist. Apost. Abdice. It was edited first  by Tischendorf from a cod. Paris. of the 11th century, and published in his Acta Apostolorum, p. 235-242. More important than these is the-

3. THOMAE EVANGELIUM (Gospel of Thomas). Next to the Protevangelium of James, it was the oldest and best known. Irenaeus probably knew it (comp. Adv. Haeres. 1, 20), while Origen (Horn. I in Lucam) mentions the same explicitly; Pseudo-Origen. Philosophus (ed. Emm. Miller, Oxon. 1851), p. 101 (comp. p. 94), speaks of its having been used by a Gnostic sect, the Naasenes, in the middle of the 2nd century; Euseb. (fHist. Eccles. 3, 25) mentions this gospel also, and Cyrill. Hierosol (Catech. p. 98, ed. Oxon. 1702; comp. ibid. 4, p. 66) thinks that this Thomas was the disciple of Manes. The origin of this, as well as of most of the Apocryphal gospels, must be sought among the Gnostics, and especially among those who embraced Docetism with regard to the person of Christ; and the very large number of miraculous stories mentioned in this gospel, which found so much favor among the Manichaeans, points to this Docetism. Accordingn to Irenaeus, loc. cit, the author must have belonged to the Marcosianic sect.

We have no complete text of this gospel, but fragments only. Cotelerius first published, in the notes to his Constit. Apostol. 6:17, a fragment according to the Parisian MS. of the 15th century; a larger portion was published by Mingarelli, Nuova Raccolta d'Opuscoli Scientifici (Venet. 1764), 12:73-155. Tischendorf found a larger number of MSS., but their variations caused him to publish a triple text in his collection-viz. two Greek and one Latin-with the following titles: θωμᾶ Ι᾿σραηλίτου φιλοσόφου ῥητὰ εἰς τὰ παιδικὰ τοῦ Κυ ρίου. This gives us the childhood of Jesus from his fifth to his twelfth year in nineteen chapters. Σύγ γραμμα τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου θωμᾶ περὶ τῆς παιδι κῆς αναστροφῆς τοῦ Κυρίου gives in eleven chapters the time from-the fifth to the eighth year. Tractatus de Pueritia Jesu secundum Thomam gives in fifteen chapters the time from the flight into Egypt to the eighth year of Christ's life. These texts are published by Tischendorf in his Evangel. Apocrypha (Lips. 1853); see also the LXI Prolegom. of the Apocal. Apocryph. A Syriac codex was published by Wright (Lond. 1875), in his Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Test., Collected and Edited from Syrian MISS. in the British Museum. (B. P.)

## Thomas Aquinas [[@Headword:Thomas Aquinas ]]

             SEE AQUINAS, ST. THOMAS.

## Thomas a Becket, or of Canterbury[[@Headword:Thomas a Becket, or of Canterbury]]

             SEE BECKET, THOMAS 1.

## Thomas a Kempis [[@Headword:Thomas a Kempis ]]

             SEE KEMPIS, THOMAS A.

## Thomas of Celano[[@Headword:Thomas of Celano]]

             was a native of Celano, in Abruzzo Ultra II. He is noted as having written the earliest biography of Francis of Assisi, and the hymn Dies Irce (q.v.). Neither the date of his birth nor of his death is known. It would appear from the preface to the biography that he was early associated with. Francis, as many of the statements are given as based on personal observation or the authority of Francis himself. Caesar of Spires, the first provincial of the Order of Franciscans in Germany, appointed him to the office of custos over the Minorite convents of Cologne, Mayence, Worms, and Spires, as early at least as 1221. This statement is questioned by some, because the chronicle of the order compiled by Mark of Lisbon does not mention him among the twenty-five earlier and more important disciples of the saint, though more obscure names are found in that list. The biography ascribed to him is given, with notes, in the Acta Sanctorum, October, tom. 2. There is no proof either for or against his claim to the authorship, which is nowhere asserted by himself. Nor is the honor of having composed theDies Irce secured to him by any better evidence. The Franciscans attribute its composition to him, the Dominicans to one of their own order, a Jesuit to an Augustinian monk, a Benedictine to Gregory the Great or to St. Bernard. Each of these statements is arbitrary, and some of them cannot be true. Bartholomew Albizzi of Pisa was the first to credit the hymn to Celano, in his. Liber Conformitatuim (1385); and his statement warrants the conclusions that the hymn was already at that date incorporated with the Missal, and therefore well known, and that Celano was generally held to be its author Wadding, in Scriptores Ordinis Minorum, states that Celano composed two additional sequences, the Freyit Victor Virtualis in honor of St. Francis, and the Sanctitatis Nova Signa. See Mohnike, Kirchen u. literan hist. Studien (1825), 1, 31; Hüber, Dreifache Chronik d. dreifachen Franzisk. —Ordens (Munich, 1686), p. 16; Wadding, A nnales Minor. tom. 2, ad ann. 1222; Hase, Frans.v. Assisi, etc. (Leips. 1856), p. 17, note 17; Tholuck, Verm. Schriften, 1, 110; Daniel, Thesaur. Hymnol. 1, 103-131. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Thomas of Villanova[[@Headword:Thomas of Villanova]]

             SEE VILLENEUVE.

## Thomas or Wilton, D.D[[@Headword:Thomas or Wilton, D.D]]

             was made first chancellor and then dean of St. Paul's, London. In his time (during the reigns of Edward IV) occurred the contest between the prelates and friars, the latter upbraiding the former for their pomp and plenty. Wilton entered into this contest, and charged upon the monks that, although confessing their poverty, they really, by their influence at the confessional, opened the coffers of all the treasures in the land. He wrote a book, An Validi Mendicantes sint in Statu Perfectionis, maintaining that much were rogues by the laws of God and man, and fitter for the house of correction than a state of perfection. Wilton flourished in 1460. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:335.

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

             one of Wesley's early helpers, was a native of Cornwall, England. He was admitted on trial by the Conference in 1764 and preached in Wales, and was likewise stationed in Cork. He was named in the deed of declaration. He at length desisted from an itinerant life, and settled in Leeds, but: sank into obscurity, and died of a violent fever while the Conference was in session in that city (1793). See Atmore, Meth. Memorial, s.v.

## Thomas, Benjamin Calley[[@Headword:Thomas, Benjamin Calley]]

             a Baptist missionary, was born in Massachusetts. He graduated at Brown University in the class of 1847, and at the Newton Theological Institution in the class of 1850. For eighteen years he was a missionary of the American. Baptist Missionary Union, being stationed during this period at various places-three years at Tavoy, Bengal; three years at Henzadah, Burmah; and two years at Bassein, Bombay. At one time he had under his charge a school for the education of native teachers. Returning to the United States, he died in the city of New. York, June 10,1869. (J. C. S.)

## Thomas, Benjamin Franklin[[@Headword:Thomas, Benjamin Franklin]]

             chancellor of Brown University, was born in Boston, Mass., Feb. 1'2,. 1813, and was a graduate of Brown University in the; class of 1830, having entered college at the early age (of thirteen. He was admitted to the bar of Worcester in, 1834. By degrees he rose to an extensive practice, and occupied a high position among the able lawyers with whom he was contemporary. For four years (1844-48) he was judge of probate for Worcester County. In 1853 he was appointed to a place made vacant on the belief of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, and held the office for six years (1853-59). Having re-signed his position on the bench, he removed to Boston, where in his profession he achieved eminent success. He served one term (1861-63) as a representative in Congress from Boston. He was elected chancellor of Brown University in 1874. His death took place at Beverly, Mass., Sept. 27, 1878. (J. C. S.)

## Thomas, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Thomas, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in South Wales in 1823, and, when quite young, removed to Ohio. He graduated from Denison University, was ordained in 1846, and, for a time, taught in Vermillion College. His pastorates were as follows: Mansfield, Monroeville, First Church in Zanesville, Bradfield, and Newark, all in Ohio. Subsequently he removed to Bloomington, Illinois, and became western secretary of the American Bible Union. Having occupied other prominent positions in his denomination in Illinois, he removed to Arkansas in 1864, and became president of the university at Judsonia. During the war he served as a soldier in the Federal  army, and became brevet-colonel. He died at Little Rock, Arkansas, March 5, 1884. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1147. (J.C.S.)

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

             a modern philosopher, was born at Leipsic in 1665, and graduated at the Leipsic University. Reading Paffendorfs Apology for Rejecting the Scholastic Principles of Morals and Law, he determined to renounce all implicit deference to ancient dogmas. Brucker gives the following brief specimen of his peculiar tenets: “Thought arises from ‘images impressed upon the brain, and the action of thinking is performed in the whole brain. Brutes are destitute of sensation. Man is a corporeal substance, capable of thinking and moving, or endued with intellect and will. Man does not always think. Truth is the agreement of thought with the nature of things. The senses are not deceitful, but all fallacy is the effect of precipitation and prejudice. From perception arise ideas and their relations, and from these, reasonings. It is impossible to discover truth by the syllogistic art… God is not perceived by the intellectual sense, but by the inclination of the will; for creatures affect the brain, but God the heart. All creatures are in God; nothing is exterior to him. Creation is extension produced from nothing by the divine power. Creatures are of two kinds, passive and active; the former is matter, the latter Spirit.. .. The human soul is a ray from the divine nature, whence it desires union with God, who is love,” etc. Thomas died at Halle in 1728. He published, An Introduction to Puffendorf (1687): —A Defense of the Sect of the Pietists: —An Introduction to Aulic Philosophy, etc.: —Introduction to Rational Philosophy: —A Logical Praxis: —Introduction to Moral Philosophy : —A Cure for Irregular Passions: —Essay on the Nature and Essence of Spirit, etc.

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Matthews County, Va., Oct. 31, 1797. He was converted in 1816, admitted on trial in the Virginia Conference in 1823, and appointed to the Sussex Circuit. In 1824 he still held the same circuit; in 1825, Yadkin; in 1826, Salisbury; in 1827, Iredell; in 1-828, Williamsburgh; and in 1829, Newbern, N. C., all of which appointments he filled with ability and success. He died Nov. 14,1829. He was a plain man, of strict integrity, consistent Christianity, and highly respectable abilities. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1830, p. 75.

## Thomas, David (1)[[@Headword:Thomas, David (1)]]

             a minister of the Baptist denomination, was born at Loudon Tract, Pa., Aug. 16, 1732. In early life he enjoyed more than ordinary advantages for  obtaining a good education. He studied for some time at the Academy in Hopewell, under the tuition of Rev. Isaac Eaton, and in 1769 received the honorary degree of A.M. from Brown University. When quite young he began to preach. He removed to Virginia in 1760, and spent about a year and a half in Berkeley County. He then visited Fauquier County, and under his ministry the Broad River Church was formed, of which, for a time, he was the pastor. Subsequently, from this church, five or six other churches were constituted. He traveled as an evangelist in different sections of the state, and his preaching was greatly blessed in the conversion of souls. He is said “to have been a minister of great distinction in the prime of his days. Besides the natural endowments of a vigorous mind, and the advantages of a classical and refined education, he had a melodious and piercing voice, a pathetic address, expressive action, and, above all, a heart filled with love to God and his fellow-men.” Many persons in Virginia had been accustomed to hear but little evangelical preaching. ‘They were attracted by the eloquence of so accomplished a minister as was Mr. Thomas, and not a few who occupied high social positions were led to the Savior. Near the close of his life he removed to Kentucky. He lived to a great age, and for some time before his death was nearly blind. The influence of this faithful servant of Christ was good and permanent. See Lives of Virginia Baptist Ministers, p. 51-53. (J. C. S.)

## Thomas, David (2)[[@Headword:Thomas, David (2)]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born at Cowbridge, May 19, 1783. He graduated at Wrexham Academy, studied theology with Dr. Jenkin Lewis, and itinerated through the hamlets and villages about Magor and Penywain. In 1815 he settled over the parish of Wolvasnewton, and in 1819 removed to Nebo. In 1824 he took the oversight of the Church at Llanvaches, and continued his missionary labors through many neighboring parishes. He died in November, 1864. His life was one calm, public, and unwavering testimony for truth and for God. See (Lond.) Cong. Year- book, 1866, p. 285.

## Thomas, David (3)[[@Headword:Thomas, David (3)]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born in 1793. He graduated at the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen, and was ordained in 1820 at Pembrokeshire, and shortly afterwards settled at Wotton-under-Edge, and retained this charge until the close of his life. He died March 28, 1861. His  preaching was earnest, faithful, and evangelical. See (Lond.) Cong. Year- book, 1862, p. 263.

## Thomas, David (4) A.B[[@Headword:Thomas, David (4) A.B]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Merthyr-Tydvil, Aug. 16, 1811. He was educated at Highbury College and Glasgow University, where he took the first prize in logic. He was ordained in 1836, at Zion Chapel, Bedminster. In 1844 he settled at Highbury Chapel, Cotham, and commenced that career of spiritual power and ministerial prosperity, which lasted thirty years, growing more and more bright and beautiful from year to year. Mr. Thomas had a vigorous intellect, highly cultivated, and marked by large intelligence and the purest taste. “His conversation on books, public men, and human affairs manifested a comprehensive grasp, a discriminating touch, and no small amount of genial humor.” He died Nov. 7, 1875. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1876, p. 374.

## Thomas, Ebenezer, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Thomas, Ebenezer, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Chelmsford, England, Dec. 23, 1812. His father was an Independent minister, educated at Hoxton College in London, and was ordained at Chelmsford in 1805, where he remained as pastor for a number of years. He removed to Cincinnati, O., when his son was but a child. He was engaged in preaching in Cincinnati and destitute neighborhoods for several years. With a view of supplying the destitute, he organized a Home Evangelization Society, and was its agent. He accepted a call to take charge of the Welsh Independent Church at Paddy's Run, O. Here he established a boarding school, and some of the first men of the country were his patrons and pupils. Under his father's instruction, young Thomas was prepared for college. He entered the Miami University and graduated in 1834. He possessed powers of mind of the highest order, and his scholarly attainments were rarely equaled, never surpassed. Immediately after his graduation, he commenced teaching at Rising Sun, Ind., and afterwards at Franklin, O. When not engaged in teaching, he pursued the study of theology. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Oxford in 1836. Although he had not had the advantage of training in a theological seminary, there were few more thoroughly educated in every branch of theology. He was called to take charge of the Church at Harrison, and he was ordained and installed over the same in July, 1837. After remaining in Harrison over two years, he was called to the Hamilton  Church, where he remained until 1849, when he was elected president of Hanover. College. This position he occupied until 1854, when he resigned to accept the chair of Biblical literature and exegesis in the Theological Seminary at New -Albany, Ind. Here he remained till the seminary was- removed so Chicago, when he resigned, but was re-elected by the new board at its first meeting. He accepted the appointment, but on account of controversy in the Church in regard to his views and those of his colleague, Professor McMasters, in regard to slavery, the seminary was not opened for two years. In the meantime he supplied the pulpit of the first Presbyterian Church in New Albany. In 1858 the synods in whose bounds the seminary was located voted to offer it to the General Assembly, and in 1859 it was accepted by the same. In the meantime the first Church of Dayton, O., gave Dr. Thomas a call, which he accepted. Here he was duly installed, and entered on his work, which he prosecuted with energy and success for twelve years, when he resigned to accept the chair of New Test. Greek and exegesis in Lane Seminary, Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, O. He died there Feb. 2, 1875. Dr. Thomas was a general scholar. He carried his studies outside of the curriculum, and was at home in history, geology, botany, entomology, mineralogy, astronomy, and microscopy. He was a model teacher, his thorough knowledge of every department and his unrivalled colloquial powers combined to make him a great favorite in the classroom. As a theologian he was a sincere and sound Calvinist, and he was as rich in Christian experience as he was sound in the faith. As a preacher he was popular and successful in all the fields of his labor. In all that goes to make tp excellences in writing and speaking, he was a prince. He was esteemed and honored by all. (W. P. S.)

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

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born in St. Stephen's Parish, S. C., Sept. 28, 1800, and received his early education at the grammar-school in Pineville. In 1817 he entered the sophomore class in the South Carolina College, Columbia, and graduated in 1819. He lived in Cambridge, Mass., in order to study at Harvard College; and, after a few months, transferred his residence to New Haven, prosecuting his studies at Yale. He entered the Theological Seminary, city of New York, in 1822; returned to his native state in the fall of 1824; and, in February, 1825, was ordained deacon by bishop Bowen, and became a missionary first to Fairfield District, and afterwards to Greenville. In April, 1826, he was admitted to priest's orders by bishop Bowen, and, after filling out his unexpired term at Greenville,  became rector, February, 1827, of Trinity Church on Edisto Island. In 1834 he resigned his charge on account of ill-health, and went to reside at St. Augustine, Fla., where his health so improved that the rectorship of the Church there was offered to him. He declined, and after a further residence there returned to South Carolina, and in 1836 accepted a call to the parish of St. John's, Berkeley County. In the winter of 1837-38 the disease of which he did (an affection of the bowels) began to show itself, but he continued to labor on until May 24,1840, when he gave up work entirely, dying July 11 of the same year. A volume of Sermons was published after his death, under the supervision of his widow. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5,664.

## Thomas, Eleazer, D.D[[@Headword:Thomas, Eleazer, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the State of New York; received an academic education at Cazenovia; was converted when seventeen; and entered Genesee Conference as a probationer in 1839. He was transferred to California in 1852, and was pastor one year of the Powell Street Church, San Francisco. In 1856 he was elected editor of the California Christian Advocate; and re-elected in 1.860 and 1864. He was chosen book agent in 1868, and, at the end of his four years term in 1872, was appointed presiding elder of the Petaluma District. In the spring of 1873 he was appointed a member of the Peace Commission, and sent to treat with the Modoc Indians. On April 11 the commissioners were decoyed into the Lava Beds, Southern Oregon, and Dr. Thomas and Genesis Canby were killed. Dr. Thomas was a man of good presence, fine address, and great zeal and energy as a minister. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born Dec. 31, 1805, at St. George's, Newcastle Co., Del. He was prepared for college at the Phillips Academy at Andover, Mass., under John Adams, principal, and was graduated from Amherst College in 1833. About this time he united with the Second Presbyterian Church of Wilmington, Del. He then engaged for six months as assistant teacher in a seminary at Newark, Del., after which he entered Princeton Seminary, N. J., and remained there until near the close of 1835, when he left because of feeble health. He was licensed by the Wilmington Presbytery Oct. 14, 1835, after which he began to labor as a missionary in  Rockingham Counnty, Va. He was ordained sine tutela by the Lexington, Presbytery at High Bridge Church, Va., June 17,1837.. For about a year he preached at Union, Port Republic, and Shilohi where his labors were blessed and large Congregations attended his ministry. Having accepted a call to Shemariah Church, Augusta Co., Va., he was installed as pastor Dec. 1, 1838. His health having improved, and the community having provided an academy, Mr. Thomas also commenced a classical school, which became in a short time quite flourishing. But the united duties of pastor and teacher were too onerous, and he was, at his own request, released from his former charge, Oct. 12,1843. This was his only pastoral charge. Thenceforth he resided about eighteen years at Beverly, Randolph Co., and labored as a missionary in that and several adjacent counties, ranging over a wide extent of wild and mountainous country, preaching in court-houses, jails, school-houses, barns, and private houses, wherever any would gather to hear the Word of God. There was no minister nearer on the west than Clarksburg, and on the south-west than Parkersburg. Much of the wide region he traversed was a mountain wilderness; often his only road was an obscure path; dangerous rivers were to be forded; and many of the best people were living in log-cabins, often in a single room. But he enjoyed the work, gladly breaking the bread of life to the hungry and the starving. The breaking-out of the Civil War, in 1861, stopped his work, and his mission field became a scene of strife. Having removed his family from Beverly to Craigsville, Augusta Co., he occasionally supplied, during the war, the churches of Windy Cove, Warm Springs, and Lebanon. After 1865 he preached as opportunity; offered. He generally taught school in the winter season. For several of his last years he suffered severely from chronic throat-disease. He died at Craigsville, Jan. 25, 1879. (W. P. S.)

## Thomas, John (1), LL.D[[@Headword:Thomas, John (1), LL.D]]

             an English prelate, was born at Carlisle, Oct. 14, 1712; was educated at the grammar-school at Carlisle, and Queen's College, Oxford. . After his graduation he became an assistant at a classical academy, Soho Square, London; then private tutor to the younger son of Sir William Clayton. He was ordained deacon March 27, 1737, and priest Sept. 25. In the same year he was presented by George II to the rectory of Blechingly, and was instituted Jan. 27, 1738. On Jan. 18,1748, he was appointed chaplain in ordinary to the king; April 23, 1754, he was made prebendary of Westminster; and Dec. 12, 1760, was appointed chaplain to George Il. In 1762 he was appointed sub almoner to the archbishop of York; and in  1766 was instituted to the vicarage of St. Bride's, London. He succeeded Dr. Pearce as dean of Westminster, 1768; and in November, 1774, became bishop of Rochester. He died Aug. 22, 1793. A valuable collection of his Sermons and Charges was published by Rev. G. A. Thomas (1796, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Thomas, John (2)[[@Headword:Thomas, John (2)]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born at Carmarthen, April 13,1811. He was converted at the age of eighteen, and became an efficient teacher, in the Sabbath-school; removed to Newcastle in 1844, and, at the request of the Welsh population, became pastor of their chapel. He accepted a call from Glynneath in 1855; but after two years of labor with that people, under medical advice, resigned his charge. He died Aug. 3, 1870. See. (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1871, p. 353.

## Thomas, John, D.D[[@Headword:Thomas, John, D.D]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born at Holyhead, February 3, 1821. After being educated at Martin School and Frevdyral Seminary he entered the ministry, serving several churches, the Tabernacle at Liverpool enjoying his ministry from 1854 until his death, July 14, 1892. In 1865 he visited the Welsh churches of the United, States, and again in 1876. He was chairman of the Welsh Congregational Union in 1878, and of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1885. He was widely known as a lecturer, and was a frequent contributor to the Welsh magazines, and was always in demand as a preacher at county associations and the like. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1893.

## Thomas, John, M.D[[@Headword:Thomas, John, M.D]]

             the founder of the Christadelphians (q.v.), was born at Hoxton Square, London, April 12, 1805. His father was a Dissenting clergyman while in England and a Baptist clergyman after coming to the United States in 1832. John was educated as a physician, beginning, at the age of sixteen, a medical course under a private physician, and continuing it for three years at St. Thomas's Hospital. He then assisted a London physician a year, and practiced medicine at Hackney three years. Although a member of his father's church from boyhood, his first attention to creeds was in 1830 or 1831, when he began the study of the subject of immortality, upon which he made contributions to The Lancet. Purely as a business venture he sailed for New York, May 1, 1832. Shortly after reaching Cincinnati he became acquainted with Walter Scott, the original founder of the "Christians," or Campbellites. Before he was aware of it, he had heard from Scott a full exposition of his doctrines, had assented to them as appearing rational and had been induced to indicate that assent by immersion at ten o'clock at night in the Miami canal. On a trip east, in 1833, he met and visited Alexander Campbell, was forced reluctantly into assisting him in public addresses, and was so well received by the people that, on reaching Baltimore, he made addresses every evening for a week upon religious topics. During 1834 and 1835 he practiced medicine in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Richmond, speaking to the Campbellite congregations on Sundays.

In May 1834, he issued the first number of The Apostolic Advocate. a monthly magazine, of which five volumes were issued in all. His first opposition to the received views of the sect consisted in publishing, in No. 6 of his magazine, an article on Anabaptism, resulting in controversy between him and Mr. Campbell. The former insisted upon the reimmersion of persons coming to the sect from Baptist churches; the latter denied its necessity. On December 1, 1835, Dr. Thomas made another advance in free-thought by publishing thirty-four questions which hinted at materialism, annihilation of the wicked, a physical kingdom, etc. The chief outcry against him was for his materialistic tendencies. By 1836 Mr. Campbell denounced him openly.

About this time Mr. Thomas moved to Amelia County, Virginia, abandoned the practice of medicine, set up a printing-office on his farm, and devoted himself largely to literary work. In August 1837, he engaged in a public discussion with a Presbyterian  clergyman, Reverend Mr. Watt. In November he was publicly disfellowshipped by Mr. Campbell, while, in response to the demands of the latter, he was called to account by the churches at Painesville and Bethel for his views. They did not, however, see fit to discipline him, contenting themselves with some suggestions concerning the spirit in which he should carry on the discussion. In 1838 he made a preaching tour through the southern counties of Virginia, coming in conflict more or less with Mr. Campbell. In 1839 he removed to Longrove, Illinois, took up two hundred and eighty-eight acres of land, and for two years confined his attention to farming.

After a brief residence at St. Charles, where his printing-office and physician's office were burned, he opened an office at Hennepin, and was appointed lecturer on chemistry in Franklin Medical College. The Advocate having now been suspended for nearly three years, he started, in 1842, a monthly called The Investigator, of which he issued twelve numbers. In 1843 he began The Herald of the Future Age, at Louisville, Kentucky, and continued it at Richmond. where, in 1844, he held his first meetings separately from the Campbellites. Collisions with the latter led to further study and to wider divergence of creed. He published his articles of belief at this time, and in October 1846, delivered a series of ten lectures in New York in defence thereof. Having still further perfected his declaration of belief, he decided, in February or March 1847, that he ought to be baptized into that belief; accordingly, he requested a friend to immerse him and to say over him, "Upon confession of your faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, I baptize you into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

After fourteen years of search he was now satisfied that he had reached the truth. He began to advocate it more earnestly than ever, visiting Baltimore, where he was permitted to speak in the Campbellite meeting-house; Buffalo, where he was furnished with the Millerite place of worship, and New York, where he was received by the Campbellites. With letters from many Campbellites and other friends he sailed from New York in June 1848, for England. His enemies had communicated his peculiar doctrines to the Campbellites of Nottingham and other places. He was therefore refused audience by them, but he addressed the Millerites of Nottingham, Derby, Birmingham, and Plymouth. The London Campbellites denounced him officially.

Those of Lincoln and Newark received him, and the former made him their delegate to the Church convention at Glasgow. An effort to prevent his sitting was unsuccessful, and he addressed large audiences in the City Hall. A call for the publication of his views, while at Glasgow, led  to the preparation of Elpis Israel (478 pp. royal 8vo). At Edinburgh he delivered a course of ten lectures. Spending the winter of 1848-49 in London, upon his book, he made subsequent tours through England and Scotland lecturing and preaching. In November 1850, he came again to the United States, resumed The Herald of the Future Age in 1851, and published volume 1 of Eureka. He travelled and advocated his views through the States and Canada until 1862, when the war caused the cessation of his paper, and he sailed for Liverpool. He visited all the places where groups had been organized to advocate his views, and, returning to the United States, issued the second volume of Eureka. The third volume was published in 1868. A third trip to Great Britain was made in 1869, when he found that his Birmingham church had grown from twelve to one hundred and twenty-three members. Crossing to the United States for the fourth time, in May 1870, he began a tour of the country, but was prostrated at Worcester, Massachusetts, and compelled to give up his work. He died in New York, March 5, 1871. In addition to the periodicals and books mentioned above, he issued, The Apostasy Unveiled (1838, 148 pages): — Anatolia (1854, 102 pages): — Anastasis (46 pages): — Phanerois, and several tracts and lectures. (C.W.S.)

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

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born at Penmain, Aug. 2, 1803. At an early age he was the subject of deep religious impressions, and at the age of seventeen joined the Church. He graduated at Brecon College, and was ordained pastor of the Church at Adullam Chapel, Merthyr-Tydvil, where he labored with zeal and energy for eleven years. In 1843 Mr. Thomas removed to Carmarthenshire, to take charge of the united churches of Bethlehem and Cape Isaac, where he labored for six years with much acceptance and success. In 1849 he removed to Aberavon, and devoted himself with indefatigable zeal to the spiritual improvement of the people; and, in spite of many difficulties, succeeded in erecting a spacious chapel and gathering a numerous congregation. His last charge was at Aberdare, where he labored till his death, Sept. 2, 1875. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1876, p. 377.

## Thomas, Richard H., M.D[[@Headword:Thomas, Richard H., M.D]]

             a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Anne-Arundel County, Md., June, 1805. “Having received a liberal education and completed a course of medical studies, he settled in Baltimbre, where he became eminent as a practitioner and teacher of medicine.” In the work of the ministry he labored with great diligence. He held many meetings among other denominations, and preached with great acceptability. He was a man of pleasing address; and, possessing great vivacity and extraordinary  talents, he gained ready access to the most cultivated society. He died at his residence, near Baltimore, Jan. 15,1860. See Annual Monitor, 1860, p. 128.

## Thomas, Robert Jermain, A.B[[@Headword:Thomas, Robert Jermain, A.B]]

             a Welsh Congregational missionary, was born at Rhayadar, Sept. 7, 1840. He matriculated at the London University at the age of sixteen, and gained the Mills scholarship and took high honors at the university. He was ordained June 4, 1863, at Hanover Chapel, and sailed the following month for Shanghai, under the direction of the London Missionary Society. He was afterwards appointed to the Pekin Mission, and on his way thither he undertook an extensive missionary journey through the peninsula of Corea, telling the glorious truths of the Gospel of Christ and distributing copies of the Scriptures. In 1865 the French admiral prepared an expedition against the Coreans, and Mr. Thomas was persuaded to act as an interpreter for the expedition. He was put to death by the Coreans while reading the Bible, July, 1866. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1868, p. 296.

## Thomas, Robert S., D.D[[@Headword:Thomas, Robert S., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born. in Scott County, Kentucky, June 20, 1805. He united with the Church in 1821, was ordained, in 1830, pastor at Columbia, Missouri, and for several years performed much evangelical labor in Missouri, being the first to introduce Sabbath-schools into that state. He was chosen professor of languages and moral science in the State University, and in 1853 president of William Jewell College. He finally removed to Kansas City, where he organized a church, of which he was the pastor until his death, June 12, 1859. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1149. (J.C.S.)

## Thomas, Samuel (1)[[@Headword:Thomas, Samuel (1)]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, became a member of the society, in the early period of Methodism, in the State of New Jersey. He was an acceptable local preacher for a number of years, entered the itinerancy in 1796, and filled the following stations: In 1796-97, Flanders Circuit; 1798, Elizabethtown Circuit; 1799, Freehold; 1800-1, Newburg; 1802, Bethel; 1803, Elizabethtown; 1804-5, Freehold; 1806, supernumerary in Brooklyn; 1807, in New York; 1808, superannuated, in which relation he continued until he died, in 1812. Mr. Thomas was a man of much prayer and diligence in searching the Scriptures, strongly attached to the doctrines and discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and ever considered as a strict disciplinarian. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1, 208; Stevens, Hist. of M.E. Church, 4:281.

## Thomas, Samuel (2)[[@Headword:Thomas, Samuel (2)]]

             an Independent minister, was born in Jorat, Switzerland, in 1801. By his own industry he obtained an education at Lausanne Academy, and was ordained at Grancy in 1825. After four years of usefulness at the latter place, Mr. Thomas was elected president of the Training Institute at Lausanne, a post for which he was eminently fitted, both by his earnest  piety and varied gifts and attainments. In 1836 he was called to the Church of the Oratory at Yverdun, where he spent nineteen years of useful labor, and in 1855 settled at Neufchatel. He died Jan. 12,1867. Mr. Thomas was a man of inflexible principles, yet of most gentle and tender disposition. He took a conspicuous part in the revival movement in Switzerland, and showed himself a wise and experienced counsellor. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1868, p. 297.

## Thomas, Samuel (3)[[@Headword:Thomas, Samuel (3)]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Pontreych, Nov. 20, 1815. He graduated at Brecon College in 1843, and was ordained to the pastorate of Ebenezer Chapel, Newport. Under his personal superintendence a new chapel was erected, and the Church membership greatly increased. In 1860, he removed to Bethlehem, and labored with the Church there until his death, April 5,1869. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1870, p. 322.

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

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born near Carmarthen in 1822, and was brought up under Unitarian influence and educated for the medical profession; but the love of evangelical truth induced him to enter the ministry. He graduated at Homerton College, and accepted the pastorate of Fetter Lane Chapel, London; and labored also at Wellingborough thirteen years. In 1858 he removed to Bethnal Green Chapel, London, and labored with them until his death, March 13,1861. Mr. Thomas was a worker of the highest type, and his generous nature and vivid imagination endeared him to a large circle of friends. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1862, p. 263.

## Thomas, Thomas E., D.D[[@Headword:Thomas, Thomas E., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in London, England, in 1812, and graduated from Miami University in 1834. His first pastoral charge was at Harrison, near Cincinnati, and his second at Hamilton, for twelve years. He then accepted the presidency of Hanover College, Ind., and passed from that to a professorship in the Theological Seminary at New Albany. In 1859 lie became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Dayton, Ohio, and in 1871 was elected professor of Biblical literature in Lane Theological Seminary. He died February 2, 1875. Dr. Thomas was a man of strong mind, and one of the leaders of the anti-slavery party in the Presbyterian Church long before the civil war. See Presbyterian, February 13, 1875.

## Thomas, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Thomas, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Welsh Baptist minister and educator, was born at Cowbridge, January 12, 1805. He began to preach when fifteen years of age, and labored with much zeal. At the age of seventeen he entered the Baptist College at Abergavenny, and two years later removed to Stepney College, where he spent four years in faithful study. In 1828 he entered upon the pastorate of the Church in Henrietta Street, Brunswick Square, London, where he  remained eight years. In 1836, on the removal of Abergavenny College to Pontypool, he became its president, and retained the office until 1877. In the beginning of this work he was energetic in his ministerial labors, and soon formed a Baptist Church, which, in time, became the leading one of the town. He died December 6, 1881. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1883, page 278.

## Thomas, William (1)[[@Headword:Thomas, William (1)]]

             an English prelate, was born at Bristol, Feb. 2, 1613, and received his primary education in the school of Carmarthen, where his grandfather lived. He entered St. John's College, Oxford, in 1629, and removed, later, to Jesus College, of which he was afterwards chosen a fellow and appointed tutor. His ordination as deacon took place at Christ Church, June 4, 1637, and as priest in the year following. His first preferment was the vicarage of Penbryn, Cardiganshire. He became chaplain to the earl of Northumberland, who presented him to the vicarage of Laugharne, with  the rectory of Llansadwrhen) annexed. In 1644 a party of Parliament horse came into town threatening to kill Mr. Thomas if they found him praying for the queen. They did interfere with, the service, but were so struck with his composure and. patience that they left him without further disturbance. Soon after, the Parliament committee deprived him of his living of Laugharne, from which time till the Restoration he endured great hardships, being obliged to teach a private school for his support. At the Restoration, Mr. Thomas was reinstated in his living, and by the king's letters-patent made chanter of St. David's. In 1661 he was presented to the rectory of Llanbedr in the Valley, Pembroke County, and made chaplain to the duke of York, through whose influence he was promoted to the deanery of Worcester, Nov. 25,1665; and was presented to the rectory of Hampton Lovett in 1670.. Here he removed his family, quitting the living of Laugharne. In 1677 he was promoted to the see of St. David's and held the deanery of Worcester in commendam. Having been bishop of St. David's six years, he was translated to the see of Worcester, where he effected several reforms. He died June 25,1688. Bishop Thomas published, An Apology for the Church of England (1678-79, 8vo): —Assize Sermon (1657): —The Mammon of Unrighteousness, a sermon. His Letter to the Clergy, and an imperfect work, Roman Oracles Silenced, were published after his death. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Thomas, William (2)[[@Headword:Thomas, William (2)]]

             an English clergyman and antiquarian, was grandson of the preceding, and was born in 1670. He was educated at Westminster school, whence he was elected to Trinity College, Cambridge, June 25, 1688. Here he took his master's degree, and soon went into orders, and had the living of Exhall, in Warwickshire, given him by the interest of lord Somers. Queen Anne was well disposed towards him, but he declined preferment or attendance at court. For the education of his family he removed to Worcester in 1721, and in 1723 was presented to the rectory of St. Nicholas in that city. He died July 26,1738. Besides being skilled in the Greek and Latin languages, he also mastered the French, Italian. and Saxon. He published, Antiquitates Prioratus Majoris Malvernae (1725) an edition of Ducgdale's Warwickshire (1730): —and Survey of the Cathedral Church of Worcester (1746). He intended to have published a history of Worcestershire; and, to gather material for this, visited every church in the county. To these labors Dr. Nash owns himself greatly indebted.

## Thomasin Of Zirklaria (Zerkldre)[[@Headword:Thomasin Of Zirklaria (Zerkldre)]]

             in the Italian Tyrol wrote a lengthy didactic poem between August, 1215, and May, 1216, entitled Der wälsche Gast (The Foreign Guest), by which production he began the extended series of ethical poems that distinguish the 13th century. Thomasin was a layman, and wrote for laymen, and with him begins the distinction between a religious morality for the people and a theological morality of the Church. His work is characterized by vivacity and gracefulness, by clearness of expression and warmth of feeling, though not by aesthetical and linguistic beauties. Independence of thought is also a leading quality, and is carried to such a degree as to defend the principle that conscience is superior to ecclesiastical institutions of every kind. Thomasin does not rage against the priesthood and the papacy, but rather esteems them very highly when they “bear the image of good doctrine;” but he does not, on the other hand, hesitate to utter in their ears the most cutting truths. His object, in brief, was to teach a practical morality; and his place is rather among the exponents of the religious and ethical tendencies of his time than among the poets. He teaches that Stäte, an inward and settled affinity for the good and the right, is the center of all virtues. This is not the Constantia of the ‘stoical Seneca merely, but a positive energy which actually gives effect to the impulses of the heart. Evil is Unstäte, or instability. Among particular virtues, humility is given the first place. The book existed in MS. form only until 1852, when it was issued by Rückert under the title Der walsche Gast des Thomasin von Zirklaria (Quedlinburg and Leips.), with notes. Comp. the extracts given in Gesch. d. poet. Nationalliteratur, by Gervinus, and see Diestel, Der wälsche Gast u. d. Moral des 13ten Jahrh. in Kiel, Allgem. Monatsschrift, Aug. 1852, p. 687- 714. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Thomasius, Gottfried[[@Headword:Thomasius, Gottfried]]

             a German Protestant divine, was born in the year 1802 at Egenhausen, in Franconia. In 1821 he graduated at the gymnasium in Anspach, and prosecuted his theological studies at the universities of Erlangen, Halle, and Berlin. In 1829 he was preacher at the Church of the Holy Ghost in Nuremberg, and in 1830 religious instructor, also, at the gymnasium there. In 1842 he was called to Erlangen as professor of dogmatics and university preacher. For more than thirty years he filled that chair and died as senior of the faculty, Jan. 24, 1875. He published, Origenes: ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des 3ten Jahrh. (Nuremb. 1837): De Controverisia  Hofnannianc Commentatio (Erlangae, 1844): —Beitrage zür kirchlichen Christologie (ibid. 1845): —Dogmatis de Obedientia Christi Activa Historia et Progressionis inde a Con.fessione A ugustana ad Formulam usque Concordice (ibid. 1846): —Das Bekenntniss der evalng. —luth. Kirche in der Consequen seines Prinzipes (Nuremb. 1848): —Christi Person und Werk: Darstellunq der luther. Dogmatik vom Mittelpunkt der Christologie aus (Erlang. 1853-61, 3 vols.; 2nd ed. 1857): Das Bekenntniss der luther; Kirche von der Versohnung und die Versohnungslehre Dr. Chr. K. v. Hofmanns (ibid. 1857). He also published several volumes of Sermons: a practical Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Colossians (Erlang. 1869), etc. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1337 sq.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Literarischer Handweiserfür das kathol. Deutschland, 1868, p. 119; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B. P.)

## Thomassin, Louis de[[@Headword:Thomassin, Louis de]]

             a learned French divine, was born at Aix, in Provence, Aug. 28,1619. At the age of fourteen he was admitted into the Congregation of the Oratory, where he remained as professor of moral philosophy until he was appointed to the chair of divinity at Saumur. He removed to Paris in 1654, to hold conferences in positive theology 2 the Seminary of Sainte Magloire, which he continued till 1688. From that time he was engaged principally with his writings until his death, Dec. 25, 1695. His principal works are, Ecclesiastical Discipline (reprinted 1725, 3 vols. fol. in French) Theological Dogmas (1680, 3 vols. fol. in Latin):— Tracts on the Divine Office; on the Feasts; on the Fasts; on Truth and Falsehood; on Alms; on Trade and Usury (all 8vo): —Tr. Dogmatique des Moyens dont on s'est servi dans tous les Tenips pour maintenir, Unite de l'Eglise (1703, 3 vols. 4to): —also Directions for Studying and Teaching Philosophy in a Christian Manner (8vo): —A Universal Hebrew Glossary (Louvre, 1697, fol.): —Dissertations on the Councils, in Latin (1667, 4to): Memoires sur la Grace (1682, 4to). His life, by Bordes, is prefixed to his Hebrew Glossary. See Chalmers Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Thomists[[@Headword:Thomists]]

             a name often given to the followers of Thomas Aquinas, who, besides adopting the Aristotelian philosophy, in opposition to Duns Scotus, who held the Platonic, also taught the doctrines of Augustine on the subject of  original sin, free grace, etc. He condemned the dogma of the immaculate conception, in opposition to Scotus. The two sects were also divided on the question of the sacraments, as to ‘whether grace was conferred by them physically or morally; the Thomists holding the former, the Scotists the latter. Dens, who was a Thomist, in his theology, explains what is meant by the view of his party. He says, “The sacraments possess a physical causality, as the instruments of divine omnipotence, and truly and properly concur towards the production of their effects on the mind by a supernatural virtue from the principal agent, communicated to and united with it in the manner of a transient action; and, moreover, such a causality is more conformable to the declarations of Scripture, and demonstrates more fully the dignity of the sacrament, and the efficacy of the divine omnipotence and of the merits of Christ. Besides, they say that this is also more conformable to the sentiments of councils and fathers, who, as they explain the causality of the sacraments use various similitudes which: undoubtedly designate a causality more than moral.” On the contrary, the Scotists teach that “the sacraments do not cause grace physically, but morally; that is, they do not produce grace as physical causes do, but as moral causes; inasmuch as they efficaciously move God to produce the grace which they signify, and which God himself promises infallibly to give as often as they are rightly administered and worthily received,” etc. The Thomists were Realists, while the Scotists were Nominalists; and although the Roman see naturally inclined to favor the doctrines of the Scotists, the prestige of Aquinas was so great that the Thomists ruled the theology of the Church up to the time of the controversy between the Molinists (q.v.) and the Jansenists, when the views of the Scotists substantially prevailed. SEE AQUINAS, THOMAS A.

## Thomlinson, Joseph Smith, D.D[[@Headword:Thomlinson, Joseph Smith, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Georgetown, Ky., March 15,1802;'and, after serving a time at the saddler's trade, entered Transylvania University, where he held a high rank as a scholar. When Lafayette visited the institution, Thomlinson was the person chosen to tender him the greetings of his fellow-students. He graduated, in 1825. and became professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in Augusta College. In the same year he was admitted to the traveling connection, and in due time was ordained to the offices of deacon and elder. Having served as professor for some time, he was chosen president of the Augusta College, and held that office till 1849, when the institution was broken  down by a withdrawal of the patronage of the Kentucky Conference, and the repeal of its charter by the legislature of the State. He was subsequently elected to a professorship of the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, 0., but declined to accept it, though he acted as agent for the institution for two years. He accepted an election as professor in the university at Athens, 0., and, having served in this capacity for a year, was chosen president, which latter position he declined on account of ill-health. His mind was so affected by the sudden death of a favorite son that he never fully recovered; and although elected to the presidency of the Springfield High-school and of the State University of Indiana, he declined both. He died at Neville, O., June 4, 1853. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:706.

## Thomoi[[@Headword:Thomoi]]

             (θομοϊv. Vulg. Coesi), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 5:32) of the Heb. name (Ezr 2:53; Neh 7:55) TAMAH SEE TAMAH or THAMAH SEE THAMAH (q.v.).

## Thompson, Alexander Scroggs[[@Headword:Thompson, Alexander Scroggs]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born April 28, 1834, at Big Spring (Springfield), Cumberland Co., Pa. He received his early education at Newville Academy under Rev. Robert McCachren, and at Shippensburg Collegiate Institute under Prof. R. L. Sibbet. At an early age he joined the United Presbyterian Church of Big Spring, near Newville. He graduated from Jefferson College, Pa., in 1864, and soon after entered Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J. There he studied two years (186466), and afterwards spent a third year (1866-67) at the Western Seminary at Allegheny, Pa. He was licensed by New Brunswick Presbytery April 18, 1866, and supplied New Harmony Church in Donegal Presbytery during the summer of that year. He was ordained by the Presbytery of Allegheny at Worthington, Armstrong Co., Pa, Nov. 20, 1867, and on the same day installed pastor of Worthington Church. This relation continued until his death, which occurred suddenly, Dec. 4, 1878. He was retiring in his manners, true in his friendships, a very successful minister, and a model pastor. His remains were buried at Newville, Pa. (W.P. S.)

## Thompson, Amherst L[[@Headword:Thompson, Amherst L]]

             a young Congregational missionary, was born at Peru, Mass., in 1834. Converted at the age of fourteen, he resolved to prepare himself for the  ministry. Trusting in Providence and his own arm, he went through the curriculum of Monson Academy and Amherst College, graduating in 1856. He studied theology partly at New York and partly at Andover, graduating at the latter place. He was ordained to the missionary work at Amherst Feb. 2,1860, and on the 13th, in company with eight other missionaries, sailed from Boston for Urumiyah, Persia, where he arrived July 1. On Aug. 16 he was taken with a severe chill; which soon developed into a terrible fever, completing its fatal work on the 25th. He sleeps by the side of Stoddard in the little mission burying-ground in Mt. Seir, Urumiyah. Mr. Thompson had a vigorous and keen intellect, coolness and strong common-sense, and a brilliant imagination. As a man and a Christian he is represented as a model. At his graduation at Andover he delivered an essay on Congregational Church Polity Adapted to Foreign Missionary Work, which was published in the Cong. Quarterly, Jan. 1860. See Cong. Quar. Rev. 1861, p. 67.

## Thompson, Anthony P[[@Headword:Thompson, Anthony P]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Kentucky, Sept. 2, 1806. He became an exhorter in 1824, and was soon after licensed as a local preacher, received on trial in 1829, appointed to Terre Haute Circuit, Indiana Conference, in 1832, and died May 19, 1833. He was a young man of excellent talents. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 2, 277.

## Thompson, Anthony, A.B[[@Headword:Thompson, Anthony, A.B]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Alawick in 1835. He graduated at Spring Hill College, and matriculated at the London University. In 1863 he accepted a call from Douglas, Isle of Man, and, full of zeal and hope, entered upon his labors. His pulpit ministrations were marked by many tokens of blessings. He had a deep consciousness of the responsibilities attending his position, and faithfully fulfilled the duties devolving upon him. He died April 5,1866. See (Lond.) Cong. Yearbook, 1867, p. 322.

## Thompson, Charles[[@Headword:Thompson, Charles]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Salem, N.Y., Nov.26, 1831. He was converted in 1853; educated at Monmouth College and Theological Seminary, Monmouth, Ill.; licensed by Chicago Presbytery April 3, 1863; ordained by Monmouth Presbytery pastor of Olena and Oquaka churches,  Ill., June 17, 1863; and died Dec. 31, 1865. He was a good, man, “walked with God,” and preached in demonstration of the spirit, and with power. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 363.

## Thompson, Frederick Bordine[[@Headword:Thompson, Frederick Bordine]]

             a missionary of the Reformed Church in America to Borneo, was born in 1810, and united with the Church in New Brunswick, under Rev. Dr. James B. Hardenbergh, at the age of seventeen. His pastor having induced him to prepare for the ministry, he graduated at Rutgers College in1831, and at the Theological Seminary in New Brunswick in 1834. After being settled as pastor of the Church at Upper Red Hook, N. Y., from 1834 till 1836, he determined to devote himself to foreign missionary work, and was sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the Board of Foreign Missions of his own Church, with the devoted William J. Rohlman, to join the mission in Borneo. He reached Singapore Sept. 17,1838, and labored at Karangan, one of the two stations occupied by the mission (the other being Sambas), for several years, with great industry and devotion to his work, among the Dyaks. His first wife, formerly a Miss Wyckoff, of New Brunswick, died in 1839. In 1840 he married a Swiss lady, Miss Combe, a teacher in the mission, who also died, in 1844. In 1847 a hemorrhage of the lungs compelled him to desist from labor; and, by medical advice, he sailed for Europe with his motherless daughter, to place her with her relatives in Switzerland, and to try the benefit of the change of climate for himself. At first he improved, but the disease returned, and he died Jan. 17, 1848. Thus ended the brief career of one whose piety, talents, and consecration bade fair to place him, if he had been spared, among the very first of modern evangelists to the heathen. He was a grave, quiet, devout, and intensely earnest man. His missionary trials and. last illness were borne with patient submission to the will of God, and with clear views of his acceptance ands peace with the Lord. His labors among the Dyaks, like those of the whole mission, seemed to be fruitless of immediate results; but his name lives in the Church as a power for missions, and perhaps in future ages Borneo will enshrine it among her first evangelists. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Ch. p. 489. (W. J. R. T.)

## Thompson, George C[[@Headword:Thompson, George C]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Nanticoke, Luzerne Co., Pa., Jan. 15,1817. He was converted in December, 1832, educated at  Cazenovia Seminary, licensed to preach Aug. 6, 1836, received on trial in the Oneida Conference in 1840, and appointed to Dundaff Station; in 1841, to Montrose Circuit; in 1842, ordained elder and reappointed to the same circuit; in 1843 he became insane, and died Sept. 18, 1846, at the New York Lunatic Asylum in Utica. His talents as a minister were elevated. “In ministerial labors he was abundant, in mental application he was excessive.” See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 4:257.

## Thompson, George Washington, D.D[[@Headword:Thompson, George Washington, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at New Providence, Essex Co., J., Oct. 10,1819; converted in 1835; graduated at Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., and at the Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick; ordained pastor of the churches of Mifflinsburg and New Berlin, 1842; became pastor of the Church of Lower Tuscarora in 1847, and remained there seventeen years. He died Jan. 28, 1864. Dr. Thompson had an acute, ready, practical mind. As a scholar he was thorough and critical; his Expository Lectures on Daniel and on the Romans display a vast amount of patient research, deep thinking, critical analysis, and full knowledge of the teachings of the Bible. : See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p.123.

## Thompson, John[[@Headword:Thompson, John]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Chambersburg, Franklin Co., Pa., Nov. 11 1772. He received his literary training in the Kentucky Academy, Lexington, studied theology privately, was licensed by Transylvania Presbytery in 1799, and ordained by Washington Presbytery, O., in 1801. He was pastor of Glendale Church, O., 1801-33; then removed to Indiana, became a member of Crawfordsville Presbytery, and labored as an evangelist. He died Feb. 15,1859. He was an earnest revival preacher, an eloquent and successful minister, and many persons were hopefully converted under his labors. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 123.

## Thompson, Jonathan[[@Headword:Thompson, Jonathan]]

             a Wesleyan Methodist preacher, was born at Torhouse, Haltwhistle, Northumberland, England. In his early life he resided for a time in Ayr, Scotland. He was converted under Cownley at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. In 1786 he returned to Ayr, where he officiated as a local preacher. In 1789  he came out to labor in connection with the British Conference, and was sent to the Inverness Circuit. He was soon cut down by a fever in Elgin, Morayshire. He was interred in the same tomb that had received the remains of the holy Joshua Keighley only a year before. Young Thompson was a man of holiness and much prayer. “His great zeal for God, united with the fervor and imprudence of youth, led him to excessive labor in the work of his great Master, which proved the cause of his death.” See Minutes of Wesleyan Conferences, 1790; Atmore, Meth. Memorial, s.v.

## Thompson, Joseph Parrish, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Thompson, Joseph Parrish, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Congregational divine, was born in Philadelphia, Aug. 7,1819. He graduated at Yale College in 1838. Afterwards he pursued the study of theology at the Andover and New Haven Theological schools. In November, 1840, he was ordained pastor of the Chapel Street Congregational Church in New Haven. While occupying this position, Dr. Thompson assisted in establishing The New-Englander. He published also, while at New Haven, a Memoir of Timothy Dwight. In 1845 he was called to the pastoral charge of the Broadway Tabernacle Church in New York city, and was installed on the 15th of April of that year. For some years the Tabernacle continued to be a great center of religious interest. The vast edifice was often thronged by a congregation composed of strangers, young men, and those who had no regular place of worship. The Tabernacle Church was the mother of several Congregational churches in New York and Brooklyn.

The society determined to sell the Tabernacle in 1855, and the new church was built at the intersection of Broadway, Sixth Ave., and Thirty-fourth Street. This building was completed in 1859, and dedicated April 24 of that year. Under the ministry of Dr. Thompson the society flourished exceedingly. When the church was dedicated there was a debt upon it of 165,000. No pews were sold, as it was resolved that there should be no private ownership in the building. In 1863 the society paid off $25,000 of this indebtedness; the remaining sum of $40,000 was paid in March, 1864. Notwithstanding Dr. Thompson's immediate pastoral labors, he was always busy with his pen. In 1845 he printed a Memoir of David Hale (late editor of the Journal of Commerce), with Selections from his Miscellaneous Writings-a work which passed through various editions. In 1846 appeared his Young Men Admonished, afterwards, in subsequent editions, which were numerous, entitled Lectures to Young Men… Hints to Employers appeared in 1847, and another edition in 1851. Stray Meditations, was published in 1852; and in 1857 there was a revised  edition, entitled The Believer's Refuge.

He was one of the first editors of the Independent, being associated ill that service with the Rev. Dr. Storrs and the Bev. Dr. Bacon. In 1852 he originated the plan of the Albany Congregational Convention. He also served as a manager of the American Congregational Union and of the American Home Missionary Society. In 1852 he went abroad, visiting Palestine, Egypt, and other Eastern lands. This gave an Oriental cast to his subsequent, studies and writings, and he became well known as art authority in Egyptology. Many of his writings upon this subject appeared in the North American Review, the Bibliotheca Sacra, the Journal of the American Geographical and Statistical Society, in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, and the revised edition of Kitto's Cyclop. of Biblical Literature. He published Egypt, Past and Present, in 1856. During the Civil War, Dr. Thompson occupied a warmly patriotic position. He did a great deal for the Christian Commission. Twice he went to the South; he visited the army; and he was a member of the Union League Club. His son was killed in the service of the country. Dr. Thompson published (1863) a souvenir of him entitled The Sergeant's Memorial, by his Father. When president Lincoln was assassinated, Dr. Thompson delivered a notable eulogy upon him before the Union League Club.

In 1872 Dr. Thompson was compelled by ill health to sever the relation, which he had so long maintained with the society. One night, while working in his study, he imagined that he heard a terrible crash, as if the whole house were falling, and he remembered-nothing more 4til he regained consciousness at three o'clock in the morning. When he resigned his pastoral charge of the Tabernacle Church, it made him a gift of $30,000; and individuals gave him $20,000 more. Having resolved upon going abroad, he took up his residence in Berlin, where he devoted himself to study, especially in Egyptology. During the controversy between Bismarck and the pope, at the request of the Prussian minister, he prepared and published a work on the relations of Church and State in America; and in the Centennial Year he delivered in different cities of Europe several addresses concerning the United States. . His oration occasioned by the death of Mr. Bayard Taylor, the American minister, delivered in Berlin, was a beautiful and much- admired production. He had prepared an address to be delivered before the Evangelical Alliance at Basle, Switzerland, on the subject of the persecutions in. Austria. When Mr. Taylor died, Dr. Thompson was spoken of as his successor. It is known that when the rumor reached his ears, he wrote that he could not accept the position, and considered himself unfitted for it. He spoke excellently both French and German, and he  frequently had occasion to employ his accomplishments as a linguist. in the public addresses which he delivered in Europe. Though always an invalid, Dr. Thompson's last illness was caused by an accident which had happened to him during his visit to London, when, while standing upon the doorstep of a friend's house, he was prostrated by vertigo, severely injuring his head. He died at Berlin, Sept. 20,1879. Among his other productions may be noted The College as a Religious Institution (1859) Love and Penalty (1860): — Bryant Grey (1863): Christianity and Emancipation (1863): — The Holy Comforter (1866): —Man in Genesis and Geology (1869): and Life of Christ (1875): —with a great variety of pamphlets and of contributions to periodical literature. He was understood, at his death, to be preparing a work on The Hebrews in Egypt. See N. Y. Tribune, Sept. 22,1879.

## Thompson, Joseph Russell[[@Headword:Thompson, Joseph Russell]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born Sept. 15, 1823. He received a good academical training, graduated at Jefferson College in 1848, and at the Associate Theological Seminary at Canonsburg, Pa., in 1851; was licensed by the Associate Presbytery of Chartiers in 1852, and ordained and installed pastor of the Mount Pleasant Church April 25, 1853. He died Dec. 16, 1861. Mr. Thompson was a popular preacher, a constant worker, and a tender and thoughtful pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 365.

## Thompson, Lewis[[@Headword:Thompson, Lewis]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Volney, N. Y., April 25, 1830. After receiving a classical education, he entered the Union Theological Seminary in 1854, aid, completing the course, graduated in 1857. He was ordained and installed pastor of the Church in Whippany, N. J., June 9,1857. He remained in this charge with great acceptability and usefulness until 1869, when he resigned to become editor of a religious paper in Bricksburg, N. J. He occupied this post for two years, and then removed to Brooklyn, N. Y., and became a classical teacher, in the occupancy of which position he died, April 19,1873. (W. P. S.)

## Thompson, Otis[[@Headword:Thompson, Otis]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in 1773, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1798. After his graduation he was a tutor in the  university for two years (1798-1800). Having pursued his theological studies with Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, Mass., he was settled for life as pastor of the Congregational Church in Rehoboth. For many years he received and instructed pupils who were looking forward to the ministry. He was everywhere regarded as a profound theologian, and a man of more than usual ability. He published several sermons and discourses, and for several years was the editor of a journal known as the Hopkinsian Magazine. He died at North Abingtoil, Mass., June 26,1859. (J. C. S.)

## Thompson, Robert Gordon[[@Headword:Thompson, Robert Gordon]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born Oct. 22, 1806, in Conemaugh township, Indiana Co., Pa. His education preparatory to the college was received in part from the Rev. Jesse Smith, pastor of the Ebenezer congregation in Indiana County, and in part in the preparatory department of Jefferson. College at Canonsburg, Pa. He uited, on profession of his faith, with the Chartiers Presbyterian Church, Washington Co., in 1827. He was graduated from Jefferson College in September, 1830, and passed from college immediately into Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J., where he. spent two and a half years (1830-33) in study. . He was licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, April 19,1833; and was ordained by the same presbytery, sine tutela, in the Great Valley Presbyterian Church, Oct. 7, 1833. Mr. Thompson spent the first two years of his ministry (from June 1, 1833, to June 1,1835) as stated supply at Poundridge, Westchester Co., N. Y., where his labors were accompanied by a blessed revival. Having accepted a call to Yorktown, N. Y., he was installed as pastor of the Church at that place, May 18,1836; and after a most successful pastorate of ten years, having accepted, a call to Tariffville, Conn., was released Feb. 5, 1846, and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Tariffville, March 17, 1846. There he labored with ability and fidelity six and a half years, when, his health becoming impaired, he was released by his presbytery, Sept. 30, 1852, and removed to Wisconsin. His next field was Roscoe, Ill., where he preached as stated supply from Oct. 24, 1852, to Oct. 8, 1854.

From 1855 to 1862 he supplied, for longer or shorter periods, as his health permitted, the churches of Rockford, Roscoe, Belvidere, and Willow Creek, Ill.; and Janesville and Brodhead, Wis. From July 1, 1862, he supplied Willow Creek Church for two years, when, having accepted a call from that Church, he was installed as pastor, July 6, 1864; and labored there very usefully until he was released, Nov. 16, 1868. He next preached as stated supply at Brodhead from Dec. 5, 1869, to Oct.  9, 1871. A few weeks after the latter date he removed to Greeley, Colossians, to take charge as pastor of a newly organized Presbyterian Church, but was never installed, although he continued as pastor elect to fill its pulpit until March 1, 1877. From this time he was without any charge, but continued to be, so far as his age and increasing physical infirmities would permit, active in laying the foundation both of the Church and of the State in that new region. He died at Greeley, March 19, 1879. Mr. Thompson's views of truth were clear and strong, and his voice gave no uncertain sound. As a preacher he was solid and able, at the same time earnest and affectionate; as a presbyter he was unsurpassed in Christian uprightness; as the head of a family he tenderly loved, and was beloved. (W. P. S.)

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

             a Methodist Protestant minister, was born on the rocky shores of Maine, Oct. 5, 1782; he was converted in 1802, and at once began to preach. Three years later he was ordained deacon, and, after two more, elder. In 1812 he was located, and in 1816 removed to Wheeling Creek, W. Va., where he spent six and a half years, and then withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and united in the movement that eventually resulted in the Methodist Protestant Church. For fifteen years he labored to build up this new branch of the Methodist denomination, when from conscientious impulses he united others in raising an antislavery Church (the Wesleyan). In 1848 he removed to Iowa, and continued in connection with the Wesleyans until 1860, when, learning of the antislavery element in the Methodist Protestant Church, he reunited with them at Mount Pleasant, Ia., and continued to labor in their interest till his death, Oct. 24, 1867. See Bassett, Hist. of the Meth. Pirot. Church, p. 348.

## Thompson, Samuel H[[@Headword:Thompson, Samuel H]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Westmoreland County, Pa., March 16, 1786, and carefully instructed in the principles of the Christian religion according to the views of the Presbyterian Church. In 1804 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church; was received on trial in the Western Conference in 1809; and from that time until 1836, a period of twenty-seven years, his field of labor in successive years embraced large, portions of the states of Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and the whole of the territories of Missouri and Illinois. In all this vast region he first assisted to  plant the principles of the Gospel, and afterwards continued to cultivate them with the most assiduous labor. In 1836, his health failing, he was compelled to take a superannuated relation, and, as such, for the next four years he served the Church in the stations of Alton, Vandalia, Hillsborough, and Belleville. In 1840 he was again returned effective, and appointed to Belleville station, but died March 19 of that year. He was a minister of fine abilities, and everywhere he breathed the peaceful spirit of Christianity around him. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 3, 346.

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Beaver County, Pa.; awakened at a camp-meeting under the preaching of the Rev. William Swayze; admitted on trial in the Pittsburgh Conference in 1831, and appointed to Leesburg Circuit. He labored as follows: Centreville, Mercer, Newcastle, Richmond, Salem, Lumberport, and Grandview. In 1843 he became a supernumerary, and in 1848 a superannuate.. He died Feb. 13,1851. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 4:602.

## Thompson, Thomas Jefferson, D.D[[@Headword:Thompson, Thomas Jefferson, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Dorchester County, Maryland, March 13, 1803. He was converted in his thirteenth year, began his itinerant career in 1825, and in 1826 entered the Philadelphia Conference. In it he served in turn Milford and Talbot Circuits; St. George's, Philadelphia; Rahway, N.J.; St. John's, Philadelphia; Kent Circuit, Maryland; Trenton, N.J.; Newark; East Jersey District; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Fifth Street, Philadelphia; St. Paul's; Snow Hill District; Asbury Church, Wilmington; Union Church, Philadelphia; South Philadelphia District; Reading District, as general agent of Wesleyan Female College; Dover, Delaware; Easton District, Dover District, and Wilmington District — thus summing twenty-two and a half years on circuits and stations, two years as agent, and twenty-five years as presiding elder. In 1836 the New Jersey Conference was organized and Mr. Thompson became identified therewith, but the next year returned to the Philadelphia Conference. In 1868, on the formation of the Wilmington Conference, he fell within its limits, and therein remained till his death, at Wilmington, Delaware, November 29, 1874. Dr. Thompson was a member of the General Conferences of 1844, 1852, 1856, 1860, 1868, 1872. He  was characterized by promptness and sterling integrity, zeal and solid worth. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, page 27.

## Thompson, William[[@Headword:Thompson, William]]

             an eminent English Wesleyan preacher, was born in the county of Fermanagh, Ireland, in 1733. He was converted young, and in 1757 he commenced his ministry among the Methodists. In 1758 he went to England, and soon learned what kind of a work it was which he had undertaken. On one occasion, when Mr. Thompson was preaching, a mob, instigated by a minister of the Church of England, arose and carried him and the principal Methodists on board a transport which was ready to sail with a war-fleet, England then being engaged in war on the Continent. Through the exertions of lady Huntingdon, however, the government ordered their release. In 1760 Thompson labored in Scotland, but with little success. After 1782 he traveled some of the principal circuits in England. His last was Manchester. He died at Birmingham, May 1, 1799, of a disease the seeds “of which had been sown in 1764 by sleeping in a damp bed, an indiscretion which killed many of the early Methodist preachers. William Thompson was one of the men who piloted the bark of Methodism-through the troublous waters after the death of the great helmsman, Wesley. He was a man of that calmness, sagacity, and statesmanlike cast of mind which were so much needed at that time, and which led to his election as president of the first Conference (1791) after  Wesley's death. He was one of the committee appointed to converse with Kilham. With the endorsement of Benson, Bradburn, Hopper, and others, he sent out the Halifax Circular, which marked out a basis for the preservation and government of the infant Church. Mather and Pawson consulted him on the state of the connection. He arbitrated in regard to the settlement of the Bristol disputes in which Benson was embroiled; he approved Mather's Letter to the Preachers; and he gave to Methodism its district meetings and Plan of Pacification. He was one of the ablest speakers and closest reasoners in the British Conference. “Fewer traces,” says Bunting (in his Life of his father, Jabez Bunting, ch. vi), “are to be found of him than of any of his eminent contemporaries. My father used to speak of the old man's gravity of speech, spirit, and demeanor, and of the advantages he himself derived from his example and ministry.” See Atmore, Meth. Memorial, s.v.; Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1799; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 3, 25, 33, 140; Memoir of Entwisle, ch. 3; Smith, Hist. of Wesl. Methodism, vol. 1, 2 (see Index, vol. 3).

## Thompson, William J[[@Headword:Thompson, William J]]

             a clergyman of the Reformed Church, and a classical teacher of high reputation, was born at Readington, N. J., March 8, 1812. He was the grandson of John Thompson, a Scotch immigrant who was killed by the Indians near Williamsport, Pa. After graduating at Rutgers College in 1834, he taught successfully at Millston, N. J., until 1838, when he began to pursue the usual course of instruction in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. He entered the ministry in 1841, and was settled over the churches of Ponds and Wyckoff, N. J., for three years (1842-45), when he accepted the position of rector of the Grammar-school of Rutgers College. He held this important place eighteen years (1845-63), when he resigned and became principal of the Somerville Classical Institute. He died in 1867. He was a thorough student, scholar, and teacher. His standard of education was high; his drill incessant, exacting, and minute. He was never satisfied until his pupils had been made familiar with their subjects. He was also tutor in the classics in Rutgers College (1838-41), during his seminary course. Hundreds of his students have passed successfully into the learned professions and other honorable callings. A paralysis of the right side, which afflicted him at four years of age, and during his whole life, interfered materially with his pulpit efficiency, but did not affect his voice or mental powers. He was an enthusiastic teacher, sometimes stern and severe in discipline, but always conscientious, capable, and successful in  dealing with intelligent scholars who wished to learn. His mind was clear and logically exact; his knowledge was always at command. His character was distinguished for unyielding uprightness and an honorable spirit; his attainments in the sacred languages and theology were large and accurate. As a preacher, he was plain, without any ornamentation of style or force of delivery, but evangelical in doctrine and practical in his aims. See. Corwin, Manual of the Ref: Ch. p. 492. (W. J. R. T.)

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

             a Congregational minister, was born at Goshen, Connecticut, February 18, 1806; graduated from Union College in 1827, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1832; was pastor for one year, at the end of which he became Nettleton professor of the Hebrew language and literature in East Windsor (now Hartford) Theological Seminary, 1834-81; and thereafter emeritus professor and dean of the faculty until his death, February 27, 1889. Dr. Thompson was also chaplain of the Retreat for the Insane seventeen years.

## Thomson, Andrew, D.D[[@Headword:Thomson, Andrew, D.D]]

             a Scotch Presbyterianism minister, was born at Sanquhar, Dumfriesshire, July 11, 1779, and educated at the University of Edinburgh.. He was pastor of the Church at Sprouston, Roxburghshire, from 1802 till 1808; afterwards of the East Church of Perth till 1810; subsequently of the New Greyr Friars Church, Edinburgh; and finally of St. George's Church, until his death, Feb. 9, 1831. Dr. Thomson was a man of unconquerable zeal, untiring energy, and commanding eloquence. He attacked the British and Foreign Bible Society for circulating the Apocrypha with the Holy Scriptures. He opposed the abuses of lay patronage in the Church of Scotland, effectually denounced British colonial slavery and other evils, and did much to promote education, morality, and evangelical religion in Scotland. Dr. Chalmers says of him, “His was no ordinary championship; and although the weapons of our spiritual warfare are the same in every hand, we all know that there was none who wielded them more vigorously than he did, or who, with such an arm of might, and voice of resistless energy, carried, as if by storm, the convictions of his people.” Among Dr. Thomson's works are, Lectures, Expository and Practical, on Select Portions of Scripture (Edinb. 1816, 2 vols. 8vo): —Sermons on Infidelity (1821, 18mo; 1824, cr. 8vo) Sermons on Hearing the Word (1825, 18mno): —TheScripture History (Bristol, 1826, 12mo): —The Scripture History of the New Testament (Lond. 1827,12mo):Sermons on Various Subjects (Edinb. 1829, 8vo): —Doctrine of Universal Pardon, being Sermons with'Notes(1830, 12mo). He also published a number of Catechisms, educational and religious works for children. He originated and edited the Edinburgh Christian Instructor (1810 sq.), and contributed to the Edinburgh Encyclopedia. After his death appeared his Sermons and Sacramental Exhortations, with Memoir prefixed (1831, 8vo; Boston, 1832, 12mo). See Chambers and Thompson, Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen. (W.P.S.)

## Thomson, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Thomson, Edward, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Portsea, England, Oct. 12, 1810, and, with his father's family, came to America in 1818, settling, in 1820, in Wooster, O. — He studied medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his diploma when nineteen years of age, and commenced his practice. In December, 1831, he was converted, and, although brought up a Baptist, entered the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was admitted into the Annual Conference in 1832. After filling appointments in Norwalk, Sandusky City, Cincinnati, and Wooster, he was transferred to the Michigan Conference, and stationed at Detroit. From 1838 to 1843 he had charge of the Norwalk Seminary; in 1844 he was elected editor of the Ladies Repository; in 1846 president of the Ohio Wesleyan University, where he remained till 1860, when he was elected editor of the N. Y. Christian. Advocate and Journal. In 1864 he was elected to the office of bishop, in which capacity he made his first official visit to India. He died of pneumonia at Wheeling, W. Va., March 22, 1870. His published works are, Educational Essays (new ed. by D. W. Clark, D.D., Cincinnati, 1856, 12mo): —Letters from Europe: —Moral and Religious Essays : —Biographical and Incidental Sketches. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

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

             a prelate of the Church of England, was born at Whitehaven, February 11, 1819. He graduated from Queen's College, Oxford, in 1840, and became successively fellow, tutor, dean, bursar, and provost of Queen's College. In 1842 he was rector of St. Nicholas, Guilford. In 1848 and again in 1856 he was select preacher of the University; and in ,853 he was Bampton lecturer. He was rector of All-Saints, Marylebone, in 1855, and from 1858 to 1861 was preacher at Lincoln's Inn. In 1860 he became chaplain to the queen, and the following year bishop of the sees of Gloucester and Bristol, and in 1863 archbishop of York and primate of England. He died December 25, 1890. He wrote, An Outline of Necessary Laws of Thought (1848): — Sermons Preached at Lincoln's Inn Chapel (1861): — Life in  the Light of God's Word (1868): — The Limits of Philosophical Inquiry (1868): — Word, Work, and Will. (1879).

## Thondracians[[@Headword:Thondracians]]

             an Armenian sect, founded by Sembat about A.D. 840, and taking its name from Thondrac, where he established himself. A Paulician by birth and education, he formed the acquaintance of Medshusic, a Persian physician and astronomer, whose influence led him to attempt a combination of Parseeism and Christianity. This sect, though meeting with no favor from the bishops, continually revived, and spread widely in Armenia. At one time in particular, about A.D. 1002, it made the most alarming progress, when it was joined by bishop Jacob, spiritual head of the province of Harkh. He was noted for the austerity of his life, and both he and his followers denounced the false confidence which was placed in masses, oblations, alms, and Church prayers; and he declared himself opposed to the animal sacrifice in the Armenian Church. He was taken by the catholicos, branded with the heretical mark, proclaimed a heretic, thrown into a dungeon, from which he escaped, but was finally killed. Many of the reports respecting the doctrines and morals of the Thondracians, coming as  they do from their enemies, are doubtless false, or at least exaggerated. See Neander, Hist. of the Christ. Church, 3, 588 sq.

## Thor[[@Headword:Thor]]

             the god of thunder, in Northern mythology, was, next to Odin, the highest and most feared of the gods. His parents were Odin and Frigga. His wives were the beautiful gold haired Sif, by whom he had two sons, Loride and Mode; and the Jotes maiden Jarnsaxa, a giantess of such beauty that Thor, although a sworn enemy of the Jotes, could not refrain from making her his wife. She bore him his favorite son Magni, who was most like his father in courage and strength. Terrible is the flight of Thor through the heavens, rolling, thundering behind the clouds. Still more terrible is he when he has buckled his girdle Megingjardar about him, which gives him double strength. Thus ready, grasping with his iron gloves the hammer Mjl1nir, he appears as an annihilator among the enemies of the gods. Thor's kingdom is called Thrudvangr; and the palace in his realm, Bilskirnir, is the largest that was ever built, and contains five hundred and forty halls.

There is no one so wise as to be able to state all of Thor's deeds, and a day would be too short to mention them all. The most remarkable, however, are the following: In company with his two bucks and the evil Loki, he made a journey. Towards evening they came to a certain man whom they asked for a night's lodging. Here Thor killed his bucks and ordered them to be fried, and then invited his host and family to partake of the repast, warning them, however, not to devour the bones, but to place them on the spread-out hides of the bucks. Before starting farther on his journey the following- morning, Thor bewitched the hides with his mighty hammer, and the bucks immediately came to life, fresh and young, with the exception that one of them limped, because Thialfi, the host's son, had broken the bone of his foot in order to get at the marrow. Now Thor, enraged, threatened to kill the whole family; but he allowed himself to be pacified, when the father offered him both his children, Thialfi and Roskva, as servants, whom Thor carried away on his journey.

They lodged in the iron glove of the giant Utgartsloki, who accompanied Thor under the false name of Skirner, and sought to dissuade Thor from journeying towards his (Utgartsloki's) castle. This, however, was useless, and the trifling hindrances with which Utgartsloki sought to obstruct his path-for example, tying together his cloak-sack, in which the provisions were kept-made Thor the more zealous. Thor attempted, at three different times, to break the giant's forehead, but without success. Finally they separated, and Thor continued  his journey with his bucks and servants. About noon he noticed, in a large plain, a castle which was so high that it was impossible for Thor to look over it. The travelers arrived at a garden gate; and as Thor found it locked and was unable to open it, they managed to get through the space between the bars. Inside they found a spacious hall, in which there were seated upon two benches a great number of giants. King Utgartsloki, distinguished by his height and dignity, sat in the center but he did not even seem to notice the strangers, who saluted him.

He only remarked, “This small fellow, I think, is Aukathor. Perhaps you are greater than you appear? What skilful things can you perform? In this place no one is permitted to remain who does not distinguish himself in somea art or science.” Loki answered him that he thought himself to be a great eater, and did not believe any one was able to cope with him. “We shall see immediately,” said the king, and ordered one named Logi, who sat upon the bench, to try an eating-match with Loki. Thereupon a large trough filled with meat was placed on the ground. At one end of the trough sat Logi, at the other end Loki; and as the former had eaten nothing fir quite a while, he devoured very much. But although Loki ate all the meat, Logi, besides having eaten his half, devoured the bones also. All were agreed that Loki had failed in the attempt. “What is that young man able to do?” the king inquired further. Thialfi answered he would try a walking-match with whomsoever Utgartsloki desired. The king went: out: and called a young man named Hugi to try a running-match, pointed out a track, and fixed the limit. But Hugi was ahead in three successive rounds.

The king admitted, however, that of all previous racers, none could have beaten Thialfi. Then the king asked Thor what he was able to do, as he had a great name among the Asas. Thor answered that he would try his skill in drinking. Then the king brought a large horn, and said, “It requires great skill to empty this horn in one drink; some have accomplished it in two, yet none have been so unskillful as not to be able to empty it in three draughts.” Thor put the horn to his lips three times; but when he looked into the horn, he saw that the water had hardly diminished in quantity. Thor gave it up, and said he did not wish to attempt it any longer. Thereupon the king said, “Now it is evident that your power and skill are not so great as we supposed, and you will receive very little praise should you, in other attempts, be again unsuccessful.” Thor answered that he was willing to attempt something else, and it surprised him much that what he had done was looked upon as a small affair. Utgartsloki proposed that he should lift a cat from the ground, a feat which the smallest boy could perform, and the king added  that he should never have proposed this to Thor were he not persuaded that Thor was by no means the mighty king he had been represented. A large gray cat was then brought forth, which Thor held around the body and attempted to lift from the ground. But the more he raised the cat from the ground, the more she would curve her back; and, after having exerted himself as much as possible, he found that only one of the cat's forepaws had been lifted from the ground. “Just as I expected,” said the king; “the cat is large, and Thor is much behind those who have tried to lift her before.” “If I am small,” answered Thor, “I challenge each of you to a prize-fight, because now, as I am angry, I feel my entire strength has returned to me.” Upon this, Utgartsloki said, “There is no one here who would not consider it child's play to fight with you; however, call in my old nurse, who has fought with more men before; she will probably be his match.”

The king's nurse, Elle, came, and, however much Thor exerted himself, he was not strong enough to move her one inch; and when she applied her strength, Thor fell on his knee, until the king separated them. After very hospitable treatment and a good night's rest, the strangers left the castle, much chagrined. But when they were outside the door, the king said, “Now you are out of the castle, to which, as long as I have strength, you shall never again be admitted, and into which you would not have entered had I known Thor's strength. Know now that all that has occurred was done through witchery. At first I met you in the forest under the name of Skirner; there I fastened your provision-bag with iron cords, so that you were unable to untie them; then. you struck at me thrice with your hammer, and the force with which you struck at me may be seen in the valleys hewn out of the hard rocks which, unseen, I had placed between you and me. When you subsequently came to my castle and made your attempts, I selected a man to eat who certainly could eat more than any other man, because Logi is a consuming fire that devours wood and bones and everything. Thialfi Tah with no one but my thoughts, and it is easy to conceive how these reached the limit before him.

But you have accomplished something supernatural, because the horn which you attempted to empty was at one end sunk in the ocean, and you took such immense. draughts of water that the ocean for a great distance became dry, which is now called ebb. The cat which you lifted from the ground was the Midgard's “Serpent, and you were so strong as to lift her so high from the earth that only her head and tail were visible. Finally, the old nurse with whom you wrestled vas Old Age itself, and honor be to that man who flinches from decrepit old age no more than you. Now, farewell. Although  I have numerous stratagems remaining to shield my castle, still I hold it advisable that you and I should meet no more.” Thor, very wroth to see himself thus fooled, grasped his hammer to strike, but immediately Utgartsloki and the castle became invisible, and afterwards they saw each other a great distance apart on the great plain. To seek revenge at least upon the Midgard's Serpent, Thor sailed shortly: afterwards upon the ocean with the giant Ymer, and went out so far that the giant became afraid. Then he threw the head of a large ox, attached to a strong rope, into the water, which the Serpent seized upon.

When she felt herself wounded, she started back with such force that Thor's hands, holding the line, struck against the ship. He then applied his entire strength, and placed his foot so firmly upon the bottom of the boat that it went through, and he stood upon the bottom of the ocean. The giant was very much frightened when Thor drew up the Serpent by the line, and gazed at her with his fiery eyes, as she aimed a stream of poison at him.” Then Thor raised his hammer, but, before he could strike, Ymer had cut the line, and the Serpent fell back into the water. Thor then threw the giant head-foremost into the ocean, so that his feet appeared above the water. He then waded ashore. Another deed was done by Thor under Gejwid and Hrugner. The Wends also worshipped Thor as one of the highest gods. They erected to him numerous monuments, cut from a willow-tree, which was to represent the face of the god without any form. A platform built about the monument was used as an altar to worship upon.

## Thorah, Feast Of The[[@Headword:Thorah, Feast Of The]]

             SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

## Thorn[[@Headword:Thorn]]

             is the rendering, in many passages of the A.V., of eleven different Hebrew words and two (accurately only of one) Greek words ; but, as we will see below, there are no less than twenty-two words in the original languages of the Bible variously translated “thorn,” “thistle,” “brier,” etc., and signifying thorny and prickly plants. Some of these, however, are probably so interpreted only because they are unknown, and may merely denote insignificant shrubs. We have elsewhere treated most of these in detail, and we therefore briefly recapitulate them below alphabetically, though we can hardly hope to throw much additional light upon what has already baffled so many inquirers. The difficulty of identifying them does not arise from any deficiency of thorny plants to which the Biblical names might be applied, but from the want of good reasons for selecting one plant more than another; for, as Celsius has said, “Fuerunt in Judaea haud pauca loca a spinis diversorum generum denominata, quod. esset htec terra non tantum  lacte et mellefluens, sed herbis quoque inutilibus, et spinis multifariis passim infestata.” As examples, we may mention the genera of which some of the species are thorny, such as Acacia, Astragalus, Acanthodium, Alhagi, Fagonia, Tribulus, Berberis, Prunus, Rubus, Cratsegus, Solanum, Carduus, Cnicus, Onopordon, Eryngium, Rhamnus, Zizyphus; and of species which are named from thischaracteristic, Anabasis spinosissima, Paliurus aculeatus, Ruscus aculeatus, Forskalea tenacissima, Aristida pungens, Salsola echinus, Echinops spinosus, Bunias spinosa, Lycium spinosum, Poterium spinosum, Atraphaxis -spinosa, Prenanthes spinosa, Ononis spinosa, Smilax asper, Spartium spinosum, Zizyphus Spina Christi. SEE BOTANY.

In the morphology of plants it is now recognized that thorns are abortive or undeveloped branches, and in many cases under cultivation thorns become true branches. A spine or thorn, of which we have examples in the hawthorn and the sloe, must be distinguished from the prickles (aculei) which belong to the integumentary system of the plant, and which are really hardened hairs. Of these last we have examples in-the bramble and the rose, and in the animal economy we have something analogous in the spines of the hedgehog and the quills of the porcupine. “May we not see in the production of injurious thorns-an arrestment by the fiat of the Almighty in the formation of branches, and thus a blight passed on this part of creation a standing memorial of the effects of sin on what was declared at first to be very good? It is remarkable to notice that when Christ became a curse for his people, the Jews mocked him by putting on him a crown of thorns, and thus what was an indication of the fall of mal was used by them to insult the seed of the woman who came to bruise the head of the serpent. The removal of the curse from creation, which is now groaning and-travailing in pain, is frequently set forth by illustrations taken from the disappearance of briers and thorns (Isaiah Iv, 13; Eze 28:24)” (Balfour, Bot. and Relig. p. 110-115).

Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 81) illustrates Isa 33:12, “The people shall be as the burning of lime, as thorns cut up shall they be burned in the fire,” by the following observation: “Those people yonder are cutting up thorns with their mattocks and pruning-hooks, and gathering them into bundles to be burned in these burlings of lime. It is a curious fidelity to real life that when the thorns are merely to be destroyed they are never cut up, but set on fire where they grow. They are cut up only for the lime-kiln” (see also ibid. 1, 527 sq. for other scriptural allusions).

1. AKANTHA (ἄκανθα.) occurs in Mat 7:16; Mat 13:7; Mat 13:22; Mat 27:27; and also in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke, and as forming the crown of thorns, in Joh 19:2; Joh 19:5. The word is used in as general a sense as “thorn” is with us, and therefore it would be incorrect to confine it to any one species of plant in all the above passages, though, no doubt, some particular thorny plant indigenous in the neighborhood of Jerusalem would be selected for plaiting the crown of thorns. Hasselquist says of the Nabca Paliurus Athencei of Alpinus, now Zizyphus Spina Christi, “In all probability, this is the tree which afforded the crown of thorns put upon the head of Christ. It is very common in the East. This plant is very fit for the purpose, for it has many small and sharp spines, which are well adapted to give pain: the crown might easily be made of these soft, round, and pliant branches; and what, in my opinion, seems to be the greater proof is that the leaves very much resemble those of ivy, as they are of a very deep glossy green. Perhaps the enemies of Christ would have a plant somewhat resembling that with which emperors and generals were crowned, that there might be a calumny even in the punishment.” ‘This plant is the nebk or dhom of the Arabs, which grows abundantly in Syria and Palestine, both in wet and dry places. Dr. Hooker noticed a specimen nearly forty feet high, spreading as widely as a good Quercots ilex in England. The nebk fringes the banks of the Jordan, and flourishes on the marshy banks of the Lake of Tiberias; it forms either. a shrub or a tree, and, indeed, is quite common all over the country. It grows to the height of six feet or more, and yields a slightly acid fruit, about the size of the sloe, which is eaten by the Egyptians and Arabs. Like its cognate, Paliurus, it abounds in flexible twigs, which are armed with a profusion of sharp, strong prickles, growing in pairs, the one straight, the other somewhat recurved (Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 429). Some, however, have fixed upon Paliurus aculeatus, and others upon Lycium horridumn, as the plant which furnished the thorny wreath in question. SEE CROWN OF THORNS.

2. ATID (אָטָד; Sept. ἡ ῥάμνος; Vulg. rhamnus) occurs as a proper name in Genesis 1, 10, 11 : “the threshing floor of Atad.” SEE ATAD. In the fable in Jdg 9:14-15, the atdd, or “bramble,” is called to reign over the trees. From Psa 58:9 it is evident that the atfd was employed for fuel: “Before your pots can feel the thorns.” Atad is so similar to the Arabic  ausuj that it has generally been considered to mean the same plant, namely, a species of buckthorn. This is confirmed by atadmi being one of the synonyms of rhamnus, as given in the supplements to Dioscorides. A species of rhamnus is described both by Belon and by Rauwolf as being common in Palestine, and by the latter as found especially in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. It has been described by Alpinus as having an abundance of long branches, on which are found many long and very sharp thorns. So Rauwolf, “It puts forth long, slender, crooked switches, on which there are a great many long, strong, and acute thorns.” This has been supposed by some to be the above-mentioned true Christ's thorn, Rhamnus, now Zizyphus Spina Christi; but by others the plant in question is supposed to be Lycium Europeum, or L. afrumn (box-thorn), both of which species occur in Palestine (see Strand, Flor. Palaest. Nos. 124, 125). Dioscorides (Comm. 1, 119) thus speaks of the ῥάμνος : “The rhamnus, which some call persephonion, others leucacantha, the Romans white-thorn, or cerbalis, and the Carthaginians atadin, is a shrub which grows around hedges; it has erect branches with sharp spines, like the oxyacantha (hawthorn ?), but with small, oblong, thick, soft leaves.” Dioscorides mentions three kinds of rhamnus, two of which are identified by Sprengel, in his Commentary, with the two species of Lycium mentioned above. In his Hist. Rei Herb., however, he refers the ῥάμνος to the Zizyphus vulgaris. See Belon, Observalions de Plus. Sing. etc., II, 78; Rauwolf, Travels, III, 8; Alpinus, De Plant. Egypt. p. 21; Celsius, Hierob. 1, 199.

Lycium Europceum is a native of the south of Europe and the north of Africa; in the Grecian islands it is common in hedges (English Cyclop. s. “Lycium;” see also the passages in Belon and Rauwolf cited above).

3. BARKIN (בִּרְקָן, only in the plur.; Sept. Βαρκα νίμ) occurs in Jdg 8:7; Jdg 8:16, where Gideon is described as saying, “Then I will tear your flesh with the thorns (kozim) of the wilderness, and with briers (bartkanim).” There is no reason for believing that briers, as applied to a rose or bramble, is the correct meaning; but there is nothing to lead us to select any one preferably from among the numerous thorny and prickly plants of Syria as the backanita of Scripture. Rosenmüller, however, says that this word signifies “a flail,” and has no reference to thorny plants. It probably denotes the sharp stones set in the bottom of the Oriental threshing-sledge. See BRIER.

4. BATOS (ἡ Βάτος, “bramble bush,” Luk 6:44; elsewhere simply “bush”). See Seneh, below.

5. BOSHAH (בָּאְשָׁה, literally stink-weed, from בָּאִשׁ, to stink, hence to be worthless; Sept. βάτος; Vulg. spina, and so the Targ., Syr., and Arab.; A.V. “cockle” ) is the name of a plant or weed of a worthless or noxious kind (Job 31:40). From the connection in which it is introduced, it is probable that some particular and well-known herb is intended; it answers to “thorns” (chodch) in the parallel member. Fürst pronounces it a useless, noxious, and spinose herb of the cockle or darnel species. Celsius (Hierob. 2, 201) makes it a poisonous plant, the bish of the Arabic writers, a species -of aconite. Lee (Lex. s.v.) suggests hemlock as the probable synonym. Zunz gives lolch, and Renan (Livre de Job, ad loc.) 4.raie. Tristram remarks (Nat. Hist. of the, Bible, p. 439), “There is a shrub which attacks corn, and has a putrid smell (Uredo fretida). Some of the arumns of the corn plains have an intolerably fetid stench, and may well suit the derivation of the word. The stinking arums are common in Galilee.” SEE COCKLE.

6. CHARCL (חָרוּל, from an obsolete root חרל, which Gesenius thinks- חָרִר, to burn; but Fürst thinks= חָרִד, in the sense of pricking, and he compares the Phoenician חִרְדֶּןχερδάν, Dioscor. 3, 21; also the vulgar Heb. חִרְדֶּל, mustard, from its smarting taste), a prickly shrub (A. V. “nettles,” Job 30:7; Pro 24:31; Zep 2:9), perhaps a kind of thistle. Tristram remarks (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 475), “The chartul would appear to be different from the ordinary nettle, since in Pro 24:31 it is mentioned along with it. It cannot be a shrub like the Zizyphus or the Paliurus, because it is evidently spoken of by Solomon as a plant of quick growth in the corn-fields. It must have been of some size, from the passage in Job, where the outcasts shelter under it. I am inclined to believe that it designates the prickly acatnthus (Acanthus spinosa), a very common and troublesome weed in the plains of Palestine and equally abundant among ruins. We have often seen it in the plain of Esdraelon choking the corn, and reaching to the height of six feet. Its sting is most irritating and unpleasant, and well supports the derivation of the Heb. word, ‘that which burns.” SEE NETTLE.

7. CHEDEK (חֵדֶק; Sept. ἄκανθα, σὴς ἐκτρώγων; Vulg. spina, paliurus) occurs in Pro 15:19, “The way of the slothful is as a hedge of chedek (A.V. thorns),” and in Mic 7:4, where the A. V. has brier.” The Alexand. MS., in the former passage, interprets the meaning thus, “The ways of the slothful are strewed with thorns.” Celsius (Hierob. 2, 35), referring the Heb. term to the Arabic chadak, is of opinion that some spinous species of the solanum is intended. The Arabic term clearly denotes some species of this genus, either the S. melongela, var. esculentum, or the S. Sodomeum (“apple of Sodom” ). SEE VINE OF SODOM. Both these kinds are beset with prickles, and some species of solanum grow to a considerable size. They are very common in dry arid situations, S. sanctum, the S. spinosum of others, is found in Palestine. Dr. Harris is of opinion that chedek is the Colutea spinosav of Forskal, which is called heddad in Arabic, and of which there is an engraving in Russell's Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, tab. 5. SEE BRIER.

8. CHOACH (חוֹחִ; Sept. ἄκαν, ἄκανθα, ἀκχούχ, κνίδη ; Vulg. paliurus, lappa, spina, tribulus), a word of very uncertain meaning which occurs in the sense of some thorny plant, is rendered “thickets” in 1Sa 13:6; “brambles” in Isa 34:13; but usually either thistle,” as in 2Ki 14:9; 2Ch 25:18 (in both which passages it is spoken of as growing on Lebanon); Job 21:40 (“Let thistles grow instead of wheat,” which shows that it was some rapidly maturing plant); or “thorns.” as in 2Ch 33:11; Job 41:2 (which shows it had a hard spine); Pro 26:9; Song of Solomon 2, 2; Hos 9:6. Celsius (Hierob. 1, 477) believes, from the similarity of the Arabic khosh, that the blackthorn (Prunus sylvestris) is denoted; but this would not suit the passage in Job, as it is a slow-growing tree. Perhaps the term is used in a wide sense to signify any thorny plant of quick growth in some fields and meadows. There are two classes of thorny weeds which choke the corn- fields of Palestine, the thistles and the centaureas or knapweeds. These last are chiefly of two kinds, both commonly called star-thistle, namely, the Centaurea calcitrapa, which is the most frequent and troublesome intruder in both cultivated and neglected fields in Palestine, and the C. verutum, which is even more formidable. SEE THISTLE.

9. DARDIR (דִּרַדִּר) occurs in Gen 3:18, “Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee;” and again in Hos 10:8, in both of which  passages dardir is conjoined with kots. The rabbins describe it as a thorny plant which they also call accobita. The akkilb of the Arabs is a thistle ‘or wild artichoke. The Sept. and Vulg., however, render dardir by the word τρίβολος, tribulus, a caltrop, in both passages, and this will answer as well as any other thorny or prickly plant. See Tribolos, below.

10. KIMOSH (קַרמוֹשׁ) or kimmosh (קַמַּוֹשׁ) occurs in Isa 34:13; Hos 9:6, in both which passages it is spoken of as occupying deserted and ruined sites, and is translated “nettles.” Another form of the word, kimashon (קַמָּשׁוֹן), occurs in Pro 24:31, where it is used in connection with charuil as descriptive of the neglected field of the sluggard, and is translated “thorns.” “All commentators agree that this is the sting-nettle (urtica), of which there are several varieties in Palestine. The most common is Urtica pilulifera, a tall and vigorous plant, often six feet high, the sting of which is much moresevere and irritating than our common nettle. It particularly affects old ruins, as near Tell Hum, Beisan, and the ruined khan by the bridge over the Jordan; and forms a most annoying obstacle to the explorer who wishes to investigate old remains” (Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 474). The ordinary nettle is a well- known wild plant, the leaves of which are armed with stings, connected with a small bag of poison; and when the leaves are slightly pressed by the hand, the stings penetrate the flesh, force in the poison, and pro duce a swelling with a sharp burning pain. The leaf, when wet or dead, does not possess this power. The presence of nettles betokens a waste and neglected soil. SEE NETTLE.

11. KOTS (קוֹוֹ) occurs in several passages of Scripture (Exo 22:6; Jdg 8:7; Jdg 8:16; 2Sa 23:6; Psa 118:12 : Isa 32:13; Isa 33:12; Jer 4:3; Jer 12:13; Eze 28:24; A.V. invariably “thorns” ); in two (Gen 3:18; Hos 10:8) it is mentioned along with dardir, where the two words may be considered equivalent, respectively, to the English thorns and thistles. The Sept. translates it in all the passages by ἄκανθα, and it probably was used in a general sense to denote plants which were thorny, useless, and indicative of neglected culture or deserted habitations, growing naturally in desert situations, and useful only for fuel. But if any particular plant be meant, the Ononis spinosa, or “rest-harrow,” mentioned by Hasselquist (p. 289), may be selected as fully characteristic: “Spinosissima illa et perniciosa planta, campos integros tegitJEgypti et  Palestinae. Non dubutandum quinl hanc indicaverint in aliquo loco scriptores sacri.”

12. NAATSUTS (נִעֲצוּוֹ) occurs only in two passages of Isaiah, in both of which it is translated “thorn” in the A.V. Thus (Isa 7:18-19), “Jehovah shall hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria; and they shall come, and shall rest all of them in the desolate valleys, and in the holes of the rocks, and upon all the thorns” (naatsutsim; Sept. ῥαγάς; Vulg.frutetumn). By. some this has been translated crevices; but that it is a plant of some kind is evident from Isa 55:13 : “Instead of the thorn (naatsiuts; Sept. στοιβή; Vulg. saliunca) shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree.” Some have understood it generally as thorn, shrub, thorny shrub, small tree, or thicket. Others have attempted to define it specifically, rendering it bramble, white-thorn, etc. (Celsius, Hierob. 2, 190); but nothing certain has been determined respecting it. Celsius endeavors to trace it to the same origin as the Arabic niaaz, which he states to be the name of a plant of which the bark is employed in tanning leather.

The meaning of the term, he continues in Chaldeeis infigere, defigere; “to stick into” or “fix,” and it is therefore supposed to refer to a prickly or thorny plant, R. ben-Melech says that commentators explain naatsuts by the Arabic word sidr, which is the name of a well-known thorny bush of Eastern countries, a species of Zizyphus. This, Sprengel says, is the Z. vulgaris, found in many parts of Palestine, as well as in many of the uncultivated tracts of other Eastern countries. Others suppose the species to be the nubakl of the Arabs, which is the Zizyphus lotus, and considered to be the lotus of the ancients. But from the context it would appear that the plant, if a zizyphus, must have been a less highly esteemed variety or species. But ir a wild state these are very abundant, bushy, prickly, and of little value. Belon says, “Les hayes, pour la plus part, sont de tamarisques, oenoplia (i.e. zizyphi species) et rhamnes.” In Freytag's Arabic Lexicon theabove Arabic word naaz is said to be the name of a thorny tree, common in the Hejaz, the bark of which is used in tanning hides, and from whose wood a dentifrice is prepared. This might be a species of acacia, of which many species are well known to be abundant in the dry and barren parts of Syria, Arabia, and Egypt.

13. SAARB (סָרָב) -occurs (in the plur.) only once (Eze 2:6) as a synonym of sallon, and is thought by many (the rabbins Castell, Fürst, etc.) to denote a thorny plant (A.V. “brier”), as cognate with sir; but Celsius (Hierob. 2, 222) contends that it simply means. rebels (from the Chald. סַרִב, to resist).

14. SEK (שֵׂךְ, literally a thorn-hedge, so called from the interlacing of the briers) occurs only once (in the plur.) as a synonym of tsin for a prickly object in general (Num 33:55; Sept. σκόλοπες ; Vulg. clavi;A.V. “pricks” ). It occurs in the feminine plur. form sukk6th (שֻׁכּוֹת) in Job 41:7, where it is translated “barbed irons.” Its resemblance to the Arabic sh6k, thorn, sufficiently indicates the probability of its meaning something of the same kind.

15. SENH -(סְנֶה) occurs in the well-known passage of Exo 3:2, where the angel of the Lord appeared unto Moses in a flaming fire out of the midst of a “bush” (seneh), and the bush was not consumed. It occurs also in Exo 3:3-4, and in Deu 33:16, but with reference to the same event. The Sept. translates senah by βάτος, which usually signifies the rubus, or bramble; so in the New Test. βάτος is employed when referring tothe above miracle of the burning bush. Baroo is likewise used to denote the seneh by Josephus, Philo, Clemens, Eusebius, and others (see Celsius, Hierob. 2, 58). The monks of the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai have a species of rubus planted in their garden near their Chapel of the Burning Bush; but this can-not be considered as any proof of its identity with the seneh from the little attention which they have usually paid to correctness in such points. Bove says of it, “C'est une espece de Rubus, qui est voisin de notre R. fruticosus.” The species of rubus (our blackberry) are not common either in Syria or Arabia. Rubus snctus, the holy bramble, is found in Palestine, and is mentioned by Dr. Russell as existing in the neighborhood of Aleppo, and Hasselquist found a rubus among the ruins of Scanderetta, and another in the neighborhood of Seide. It is also found among the ruins of Petra (?) (Calcott).

Celsius and others quote Hebrew authors as stating that Mount Sinai obtained its name from the abundance of these bushes (seneh), “Dictus est mons Sinai de nomine ejus.” But no species of rubus seems to have been discovered in a wild state on this mountain. This was observed by Pococke. He found however, on Mount Horeb several hawthorn bushes, and says that the holy bush was more likely to have been a hawthorn than a bramble, and that this  must have been the spot where the phenomenon was observed, being a sequestered place and affording excellent pasture, whereas near the Chapel of the Holy Bush not a single herb grows.. Shaw states that the Oxyacantha Arabica grows in many places on St. Catherine's Mountain. Bove says, on ascending Mount Sinai: “J'ai trouvd entre les ro chers de granit un mespilus voisin de l'oxyacantha.” Dr. Robinson mentions it as called zarur, but it is evident that we cannot have anything like proof in favor of either plant. Tristram remarks (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 438), “The seneh denotes some particular. kind of bush, and appears to be equivalent to the Egyptian senh, the Acacia Nilotica, very like the Acacia seyal, or shittah tree, but smaller and closer in growth. The A. Nilotica is common in the Peninsula of Sinai, which mountain is by some conjectured to have derived its name from the seneh bush.” But as there is no etymological connection between the Arabic sunt (which is the same as shittah [q.v.]) and the seneh, and as the latter is a distinctive term, the basis of the identification of the latter with the acacia entirely fails, especially as the Sept. so constantly understands the burning bush to have been a bramble-like plant; moreover, had it been the-well-known tree that yielded the shittim wood, we can see no reason for the use of a peculiar or different term to designate it. ‘It was evidently not a tree at all, but a low bush, probably one of the many species of annual thorny plants still abounding on the mountain, and which, growing. in the rainy season, remain dry and bare during the summer. Hence the surprise of Moses that the highly combustible object was not consumed. The writer was struck with the habit of his native guide on Mount Sinai, who constantly set fire to these bushes as he met them. SEE BUSH.

16. SHAMIR (שָׁמַיר) occurs in all the same passages as the next word, shdyith, below, with the addition also of Isa 32:13 : “Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns (kotsim) and briers” (shamir). It is variously rendered by the Sept., χέρσος, χόρτος, δέῤῥις, ἄγρωστις, ξηρά. According to Abu'lfadl, cited by Celsius (Hierob. 2, 188), “the samtr of the Arabs is a thorny tree; it is a species of Sidra which does not produce fruit.” No thorny plants are more conspicuous in Palestine. and the Bible lands than different kinds of Rhamnaceae. The Arabs have the terms Salam, Sidra, Dhal, Nabka, which appear to denote either varieties or different-species of Paliurus and Zizyphus, or different states, perhaps, of  the same tree; but it is a difficult matter to assign to each its particular signification. Dr. Tristram states that “the Arabs of the Jordan valley confine the name samur to the Paliurus aculatus, or Christ's Thorn” (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 428).

17. SHAYITH (שִׁיַת) occurs in several passages of Isaiah (Isa 5:6; Isa 7:23-25; Isa 9:18; Isa 10:17; Isa 27:4), in all of which it is associated with shamir, the two being: translated thorns and briers in the A. V. From the context of all the passages, it is evident that some weed like plants are intended, either of a thorny or prickly nature, or such as spring up in neglected cultures and are signs of desolation, and which are occasionally employed for fuel. Nothing has, however, been ascertained respecting the plant intended by shayith, and consequently it has been variously translated in the several versions of the Scriptures. Gesenius thinks it is etymologically connected with the shittah tree (i.q. שֶׁנֶת). SEE SHITTAH.

18. SILLON (סַלּוֹן) occurs in Eze 28:24 : “And there shall be no more a pricking brier (sillon) unto the house of Israel, nor any grieving thorn (kots).” The Sept. here has σκόλοψ and the Vulg. offendiculum. So also SALLON (סִלּוֹן) occurs (in the plur.) in Eze 2:6 : “Though briers (sarabin) and thorns (sallonim) be with thee,” The Sept. and Vulg. here render both words vaguely (παροιστρήσουσι καὶ ἐπισυστήσονται, increduli et subversores). Several Arabic words resemble it in sound; as sil, signifying a kind of wormwood; silleh. the plant Zilla Myagrum; sillah, the τράγος of the Greeks, supposed to be Salsola kali and S. tragus; sulal or sulalon, which signifies the thorn of the date-tree, while the Chaldee word silleta signifies a thorn simply. It is probable, therefore, that sill6n has something of the same meaning, as also sillomin; but neither the context nor the etymology affords us a clue to the particular plant. Tristram, however states that “the Arabic word sullaon is applied to the sharp points on the ends of the palm-leaf, and also to the butcher's-broom (Ruscus aculeatus), a plant common enough in many parts of Palestine” (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 431).

19. SIR (סיר) occurs (in the plur.) in several passages, e.g. in Ecc 12:6, “as the crackling of thorns (sirim) under a pot,” etc.;  Isa 34:14, “And thorns (sirim) shall come up in her palaces,” etc.; Hos 11:6; Amo 4:2; Nah 1:10. The Sept. and other translations have employed words signifying thorns as conveying the meaning of sirim; but the etymology does not lead us to select one plant more than another.

20. SIRPID (סַרפָּד) is mentioned only once as a desert shrub (Isa 55:13), “And instead of the brier (sirpad, Sept. κονύζη, Vulg. urtica) shall come up the myrtle.” Though this has generally been considered a thorny and prickly plant, it does not follow from the context that such is necessarily meant. It would be sufficient for the sense that some useless or insignificant plant be understood, and there are many such in desert and uncultivated places. In addition to Paliurus carduus, Urtica, Conyza, species of Polygonum, ofEuphorbia, etc., have been adduced; and also Ruscus aculeatus, or butcher's-broom. The etymology of the word is obscure.

21. TRIBOLOS (τρίβολος), Lat. tribilus, is found in Mat 7:16, “Do men gather figs of thistles?” (τριβόλων);and again in Heb 6:8, ‘“But that which beareth thorns and briers (τριβολοι) is rejected.” The name was applied by the Greeks to two or three plants, one of which was, no doubt, aquatic, Trapa natans. Of the two kinds of land tribuli mentioned by the Greeks (Dioscorides, 4:15; Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. 6:7, 5), one is believed by Sprengel, Stackhouse, Royle, and others to refer to the Tribulus terrestris, Linn., the other is supposed to be the Fagonia Cretica; but see Schneider's commentary on Theophrastus, loc. cit., and Du Mo. lin (Flore Poetique Ancienne, p. 305), who identifies the tribulus of Virgil with the Centaurea calcitraapa. Linn. (“star-thistle”). Celsius (Hierob. 2, 128) argues in favor of the Faconia Arabica, of which a figure is given in Shaw, Travels (Catal. Plant. No. 229); see also Forskal, Flor. Arab. p. 88. Both or nearly allied species are found in dry and barren places in the East; and, as both are prickly and spread over the surface of the ground, they are extremely hurtful to tread upon. The word τρίβολος is further interesting to us as being employed in the Sept. as the translation of darddr (above). The presence of species of tribulus indicates a dry and barren uncultivated soil, covered with prickly or thorny plants. The Tribulus terrestris, however, is-not a spiny or thorny plant, but has spines on the fruit. The Greek word means literally three-pronged, and originally denoted the caltrop, or military crow-foot, an instrument composed of  three radiating spikes, thrown upon the ground to hinder and annoy cavalry (Veget. 3, 24; Plutarch, Moral. 2, 76). SEE WEED.

22. TSEN (צֵן) or TSENIN (צְנַין) occurs (only in the plur.) in several passages of Scripture, as in Num 33:55; Jos 23:13, where it is mentioned along with sek (sikkim); also in Job 5:5 and Pro 22:5. Both are invariably rendered “thorns” in the A. V. The Sept. has τρίβολος in Pro 22:5, and βολίδες in Num 33:55 and Jos 23:13.. It has been supposed that zinnim might be the Rhamnus paliurus, but nothing more precise has been ascertained respecting it than of so many other of these thorny plants; and we may therefore, with Michaelis, say, “Nullum simile nomen habent reliquae linguae Orientales; ergo fas est sapienti, Celsio quoque, fas sit et mihi, aliquid ignorare. Ignorantie professio via ad inveniendum rerum, si quis in Oriente quaesierit.” SEE THORN-HEDGE.

## Thorn In The Flesh[[@Headword:Thorn In The Flesh]]

             (σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί), an infliction (“a messenger of Satan to buffet me” ) mentioned by Paul as an offset to his extraordinary revelations (2Co 12:7). The expression has called forth very many, and some very absurd, conjectures (see the commentators, ad loc.), which may be resolved into the following heads, the first two of which are, from the nature of the case, out of the question:

1. Spiritual Temptations. —Many have thought that the apostle refers to diabolical solicitations (“interjectiones Satanse”), such as blasphemous thoughts (so Gerson, Luther, Calovius), or remorse for his former life (Osiander, Mosheim, etc.), or-according to Romish interpreters who seek a precedent for monkish legends incitements to lust (so Thomas Aquinas, Lyra, Bellarmine, Estius, Corn. a Lapide, etc.). These are all negatived, not only by their intrinsic improbability, but by the qualification “in the flesh.”

2. Personal Hostility. —This we know Paul frequently experienced, especially from Judaizing sectaries, and hence this explanation has been seized upon by many ancient interpreters (e.g. Chrysostom, Theophylact, (Ecumenius, Theodoret), as well as later ones (Calvin, Beza, etc.) and moderns (Fritzsche, Schrader, etc.). But this, too, could hardly with propriety be called a “fleshly” affliction.

3. Bodily Pain. This view has been adopted by very many, who differ, however, as to the particular ailment. The ancients (Chrysostom, Theophylact, AEcumenius, Jerome, on Gal 4:14) mention headache, but without assigning any special ground for the conjecture. Some have supposed hypochondriacal melancholy, which, however hardly answers the conditions of a σκόλοψ, whereby acute suffering seems to be implied. So of other speculations, for which see Poll Synopsis, ad loc.

On the whole (remarks Alford, ad loc.), putting together the figure here used, that of a thorn (or a pointed stake, for so σκόλοψ primarily signifies see Xenoph. Anab. 5, 2, 5]), occasioning pain, and the κολαφισμός, or buffeting (i.e. perhaps putting to shame), it seems quite necessary to infer that the apostle alludes to some distressing and tedious bodily malady, which at the same time caused him mortification before those among whom he exercised his ministry. Of such a kind may have been the disorder in his eyes, more or less indicated in several passages of his history (see Act 13:9; Act 23:1 sq.; Gal 4:14; Gal 6:11). But as affections of the eyes, however sad in their consequences, are not usually (certainly not to all appearance in the apostle's case) very painful or distressing in themselves, they hardly come up to the intense meaning of the phrase. Paul was therefore probably troubled with some internal disease of which the marks were evinced only in languor and physical anguish. There are few who do not thus “bear about in their body” some token of mortal frailty.

See, in addition to the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 81; and by Danz, Wourerb. p. 567, Bagot, Thorn in the Flesh (Lond. 1840); Princeton Review, July, 1863. SEE PAUL.

## Thorn, Conference Of[[@Headword:Thorn, Conference Of]]

             also known as “the Charitable Conference” (Colloquium( Charitativum), was one of those efforts to explain away the differences between the several bodies of Christians, with a view to religious reunion, of which the 17th century furnishes more than one example. It was appointed in the city of Thorn, in October, 1645, by Ladislaus IV, at the suggestion of the Reformed preacher at Dantzic, Bartholomew Nigrinus, who had become a Catholic, and persuaded the king that such a conference would be attended with good results. At this all religious parties were to appear and confer together on religion, and come to an agreement. On the side of the Lutherans, some Saxon divines of Wittenberg, especially, were invited  from Germany; for they were regarded as standing at the head of all the German theologians. The Konigsberg divines were accompanied and assisted by Calixtus of Brunswick, who had been invited by elector Frederick William. His conduct and the question of precedence between the Konigsberg and the Dantzic divines occupied the entire time of the conference, which broke up without any result, Nov. 21, 1645. The official account of the proceedings of the conference are printed in Calovius, Historia Syncretistica. See also Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, 4, 509; Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. 3, 293,359,373, note.

## Thorn-hedge[[@Headword:Thorn-hedge]]

             ( מְסוּכָה, mesukah; ;for מְשׂוֹכָה, or perhaps simply from the interlacing of the briers; Sept. κανών ; Vulg. sepes), a hedge-row of thorny plants (Mic 7:4). The formidable character of-the thorny thickets in Palestine is noted by almost every traveler. Near Jericho Mr. Tristram records as the principal tree “the Zizyphus spina Christi, growing twenty,  or thirty feet high, with its sub angular branches studded with long, pointed, and rather reflex thorns a true wait-a-bit tree. No one can approach it with impunity unless clad in leather; and in three days the whole party were in rags from passing through the thickets” (Land of Israel, p. 202). In the same way Messrs. M'Cheyne and Bonar mention how Dr. Keith was baffled in his attempt to climb a verdant-looking hill by “strong briers and thorns,” through which he found it impossible to force a passage. They add, “Some time after, when sailing up the Bosphorus, conversing with a gentleman whom we had met in Palestine, who appeared to be a man of the world, we asked him if he had climbed Mount Tabor to obtain the delightful view from its summit.

His answer was, ‘No; why should I climb Mount Tabor to see a country of thorns?'He was thus an unintentional witness of the truth of God's Word” (Mission of Inquiry, p. 119). Such predictions as Isa 7:23-24; Isa 32:12-15; Hos 9:6. acquire additional force from the circumstance that it is so often in the midst of magnificent ruins once pleasant “tabernacles” -or in regions which must formerly have been rich and fruitful fields, that these thorns and briers now maintain their undisputed and truculent empire. Thus, at Beth-nimrah, the traveler says, “The buildings may have been extensive, but-the ruins are now shapeless, and generally choked by the prickly vegetation” (Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 522). Again, “We rode up the Ghor, through a maze of zizyphus bush, which encumbers a soil of almost incredible richness; watered every mile by some perennial brook, but without trace of inhabitant or cultivation. Now and then we saw a clump of palm-trees, the ruined heap of some old village, or a piece of a broken water-course, to tell us that once the hand of civilization was here. Myriads of turtledoves peopled these thickets. We put them up absolutely by scores from every bush. The nests of the marsh-sparrow bore down the branches by their weight, and the chirping was literally deafening. The bushes and weeds were laden with seeds” (ibid. p. 570).

In his last words king David compares the sons of Belial to “thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with hands; but the man that shall touch them must be fenced with iron and the staff of a spear” (2Sa 23:6-7). A traveler tells how out of one of these bushes of nubk he tried to get a dove, which, when shot, had fallen into it; “but, though I had my gloves on, each attempt made my hand bleed and smart most painfully, as the thorns will not yield in the least. I failed in like manner when I tried to cut a stick” (Gadsby, Wanderings, 2, 60). When we remember that a single thorn is sometimes a couple, of inches long, “as sharp as a pin and as hard as a bone,” we can  appreciate the force of the allusions in Num 33:55; Pro 26:9; Eze 28:24; 2Co 12:7; and we can understand what a hopeless barrier was a “hedge of thorns” (Pro 15:19; Hos 2:6). The nubk, or zizyphus, is much used for fuel. Occurring everywhere, it is easily obtained; its slender twigs, intensely dry, flash up at once in a fierce, brilliant flame, and, although very different from the steady glow of retem charcoal, “coals of juniper,” a successive supply is sufficient to heat the kettle of the camping traveler. To its rapid ignition the psalmist alludes, “Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall sweep them away as with a whirlwind” (Psa 58:9); where “the brightness of the flame, the height to which it mounts in an instant, the fury with which it seems to rage on all sides of the vessel, give, force and even sublimity to the image, though taken from one of the commonest occurrences of the lowest life-a cottager's wife boiling her pot” (Horsley, ad loc.). Exploding so quickly, they are as speedily quenched (Psa 118:12); and there is small result from their noisy reputation (Ecc 7:6). “Ridicule is a faculty much prized by its possessors yet, intrinsically, it is a small faculty. A scoffing man is in no lofty mood for the time; shows more of the imp than the angel. This, too, when his scoffing is what we call just and has some foundation in truth. While, again, the laughter of fools-that vain sound-said in Scripture to resemble the crackling of thorns under a pot (which they cannot heat, but only soil and begrime), must be regarded in these later times as a very serious addition to the sum of human wretchedness” (Carlyle, Miscellanies, 2, 119). Dr. Tristram further remarks, “I have noticed dwarf bushes of the zizyphus growing outside the walls of Jerusalem in the Kedron valley; but it is in the low plains that it reaches its full size and changes its name to the dhom tree.

It is sometimes called the lotus-tree. The thorns are long, sharp, and recurred, and often create a festering wound. The leaves are a very bright green, oval, but not, as has been said, of the shape of the ivy. The boughs are crooked and irregular, the blossom small and white, and the fruit a bright yellow berry, which the tree continues to bear in great profusion from December to June. It is the size of a small gooseberry, of a pleasant, subacid flavor, with a stone like the hawthorn, and, whether fresh or dried, forms an agreeable dish, which we often enjoyed, mixing the berries with leben, or sour milk. There is no fence more impervious than that formed of nubk; and the Bedawin contrive to form one round their little corn plots with trifling labor. They simply cut down a few branches and lay them in line as soon as the barley is sown. No cattle, goats, or camels will attempt to force it, insignificant as it appears,  not more than a yard high; and the twigs and recurved spines become so interwoven that it is in vain to attempt to pull the branches aside” (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 429). SEE THORN.

The fences of prickly pear or Indian fig (Opuntia vulgaris), now so common in the lands of the Bible, were unknown in Bible times, the plant having only found its way to the Old World after the discovery of America (Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 432). At present, however, it forms the common hedge-thorn of Palestine, especially in the villages of the Plain of Sharon. It grows to the size of a large shrub, the stem of which is as thick as a man's body. The leaf is studded with thorns, and is of oval shape, about ten inches long, six wide, and three fourths of an inch thick; the stem and branches are formed by the amalgamation of a certain number of those succulent leaves that grow together the year after their first appearance, when each is laden with fifteen or twenty yellow blossoms, which are rapidly, matured into a sweet and refreshing fruit of the size and shape of a hen's egg. SEE HEDGE.

## Thorndike, Herbert[[@Headword:Thorndike, Herbert]]

             a learned English divine, was educated in Trinity College, Cambridge, and became proctor of that university in 1638. In July, 1642, he was admitted to the rectory of Barley, Hertfordshire; and in September, 1643, was elected master of Sidney College, Cambridge, but was prevented from occupying that position, it being secured by a Mr. Minshull. Later he was ejected from his living of Barley. At the Restoration he was replaced in this living, but resigned it on being made a prebendary of Westminster. He died July, 1672. He assisted Dr. Walton in the edition of the Polyglot Bible, particularly in marking the variations in the Syriac version of the Old Test.; and wrote several treatises: A Discourse concerning the Primitive Form of the Government of Churches (Camb. 1641, 8vo): —A Discourse of Religious Assemblies and the Public Service of God (ibid. 1642, 8vo): —A Discourse of the Rights of the Church in a Christian State, etc. (Lond. 1649, 8vo): —Just Weights and Measures, 1. 6. the Present State of Religion weighed in the Balance, etc. (ibid. 1662, 4to). —A Discourse tof the Forbearance of the Penalties, etc. (ibid. 1670, 8vo):— Origines Ecclesiae, etc. (ibid. 1670): —also his famous book, A n Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England (ibid. 3 parts, 1670).

## Thorne, James[[@Headword:Thorne, James]]

             an eminent minister of. the Bible Christians, was born at Shebbear, Devonshire, England, September 21, 1795. At an early age he was converted, and in 1816 entered the ministry. By nature and grace he was peculiarly fitted to be a leading spirit in the Connection. His gifts were diversified, his piety deep, his devotion to the work thorough, and his spirit catholic, childlike, and forbearing. He was president of the Conference five times, viz., in 1831, 1835, 1842, 1857, and 1865; secretary from 1819 to 1830, from 1832 to 1835, in 1849 and 1850, and in 1853 — eighteen times; and for several years editor and book-steward. He died January 28, 1872. See Minutes of the Conference, 1872; Jubilee Volume, published in 1866.

## Thorneborough (or Thornburgh), John, B.D[[@Headword:Thorneborough (or Thornburgh), John, B.D]]

             an English divine of the 17th century, was born at Salisbury, Wiltshire, educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, was preferred bishop of Limerick in 1593, dean of York in 1603, bishop of Bristol in 1617, at the same time holding his deanery and his Irish bishopric in commendam with it. He was translated to Worcester in the latter year, and died July 19, 1641. His skill in chemistry is spoken of. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:326.

## Thornton, Thomas C., D.D[[@Headword:Thornton, Thomas C., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Dumfries, Va., Oct. 12, 1794; graduated in his native place, and began to preach when sixteen years old. In 1813 he entered the Baltimore Conference; and was transferred to the Mississippi Conference to take charge of Old Centenary College in 1841. From some misunderstanding, he left the Methodist and joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, but refused ordination not accepting the doctrine of uninterrupted apostolical succession. In 1850 he returned to the Methodist Church, and was readmitted into the Mississippi Conference in 1853. He died March 22, 1860. He wrote Theological Colloquies and Slavery as it is in the United States, in reply to Dr. Channing. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Thornton, William Lockwood, A.M[[@Headword:Thornton, William Lockwood, A.M]]

             a Wesleyan minister, was born in Yorkshire, Jan. 27, 1811, and. was a pupil of the venerable James Sigston, Leeds. He was accepted at the Conference in 1830, receiving as his first circuit an appointment to Glasgow, where he remained but a year, and in 1831 was stationed at Hull After a three years residence in that north-eastern seaport, he was removed to the First London Circuit in1834, from thence to the Leeds East Circuit in 1837, and to Bath in 1838. After a three years location at Bath, Mr.  Thornton's itinerant career terminated, and in 1841 he became the resident classical tutor of the first theological institute established in Methodism, which, commencing at Hoxton, was afterwards divided between Richmond and Didsbury; and in 1842 he went to its northern branch, near Manchester. He remained there till 1849, when he was appointed editor of the Wesleyan periodicals. In 1864 Mr. Thornton represented the British Conference at the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; he then proceeded to Canada, and presided over that conference, and also over that in Eastern British America. On his return home, he was elected president of the British Conference, but died very suddenly, in his presidential year, March 5,1865. Mr. Thornton was a man of fine talents and thorough culture. In early life he had given himself to hard and systematic study. As a preacher he was eloquent, his style finished and elegant; as an editor he was industrious and successful.

## Thornwell, James Henry, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Thornwell, James Henry, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Marlborough, District. S. C., Dec. 9,1812. He received a good common-school training; prepared for college at the Cheraw Academy, S. C.: graduated at South Carolina College in 1831; and subsequently studied at Harvard University and in Europe. After some attention to the law he devoted himself to theology, was licensed by Bethel Presbytery, and in 1834 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Lancaster Court-house, S.C.; and soon after the churches of Waxhaw and Six Mile were added to his charge. This relation existed until 1837 when he was elected to the professorship of logic, belles-lettres, and criticism in the South Carolina College, to which metaphysics was soon added. In these departments he taught with uncommon ability and success. “In America he fully deserves the distinguished title which his admirers have long bestowed upon him of the Logician.” In 1840 he resigned his professorship, and was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Columbia, S. C.; in 1841 became professor of sacred literature and evidences of Christianity in South Carolina College; in 1851, pastor of the Glebe Street Church, Charleston, S. C.; in 1852 accepted the presidency of South Carolina College; in 1856 was elected professor of theology in-the Theological Seminary, Columbia, and also pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of that place, in which labors he continued until his death, Aug. 1, 1862. Dr. Thornwell published, The Arguments of Romanists from the Infallibility of the Church and Testimony of the Fathers on behalf of the Apocrypha, Discussed and  Refuted, etc. (N. Y. 1845). This is an answer to a series of letters by the Rev. Dr. (afterwards bishop) Lynch on the inspiration of the Apocrypha. “As a refutation, this work of Mr. Thornwell's is complete” (Bibl. Rep. and Prince. Rev. April, 1845, p. 268): Discourses on Truth (1855, 12mo; 1869, 8vo), delivered in the chapel of the South Carolina College; a work highly commended. He also published single sermons, tracts, essays, etc., and papers in the Southern Presbyterian Review. Dr. Thornwell was endowed with genius of an exalted character; a clear, penetrating, logical mind, which was cultivated by profound study, and consecrated to the advancement of learning and religion. “As a pastor, kind, affectionate, and worthy of all reliance; as a pulpit orator, a model of glowing zeal and fervid eloquence; as a teacher, gifted.” Rev. H. W. Beecher says concerning him, “By common fame, Dr. Thornwell was the most brilliant minister, in the Old school Presbyterian Church, and the most brilliant debater in its General Assembly. This reputation he early gained and never lost.” See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 209; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Duyckinck, Cyclop. of Amer. Lit. (1856), 2, 334; La Borde, Hist. of South Carolina College, 1859 ; Presb. Mag. vol. 7. (J.L.S.)

## Thorp, Constitutions of[[@Headword:Thorp, Constitutions of]]

             SEE YORK, COUNCIL OF, 1363.

## Thorwaldsen, Albert Bertel[[@Headword:Thorwaldsen, Albert Bertel]]

             the renowned Danish sculptor, was born at Copenhagen, Nov. 19, 1770, and was the son of Gottschalk Thorwaldsen, a native of Iceland. A tradition had long been preserved in his family that “the gods had promised Harold (king Harold Hildetand, who was killed in the battle of Bravalla, in 735) a descendant whose fame should spread from the extremities of the North even to the sunny regions of the South.” He assisted his father (a carver in wood) at a very early age, and when eleven years old attended the free school of the Academy of Arts, Copenhagen, receiving when seventeen a silver medal from the academy for a bas-relief of Cupid Reposing, and at twenty the small gold medal for a sketch of Heliodorus Driven from the Temple. Two years later he drew the grand prize entitling him to the royal pension, but, this being then enjoyed by another, he was obliged to wait three years, during which time he continued his professional pursuits and engaged in general study. Thorwaldsen set out  for Italy May 20, 1796, arrived at Naples in January, 1797, and reached Rome March 8. After struggling against many discouragements, success waited upon him; his fame spread far and wide; and Christian (then crown- prince) of Denmark wrote him a pressing invitation to return to Copenhagen, telling him of the discovery of a white marble quarry in Norway in July, 1819, he started to make his first visit to his native land, and arrived at Copenhagen Oct. 3. He was entertained with public feasts and other expressions of gratitude for about a year, and then returned to Rome. There he remained until 1838, when he decided to return to Copenhagen, and the Danish government sent a frigate to convey him and his works to Denmark. In 1841, finding the climate to disagree with him, he felt compelled to return to Italy, but returned to Denmark in the following year. He died suddenly, March 24, 1844. The favorite style of Thorwaldsen was basso-rilievo, in which he was the greatest master of his age. His principal works are, Christ and the Twelve Apostles : — Procession to Golgotha: —John the Baptist Preaching in the Wilderness, in the Church of Notre Dame, Copenhagen: —Entry into Jerusalem: — Rebecca at the Well. See English Cyclop. of Biog. s.v.: —Spooner, Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts, s.v.

## Thoth[[@Headword:Thoth]]

             The Egyptian deity of written learning, the author of the mystical treatises on medicine and sacred literature, called by the Greeks the Hermetic books, and himself, as the author of them, Hermes Trismeegistus, and, in his character of introducer of souls in Hades, Hermes Psychopompos. He had many names and occupations, which led to his identification with many of the chief divinities by virtue of a parity of offices. He was called on a statue in the Leyden Museum “He who is the good Savior;” and on some of the funeral papyri he takes the place of Anubis, or even Horus, with respect to the souls of the deceased. In the Hall of the Two Truths it was the duty of Thoth to weigh the souls of the deceased, and to read from his tablets a record of their actions in the past life. Thoth was also the god of all writing, and founder of all the sciences. He brought to the gods a translation of all the sacred books, and he was called the “Scribe of the Gods.” and the “Lord of the Divine Words.” In another form the god Thoth was identified with the moon, when he would be represented with the head of an ibis, surmounted by the horns and lunar disk; but oftentimes  he was figured with a human head, having-that of the ibis as a coiffure, and wearing the Atef crown. As Thoth Axah, or Thoth the Moon, he was generally entirely naked, and in the figure of an infant with thin bowed thighs, possibly to indicate the moon in its first quarter. At other times he was represented as an adult man, bearded,-and wearing the short loin- cloth, or shenti, of the Egyptians; sometimes he carried in his hand the eye of Horus, the symbol of the full moon, the Cucufa or Uas scepter, and the crux ansata. In his latter characteristics Thoth was regarded as one and the same with Khonsu of Thebes. The Cynocephalus ape was also sacred to the god Thoth, and hieroglyphically figured for him. It was Thoth who revealed to the initiated certain mysterious words and formulas, thus imparting a knowledge of divine things which was supposed to elevate man to the height of the gods. It was only necessary to pronounce these formulas in the name of the deceased over his mummy, and to place a copy of them by his side in the coffin, to insure for him the benefit of their influence in the dangers which he had to combat in the lower regions. Should any one take possession of the magic-book composed by the god Thoth before he has been initiated supernatural catastrophes will assail him. He was also worshipped by the Phoenicians, Scythians, Germans, Gauls, and other ancient nations. His symbol was the ibis; and his festival was celebrated on the first day of the first moon in the year. —Cooper, Archaic Dict. s.v. SEE EGYPT.

## Thracia, or Thrace[[@Headword:Thracia, or Thrace]]

             (θρῄκη), occurs in the Bible in one passage of the Apocrypha only (2Ma 12:35), where a Thracian horseman (τῶν ἱππέων θρᾷῶν τις, “a horseman of Thracia” ) is incidentally mentioned, apparently one of the body-guard of Gorgias, governor of Idumsea under Antiochus Epiphanes (comp. Josephus, War, 2, 16,4; Appian, Syr. 1; Civ. 4:88). . Thrace at this period included the whole of the country within the boundary of the Strymon, the Danube, and the coasts of the AEgean, Propontis, and Euxine (Herod. 4:99; Pliny, 4:18); all the region, in fact, now comprehended in Bulgaria and Rumelia. Under the Romans, Maesia Inferior was separated from it (Ptolemy, 3, 11, 1). In the early times it was inhabited by a number of tribes, each under its own chief, having a name of its own and preserving its own customs, although the same general character of ferocity and addiction to plunder prevailed throughout (Herod. 5, 3). Thucydides (2, 97) describes the limits of the country at the period of the Peloponnesian war, when Sitalces, king of the Odrysse, who inhabited the valley of the  Hebrus (Maritza), had acquired a predominant power in the country, and derived what was for those days a large revenue from it. This revenue, however, seems to have arisen mainly out of his relations with the Greek trading communities established on different points of his seaboard. Some of the clans, even within the limits of his dominion, still retained their independence; but after the establishment of a Macedonian dynasty under Lysimachus, the central authority became more powerful; and the wars on a large scale which followed the death of Alexander furnished employment for the martial tendencies of the Thracians, who found a demand for their services as mercenaries everywhere. Cavalry was the arm which they chiefly furnished (see Homer, Odyss. 9:49), the rich pastures of Rumelia abounding in horses. From that region came the greater part of Sitalces's cavalry, amounting to nearly fifty thousand (see Herod. 1, 94; 5, 3 sq.; Tacitus, Annal. 4:35; Horace, Sat. 1, 6; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 17:3, 5, 2; 18:12,1; Justin. 8:3; Mela, 2, 2; Cellarii Notitia, 2, 15; Mannert, Geogr. 7:1 sq.; Gatterer, in the Comment. Soc. Götting. 4 and 5 [Germ. by Schlickhorst, Götting. 1800]; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.).

The only other passage, if any, containing an allusion to Thrace to be found in the Bible is Gen 10:2, where on the hypothesis that the sons of Japhet, who are enumerated, may be regarded as the eponymous representatives of different branches of the Japetian family of nations — Tiras has by some been supposed to mean Thrace; but the only ground for this identification is a fancied similarity between the two names. A stronger likeness, however, might be urged between the name Tiras and that of the Tyrsi, or Tyrseni, the ancestors of the Italian Etruscans, whom, on the strength of a local tradition, Herodotus places in Lydia in the ante- historical times. Strabo brings forward several facts to show that in the early ages Thracians existed on the Asiatic as well as the European shore; but this circumstance furnishes very little help towards the identification referred to. SEE TIRAS.

## Thraseas, or rather Thrasus[[@Headword:Thraseas, or rather Thrasus]]

             (θρασαῖος, Vulg. Thrasceas), the father of Apollonius (q.v.), Syrian governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia (2Ma 3:5).

## Three (Thirty, etc.)[[@Headword:Three (Thirty, etc.)]]

             (Shalosh, שָׁלוֹשׁ שָׁלשׁetc.) frequently occurs as a cardinal number; thus, שָׁלשׁ שָׁנים, three years (Lev 19:23); as an ordinal, בַּשְׁנִתאּשָׁלשׁ, in the third year (2Ki 18:1); in combination with other numbers, as שָׁלשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה, thirteen; and it is also used in the plural as an ordinal for thirty, שְׁלשַׁים(1Ki 16:23). For other forms and uses of the words, see the Hebrew lexicons.

The nouns שָׁלַישׁ שָׁלשׁ, and: שָׁלוֹשׁliterally, according to one derivation, a third man, are used in the sense of a commander or general, sometimes as connected with war-chariots or cavalry. Thus (Exo 14:7), “Pharaoh took all the chariots of Egypt and captains (שָׁלַשַׁם, third men) over all this armament” (עַל כְּלּוֹ), no, as in our translation, “over every one of them;” Sept. τρι στάτας ἐπὶ πάντων, tristatce over all; Vulg. duces totius exercitus. So it is said (Exo 15:4) that “the choice of all Pharaoh's captains” (שְׁלשֵׁי), or third men, were drowned; Sept. ἀναβάτας τριστάτας; Vulg. principes.

The Septuagint word seems chosen upon the assumed analogy of its etymology to the Hebrew, quasi τριτο στάτης, “one who stands third.” According to Origen, tristates has this meaning, because there were three persons in each chariot, of whom the first fought, the second protected him with a shield, and the third guided the horses. Wilkinson, however, says, “There were seldom three persons in an Egyptian war-chariot, except in triumphal processions. In the field each one had his own car with a charioteer” (Ancient Egyptians, 1, 335). Jerome, on Ezekiel 23 :says, “Tristatce, among the Greeks, is the name of the second rank after the royal dignity.” But it is possible that the ideal meaning of the verb שׁלשׁmay be to rule or direct, as appears from its share in such words as שָלַשׁים, “excellent things,” or rather “rules and directions” (Pro 22:20), and משׁל,” a proverb,” from משׁל, “to rule,” hence an authoritative precept. According to this sense, our translation renders the word שָׁלַישׁ“lord:” “a lord on whose hand the king leaned” (2Ki 7:2; comp. 2Ki 5:17; 2Ki 5:19). If the latter derivation of the Hebrew word be admitted, it will cease to convey any allusion to the number three; of which allusion Gesenius speaks doubtingly of any instance, but which he decidedly pronounces to be unsuitable to the  first passage, where the word evidently stands in connection with war- chariots (see Gesenius, s.v. שׁלישׁ). SEE CAPTAIN.

Three days and three nights. “For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” The apparent difficulty in these words arises from the fact that our Lord continued in the grave only one day complete, together with a part of the day on which he was buried and of that on which he rose again. The Hebrews had no word expressly answering to the Greek word νυχθήμερον, or natural day of twenty-four hours, an idea which they expressed by the phrases a night and a day or a day and a night. Thus (Dan 8:14), “Unto two thousand and three hundred evening mornings (i.e. days, as it is in our translation), then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Thus, also, what is called “forty days and forty nights” in Gen 7:12, is simply “forty days” in Gen 7:17; wherefore, as it is common in general computations to ascribe a whole day to what takes up only a part of it, when this was done in the Jewish language it was necessary to mention both day and night; hence a part of three days was called by them three days and three nights. We have another example in 1Sa 30:12, where the Egyptian whom David's men found in the field is said to have eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights. Nevertheless, in giving an account of himself, the Egyptian told them that his master had left him “because three days ago I fell sick;” in the Hebrew it is I fell sick this third day, that is, this is the third day since I fell sick. Indeed, among the Hebrews, things were said to be done after three days, which were done on the third day (comp. 2Ch 10:5 with 2Ch 10:12; Deu 14:28 with Deu 26:2). Agreeably to these forms of speech, the prophecy of our Lord's resurrection from the dead-is sometimes represented as taking place after three days, sometimes on the third day (see Whitby, Macknight, Wakefield, Clarke, ad loc.).

The phrase “three and four,” so often repeated (Amos 1), means abundance, anything that goes on towards excess. It finds its parallel in Virgil's well-known words, O terque quaterque beati (“O three and four times happy,” En. 1, 94; see also Odyss. 5, 306).

Three has also been considered, both by Jews and Christians, as a distinguished or mystical number, like “seven,” Ainsworth, on Gen 22:4, has collected many such instances, but they appear to be somewhat fanciful. A ternary or trial arrangement of subjects, however, is very  prevalent in the Bible (see an anonymous monograph on The Triads of Scripture [Lynchburg, 1866]). SEE NUMBER.

## Three Chapters[[@Headword:Three Chapters]]

             (Tria Capitula), the title of an edict published by the emperor Justinian. He having, in the year 542, been shocked by some of the writings of Origen, published an edict in which nine of the chief Origenist errors were set forth and condemned, Origen himself being also anathematized. Theodore, the Monophysite bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, devised a plan by which to avenge the memory of Origen, and to strengthen the position of the Monophysites. He persuaded the emperor that the Acephali might be restored to the Church and reconciled to the decrees of Chalcedon, if the writings under three “heads” or “chapters” which he named were condemned, and so ceased to become stumbling-blocks to them by seeming to support the Nestorian heresy. These were (1) the Epistle of Theodoret against the twelve anathemas of St. Cyril, (2) the Epistle of Ibas of Edessa to Maris, and (3) the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. All these writings having carried weight with them at the Council of Chalcedon, the condemnation of them by Justinian would be, to a certain extent, a repudiation of that council, and so a recognition of the Monophysites condemned by it. Attracted by the hope of reconciling the Acephali, and not seeing these consequences, the emperor published the edict of the Three Chapters, A.D. 544; giving a profession of his own faith, and anathematizing the three works above named. The edict was subscribed by the four Eastern patriarchs, and, after some hesitation, it was also assented to by Vigilius, bishop of Rome, with an added clause to the effect that in doing so he did not condemn the Council of Chalcedon. This assent he afterwards retracted when excommunicated by a council at Carthage, and in 550 declared the Eastern bishops separated from the communion of Rome. The condemnation of the Three Chapters, with a similar reservation respecting the Council of Chalcedon, was, however, confirmed by the fifth General Council, A.D. 553, the second Council of Constantinople. See Mansi, Concil. 9:61, 181, 487; Natal. Alex. 5, 502.

Three Denominations, a name given to the Independents, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians at the time when these three sects represented the great body of English Dissenters. They were the Dissenters recognized by the Act of Toleration (1 William and Mary, c. 18), and had the privilege  granted to them of presenting corporate addresses to the sovereign. — Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.

## Three Taverns[[@Headword:Three Taverns]]

             (Τρεῖς Ταβερναί, Graecized from the Latin Tres Tabernce), a station on the Appian Road, along which Paul traveled from Puteoli to Rome (Act 28:15). The Roman Christians went, in token of respect, to meet Paul at these places, having been probably apprised of his approach by letters or express from Puteoli (Act 28:13-15) one party of them resting at the Three Taverns, and the other going on to Appii Forum. When the apostle saw this unequivocal token of respect and zeal, he took fresh courage. There is no doubt that the Three Taverns was a frequent meeting place of travelers. A good illustration of this kind of intercourse along the Appian Way is supplied by Josephus (Ant. 17:12, 1) in his account of the journey of the pretender Herod Alexander. He landed at Puteoli (Dicaearchia) to gain over the Jews that were there; and “when the report went about him that he was coming to Rome, the whole multitude of the Jews that were there went out to meet him, ascribing it to Divine Providence that he had so unexpectedly escaped.” SEE PAUL.

The word ταβέρνα is plainly the Latin taberna in Greek letters, and denotes a house made with boards or planks; quasi trabena. Wooden houses, huts, etc., are called tabernae. Thus Horace, “Pauperum tabernas regumque turres” (Carm. 1, 14,13). Hence the word also means shops, as distinguished from dwelling-houses. Horace uses it for a bookseller's shop (Sat. 1, 4, 71), and for a wine-shop (Ep. 1, 14, 24). The shops at Pompeii are booths, connected in almost every case with dwellings behind, as they were in London three centuries ago. When eatables or drinkables were sold in a Roman shop, it was called taberna, tavern, victualling house. Grotius observes that there were many places in the Roman empire at this time which had the names of Forum and Tabernae, the former from having Markets of all kinds of commodities, the latter from furnishing wine and eatables. The place or village called “Three Taverns” probably, therefore, derived its name from three large inns, or eating-houses, for the refreshment of travelers passing to and from Rome. Zosimus calls it τρία καπηλεῖα (2, 10).

Appii Forum appears to have been such another place. Horace mentions the latter, in describing his journey from Rome to Brundusium, as “differtum nautis, cauponibus atque malignis” stuffed with rank boatmen, and with vintners base (Sat. 1, 5, 3). That the Three Taverns  was nearer Rome than Appii Forum appears from the conclusion of one of Cicero's letters to Atticus (2, 10), which, when he is traveling south- eastwards from Antium to his seat near Formiae, he dates “Ab Appii Foro, hora quarta” from Appii Forum, at the fourth hour; and adds, “Dederam aliam paulo ante, Tribus Tabernis” (I wrote you another, a little while ago, from the Three Taverns). Just at this point a road came in from Antium on the coast, as we learn from the same letter of Cicero (Att. 2, 12). The Itinerary of Antoninus places Appii Forum at forty-three Roman miles from Rome, and the Three Taverns at thirty-three; and, comparing this with what is observed still along the line of road, we have no difficulty in coming to'the conclusion that the Three Taverns was near the modern Cisterna (see Smith, Dict. of Greek and Romans Geog. 2, 1226 b, 1291 b). In the 4th century there was a bishop of Three Taverns, named Felix (Optatus, lib. 1). It has been stated by some that the place still remains, and is called Tre Taverne. Thus, in Evelyn's time (1645), the remains were “yet very faite” (Diarie, 1, 134). -But recent travelers have been unable to find more. than a few unnamed remains on the spot indicated (Chaupy, Maison d'Horace, 3, 383; D'Anville, Analyse de D'Italie, p. 195; Westphal, Ronm. Kampagne, p. 69; Fleck, Wissenschaft. Reise, I, 1, 375). SEE APPII FORUM.

## Threshing[[@Headword:Threshing]]

             (prop. הוּשׁ; but sometimes הַדְרַיךְ, to tread out, ἀλοάειν; and occasionally חָבִט). The Hebrews made use of three different-processes for separating the grain from the stalk (comp. Isa 28:27 sq.), an operation always carried on in the open air. SEE STRAW.

1. In the earliest period, and even later for small quantities, especially in the former part of the harvest season, and for the frailer kinds of grain, the seed was beaten out with sticks (חָבִט, Sept. ῥαβδίζειν). This was a process applied to other agricultural products (Jerome, ad Isaiah loc. cit.), as well as to field grain (Jdg 6:11;. Rth 2:17; Isa 28:27; comp. Columel. 2, 21; Strabo, 4:201). It is a method still in use in the East (Robinson, 2, 650; 3, 233). SEE HARVEST.

2. Usually, however, horned cattle (Mishna, Shebiith, 5, 8, as still in Egypt, Arabia, and Syria), seldom asses or (in modern times) horses (Shaw, p. 124; Buckingham, p. 288), were driven around, usually yoked in pairs or several abreast, and these, by means of their hoofs (Mic 4:13), cut up and separated the chaff and straw from the grain (Isa 28:28; Jer 50:11; Hos 10:11; comp. Varro, De Re Rust. 1, 51; Homer, 11. 20:495 sq.; Pliny, 18:72). So also in ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, 2nd ser. 1, 87, 90). SEE THRESHING-FLOOR.

3. The most, effectual method of threshing was by means of threshing- machines ( מוֹרִג חִרוּוֹ[Arab. noraj], or simply חָרוּוֹ, Isa 28:27; Isa 41:15; Job 41:22; also בִּרְקָן, Jdg 8:7; Jdg 8:16; see Gesen. Thesaur. p. 244; τρίβολον, tribulum, Pliny, 18:72; Talm. טריבל). These consisted sometimes of a wooden plank (trahea, or traha) set with sharp stones or iron points, which was dragged over the sheaves (Rashi, on Isa 41:15; comp. Varro, 1, 52; Columel. 2, 21; Virgil, Georg. 1, 164), sometimes of a sort of cart or wheeled sledge (plostellum Phanicum; comp. Jerome, ad Isa 25:10; Isa 28:27). Such a wagon is mentioned in Isa 28:27 sq. ( אוֹפִן עֲגָלָה and גִּלְגִּל עֲגָלָה). SEE THRESHING- INSTRUMENT.

Cattle were used for this vehicle, as usually still among the Arabians (Wellsted, 1, 194); and the Mosaic law forbade the yoking-together of various kinds of beasts, as well as the muzzling of the animals  (Deu 25:4; Josephus, Ant. 4:8, 21; 1Co 9:9; Talmud, Kelim, 16:7; comp. Elian, Anim. 4:25), a usage prevalent among the ancient Egyptians and other nations (Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 401; comp. Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 3, 130). SEE MUZZLE.

Threshing is frequently employed by the Hebrew poets as a figure of the divine or providential chastisements, especially national invasion (Isa 41:15; Jer 51:33; Mic 4:13; Hab 3:12). In one passage (Isa 21:10), the bruised grain is made an image of the captive Jews. See generally Schöttgen, Triturce et Fullonice Antiquitates (Tr. ad Rh. 1727; Lips. 1763); Paulsen, Ackersbau, p. 110 sq. SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Threshing-floor[[@Headword:Threshing-floor]]

             (גֹּרֶן, goren, ἃλων; Chald. אַדִּר, idddr, Dan 2:35), a level and hard- beaten plot in the open air (Jdg 6:37; 2Sa 6:6), on which the sheaves of grain (Mic 4:12) were threshed (Isa 21:10; Jer 51:33;.: Matthew 3, 12; the Mishna remarks that the threshers wore gloves, Kelim, 16:6), so that the wind had free play (Hos 13:3; Jeremiah 4:41; comp. Varro, De Re Rust. 1, 51,1, “Aream esse oportet in agro sublimiore loco, quam perflare possit ventus”). The top of a rock is a favorite spot for this purpose. The sheaves were carried straight from the field either in carts, or, as more commonly happens in the present day, on the backs of camels and asses, to the threshing-floor. On this open space the sheaves were spread out, and sometimes beaten with flails-a method practiced especially with the lighter kinds of grain, such as fitches or cumin (Isa 28:27) but more generally by means of oxen. For this purpose the oxen were yoked tide by side, and driven round over the corn, by a man who superintended the operation, so as to subject the entire mass to a sufficient pressure; or the oxen were yoked to a sort of machine (what the Latins called tribulunm or trahea) which consisted of a board or block of wood, with bits of stone or pieces of iron fastened into the lower surface to make it rough, and rendered heavy by some weight, such as the person of the driver, placed on it; this was dragged over the corn, and hastened the operation (Isa 28:27; Isaiah 41, 15). The same practices are still followed, only mules and horses are occasionally employed instead of oxen, but very rarely. Dr. Robinson describes the operation as he witnessed it near  Jericho: “Here there were no less than five floors, all trodden by oxen, cows, and younger cattle, arranged in each case five abreast, and driven round in a circle, or rather in all directions, over the floor. The sled, or sledge, is not here in use, though we afterwards met with it in the north of Palestine. By this process the straw is broken up and becomes chaff. It is occasionally turned with a large wooden fork having two prongs; and, when sufficiently trodden, is thrown up with the same fork against the wind, in order to separate the grain, which is then gathered up and winnowed. The whole process,” he adds, “is exceedingly wasteful, from the transportation of the corn on the backs of animals to the treading-out upon the bare ground” (Researches, 2, 277). During this operation the Mohammedans, it seems, generally observe the ancient precept of not muzzling the oxen while treading out the corn; but the Greek Christians as commonly keep them tightly muzzled. SEE THRESHING.

As in the East there is no rain during the harvest season (Hesiod, Opp. 558), the threshing-floors were in the open field, and were carefully selected and managed (Virgil, Georg. 1, 178 sq.; Pallad. 7:1; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 12:32; 15:8; 17:14; 18:71, etc.). The farmers remained on the corn- floor all night in order to guard the product (Ruth 3, 4, 6, 14).'The threshing-place was of considerable value, and is often named in connection with the wine-press (Deu 16:13; 2Ki 6:27; Hos 9:2; Joel 2, 24), since wheat and wine and oil were the more important products of the land (Mishima, Baba Bathra, 2, 8). They often bore particular names, as that of Nachon (2Sa 6:6) or Chidon (1Ch 13:9), of Atad (Genesis 1, 10), of Ornan, or Araunab (2Sa 24:18,'20; 1Ch 21:15; Josephus, Ant. 7:13, 4). See Thomson, Hand Book, 2, 314; Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 160; Van Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 79; Conder, Tent-Work in Palestine, 2, 259. SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Threshing-instrument[[@Headword:Threshing-instrument]]

             was a sledge for driving over the sheaves and separating the grain. These sledges, called among the Hebrews by the general term בִּרְקָנַי, badrkanim, rendered “briers” inJudges 8:7, 16, were of two kinds, corresponding respectively with two words, the first of which alone is rendered as above in the, A.V. SEE THRESHING.

1. Morag (מוֹרִג, so called from triturating; 2Sa 24:22; 1Ch 21:23; Isa 41:15; by ellipsis charults, pointed. Job 41:22; Psalm 28:27; Amo 1:3) was a threshing instrument still in use in the north of Palestine. Prof. Robinson, who frequently saw this rustic threshing-sledge, says, “It consists chiefly of two planks fastened together side by side, and bent upwards in front; precisely like the common stone- sledge of New England. Many holes are bored in the bottom underneath, and into these are fixed sharp fragments of hard stone. The machine is dragged by oxen as they are driven round upon the grain; sometimes a man or a boy sits upon it. The effect of it is to cut up the straw quite tine” (Researches, 2, 306).

2. Agalah (עֲגָלָה, rendered “cart” or “wagon”) was a threshing-sledge with wheels or rollers of wood, iron, or stone, made rough and joined together in the form of a sledge (Isa 28:27-28). Mr. Lane found it still in use in Egypt, perhaps somewhat improved. He says,

For the purpose of separating the grain of wheat or barley, etc., and cutting the straw, which serves as fodder, the Egyptians use a machine called morag, in the form of a chair, which moves upon small iron wheels, or circular plates, generally eleven, fixed to three thick axle-trees; four to the foremost, the same number to the hindmost, and three to the intermediate axle-tree. This machine is drawn in a circle, by a pair of cows or bulls, over the corn” (Mod. Egyptians, 2, 33).

Threshold is the rendering in the A.V. of three Heb. words.

1. Saph (סִ,so called perhaps from the attrition there, Jdg 19:27; 1Ki 14:17; Eze 40:6-7; Eze 43:8; Zep 2:14; elsewhere door” or “door-post”), the-sill, or bottom, of a door-way. See GATE.

2. Miphtan (מַפְתָּן, so called apparently from its firmness or stretch), obviously to be interpreted of the sill, or bottom beam, of a door (1Sa 5:4-5; Zep 1:9; Eze 47:1); but perhaps meaning sometimes, as the Targum explains it, a projecting beam, or corbel, at a higher point than the threshold properly so called (Eze 9:3; Eze 10:4; Eze 10:18). See DOOR.

3. Asoph (אָסֹ, only in the plur. Asuppim, אֲסְפַּים, collections; Sept. σιναγαγεῖν; Vulg. vestibula; Neh 12:25), a storehouse or depository (“Asuppim,” 1Ch 26:17), especially as connected with the western gates of the Temple, hence called beth-Asuppim (1Ch 26:15). SEE ASUPPIM.

## Throne[[@Headword:Throne]]

             (כַּסֵּא, kisse; θρόνος, a seat, as often rendered; twice כַּסֵּה, kisseh, 1Ki 10:19; Job 26:9; Chald. כָּרְסֵא, horse, Dan 5:20; Dan 7:9, so called as being covered, i.e. either the seat itself or with a canopy) applies to any elevated seat occupied by a person in authority, whether a high- priest (1Sa 1:9), a judge (Psa 122:5), or a military chief (Jer 1:15). In Neh 3:7 the term is applied to the official residence of the governor, which appears to have been either on or near to the city wall. In the holy of holies, between the cherubim, was the throne of Jehovah, the invisible king of the Hebrews (Exo 25:22). SEE PAVILION.

The use of a chair in a country where the usual postres were squatting and reclining was at all times regarded as a symbol of dignity (2Ki 4:10; Pro 9:14). In order to specify a throne in our sense of the term, it was necessary to add to kiss the notion of royalty; hence the frequent occurrence of such expressions as “the throne of the kingdom” (Deu 17:18; 1 Kings 1, 46; 2Ch 7:18). The characteristic feature in the royal throne was its elevation: Solomon's throne was approached by six steps (1Ki 10:19; 2Ch 9:18); and Jehovah's throne is described as “high and lifted up” (Isa 6:1; comp. Hom. Odyss. 1, 130; 4:136; Curtius, 5, 2, 13). The materials and workmanship were costly: that of Solomon is described as a ‘throne of ivory” (i.e. inlaid with ivory), and overlaid with pure gold in all parts except where the ivory was apparent. It was furnished with arms or “stays,” after the manner of an Assyrian chair of state (see Rawlinson, Herod. 4:15). The steps were also lined with pairs of lions, the number of them being perhaps designed to correspond with that of the tribes of Israel. As to the form of the chair, we are only informed in 1Ki 10:19 that “the top was round behind” (apparently meaning either that the back was rounded off at the top or that there was a circular canopy over it). In lieu  of this particular, we are told in 2Ch 9:18 that “there was a footstool of gold fastened to the throne.” but the verbal agreement of the descriptions in other respects leads to the presumption that this variation arises out of a corrupted text (Thenius, Comm. on 1 Kings, loc. cit.) a presumption which is favored by the fact that the terms כֶּבֶשׁand the Hop- hal-form מָאַחָזַיםoccur nowhere-else. — The king sat on his throne on state occasions, as when granting audiences (1Ki 2:19; 1Ki 22:10; Esther 5, 1), receiving homage (2Ki 11:19), or administering justice (Pro 20:8). At such times he appeared in his royal robes (1Ki 22:10; Jon 3:6; Act 12:21). Archelaus addressed the multitude from “an elevated seat and a throne of gold” (Josephus, War, 2, 1, 1). A throne was generally placed upon a dais or platform, and under a canopy; and in the sublime description of the King of kings (Revelation 4), this latter is compared to the emerald hue of the rainbow. In Rev 4:4; Rev 11:16 the elders who represent the Church as reigning with Christ are seated on thrones placed around his; and in Rev 2:13 Satan is represented as imitating the royal seat of Christ. For modern Oriental thrones, see Van Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 643.

Mr. Layard discovered in the mound at Nimriud, among other extraordinary relics, the throne on which the Assyrian monarchs sat three thousand years ago. It is composed of metal and of ivory, the metal being richly wrought and the ivory beautifully carved. The throne seems to have been separated from the state apartments by means of a large curtain, the rings by which it was drawn and undrawn having been preserved (Nin. and Bab. p. 198). The chair represented on the earliest monuments is without a back, the legs are tastefully carved, and the seat is adorned with the heads of rams.

The cushion appears to have been of some rich stuff, embroidered or painted. The legs were strengthened by a cross-bar, and frequently ended in the feet of a lion or the hoofs of a bull, either of gold, silver, or bronze (Nineveh, 2, 235). The throne of the Egyptian monarchs is often exhibited on the ancient monuments. SEE CHAIR.

The throne was the symbol of supreme power and dignity (Gen 41:40), and hence was attributed to Jehovah both in respect to his heavenly abode (Psa 11:4; Psa 103:19; Isa 66:1; Act 7:49;  Rev 4:2) and to his earthly abode at Jerusalem (or Rev 3:17), and more particularly in the Temple (Rev 17:12; Eze 43:7). Similarly, “to sit upon the throne” implied the exercise of regal power (Deu 17:18; 1Ki 16:11; 2Ki 10:30; Est 1:2), and “to sit upon the throne of another person” succession to the royal dignity (1Ki 1:13). The term ‘“throne” is sometimes equivalent to “kingdom” (2Ch 9:8; Act 2:30; Heb 1:8). So, also, “thrones” designates earthly potentates and celestial beings, archangels (Col 1:16). SEE SEAT.

## Throne, Episcopal[[@Headword:Throne, Episcopal]]

             the official seat placed in the cathedral, or chief seat of a diocese, and occupied by the bishop on public occasions. This was the common honor and privilege of all bishops from very early times. Thus Eusebius calls the bishop of Jerusalem's seat θρόνος ἀποστολικός, the apostolical throne, because James, bishop of Jerusalem, first sat in it. It was also called βῆμα, rostrum; and θρόνος ὑψηλός, the high throne, because it was exalted somewhat higher than the seats of the presbyters, which were on each side of it, and were called the second thrones. It generally stood at the east end of the choir or sanctuary; that is, in churches which were built in the form of basilicas, and were apsidal. This is still the case at Milan and Augsburg. In mediaeval times the bishop's seat was frequently the best and most exclusive stall on the south side, and almost invariably occupied by him during the solemn recital of divine office. During mass, and on occasions when services took place at the altar, his throne was placed against the north wall within the sanctuary. Most of the English thrones are of wood, richly carved, while abroad they are frequently of stone. At St. Mark's, Venice, the Cathedral of Malta, and at the Cathedral of Verona the episcopal thrones are of marble. At Ravenna, Spalatro, and Torcello they are: of alabaster; at St. Peter's, Rome, the throne is of bronze; and at Ravenna, St. Maximian's throne is of ivory. In Portugal and Spain the episcopal throne is, commonly that one which in England is occupied by the dean, the first on the decani side. See Binglham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 2, ch. 9:§ 7; Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.; Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.

## Throp, Charles, D.D., F.R.S[[@Headword:Throp, Charles, D.D., F.R.S]]

             an English divine, was born at Gateshead rectory, Octobrt 13, 1783. He was educated at the Cathedral School, and at Oxford, where he obtained a fellowship, and subsequently was appointed tutor of University College. In 1807 he was presented with the rectorship of Ryton, where he spent several years in active service; in 1829 was presented with a prebendal stall in the Cathedral of Durham; and about 1831 was promoted to the archdeaconry of Durham. At the same time he was elected one of the lord Crewe trustees, in which capacity he exerted himself to the utmost. On the establishment of the University of Durham, he became its first warden. He  died at Ryton rectory, Durham, October 10, 1862. Dr. Throp was proverbial for his love of the fine arts, his gallery of pictures surpassing any other in the north of England. He was a man of rare benevolence, giving £400 per annum to endow the parish of Winlanton, and erecting a house of worship at Greenside, at his own expense, to the memory of his parents. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1862, page 693.

## Thrupp, Frances Joseph[[@Headword:Thrupp, Frances Joseph]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1827, and educated at Winchester School and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he obtained a. fellowship. He took orders in the Church of England, traveled in the East, and became vicar of Barrington Cambridgeshire, where he died, Sept. 24,1867. He was the author of Ancient Jerusalem: a New Investigation into the History, Topography, and Plan of the City, etc. (Camb. 1855, 8vo): —Introduction to the Study and Use of the Psalms (1860, 2 vols. 8vo): —The Song of Songs: a New Translation, Commentary, etc. (1862): —and The Burden of Human Sin as Borne by Christ. (three sermons). He also furnished articles for Smith's Dict. of the Bible, and prepared part of the commentary on the Pentateuch for the Speaker's Commentary. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Thrym[[@Headword:Thrym]]

             in Norse mythology, was a giant king of great strength, who, being a born enemy of Thor, sought to deprive him of his weapons in order to make him less dreadful for the giants. He succeeded in robbing Thor of his frightful hammer, Mjolnir, while Thor had fallen asleep. Loki discovered the thief and sought to negotiate with him. Thrym assured Loki that he did not intend to deliver up the hammer until the beautiful. Freia was given him as his wife. When this was told secretly to Freia, the goddess of love, she became so angry that everything shook, and her golden necklace broke in ‘twain. Then it seemed as if there were no remedy. Loki, however, who was always ready with advice, proposed that Thor should dress himself as the bride. Although this plan seemed too womanish for the mighty Thor, he nevertheless decided to try it; and went veiled, laden with riches, and accompanied by Loki as his chambermaid, to Thrym. There the tremendous appetite of the bride caused great astonishment; but Loki knew how to excuse the goddess by the pretence of an eight days fast, to which he said. she had subjected herself from longing for Thrym. So, also, her flaming eyes were excused from having been awake eight days. Thrym's sister, more cautious than the fat giant, was suspicious of the matter, and would. probably have detected the deception, as she had demand-ed to see the ring of Freia; but no sooner had Thrym brought him the hammer of Thor, to dedicate with it the bride, than Thor, seeing his Mjolnir, grasped it, and destroyed all the giants.

## Thube, Christian Gottlob[[@Headword:Thube, Christian Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germally, was born in Saxony, March 19, 1742. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1775 rector at Butzow, Mecklenburg, in 1776 preacher at Baumgarten, and died January 25, 1826. He published, Anleitung zum richtigen Verstande der Offenbarung Johannis (Minden, 1786; 2d ed. 1799): — Das Buch des Propheten Daniel, neu ubersetzt und erklart (1797): — Das Buch des Propheten Sacharja, neu ubersetzt und erklart (1801). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Thugs[[@Headword:Thugs]]

             (Hindu, thugna, “to deceive” ), a religious fraternity in India, professedly in honor of the goddess. Kall, wife of Siva, who were addicted to the committal of murders, and lived chiefly upon the plunder obtained from their victims. They were also called Phansigars, or “stranglers,” from the Hindustani phansi, a “noose.” ‘The proceedings of the Thugs were generally these banding together in gangs of from ten to fifty, and sometimes as high as three hundred, they assumed the appearance of ordinary traders; traveling, if able on horseback with tents and other comforts; if not able to travel in this manner, they assumed more humble characters. Each gang had its jemadar, or leader; its guru, or teacher; its sothas, or entrappers; its bhuttotes, or stranglers; and its laghaees, or grave-diggers.

Their mode of procedure was generally as follows: Some of the gang were employed to collect information respecting the movements of persons of means; and when they found one about to undertake a journey, endeavored to insinuate themselves into his confidence. They then proposed to him to travel in their company, under the plea of safety or for the sake of society, or else followed him, waiting for an opportunity to murder. This was generally accomplished by throwing a cloth around the neck of a victim, disabling him by strangulation, and then inflicting the fatal injury. After the murder was perpetrated, the body was mutilated and secretly buried, so as to make detection the more difficult. The mode of dividing the plunder seems to have been to appropriate one third to their goddess Kali, one third unto the widows and orphans of the sect, and the remainder to the partners in the assassination.

The Thugs had for their patron goddess Devi or Kali, in whose name they exercised their profession, and to whom they ascribed their origin. Formerly they believed Kalf assisted them by devouring the bodies of their victims; but through the curiosity of one 9f the profession who pried into the proceedings of the goddess, she became displeased and condemned them in future to bury their victims. She, however, presented her worshippers with one of her teeth for a pickaxe, a rib for a knife, and the hem of her lower garment for a noose. The pickaxe was regarded with the highest reverence by the Thugs; it was made with the greatest care, consecrated by many and minutely regulated ceremonies; entrusted to one selected for this dignity on account of his shrewdness, caution, and  sobriety; and was submitted to special purifications each time after it had been used in the preparation of a grave.

In honor of their guardian deity, there is a temple dedicated at Bindachul, near Mirzapur, to the north of Bengal. When about to go out upon a murdering expedition, the Thugs betook themselves to the temple of the goddess, presented their prayers, supplications, and offerings there, and vowed, in the event of success, to consecrate to her service a large proportion of the booty. So implicit was their trust in Kali that no amount of misfortune, even death, could make them waver in their faith in her. All the evil that befell them they attributed to a want of faithful observance of all the divinely appointed rules of their sanguinary craft. After every murder they performed a special solemnity called Tapuni, the principal feature of which consisted in addressing a prayer to the goddess, and in making the murderers partake of gau; or consecrated sugar, the effect of which was believed to be irresistible. Another feast observed by the Thugs throughout India is Kurhae Karna, or Kote. It is also in honor of Kali, and the requisites for its celebration are goats, rice, ghee (butter), spices, and spirits. ‘The superstitions of the Thugs are all of Hindu origin; but they are also adopted by the Mouammedans, who, while stout adherents to the tenets of the Koran, yet pay divine honors to the Hindu goddess of destruction. This inconsistency they sometimes reconcile by identifying Kali, whose other name is Bhavani, with Fatima, the daughter of Mohammed, and wife of All, and by saying that Fatima invented the use of the noose to strangle the great daemon Rukutbijdana.

At various periods steps have been taken by the native and English governments to suppress the Thugs, but it is only since 1831 that energetic measures have been adopted by the British authorities to counteract the evil This has been successfully accomplished by captain (afterwards Sir William) Sleeman, who secured the arrest of every known Thug, or relative of a Thug, in India. They were colonized at Jubbulpore, where technical instruction was afforded them and their children. Their descendants are still under government supervision there, and the practice of Thuggee has become extinct. For a fuller account of the Thugs the reader is referred to Sleeman, Ramaseeana, or a Vocabulary of the Peculiar Language used by the Thugs (1836); Taylor, The Confessions of a Thug (Lond. 1858); Thornton, Illustrations of the History and Practices of the Thugs (ibid. 1837).

## Thumbstall[[@Headword:Thumbstall]]

             in ecclesiastical nomenclature, is a ring, set with pearls and rubies, or a rich ornament worn by the bishop over that part of the thumb of his right hand which had been dipped in the chrism, or holy oil. This was worn out of respect to the holy oil, and to preserve his garments from stains. It was removed at that part of the service when he washed his hands. This ring was anciently called a “poucer.”

## Thummell, C.B., D.D[[@Headword:Thummell, C.B., D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Germany in 1802; in 1820 entered the University of Halle, Prussia, and graduated from the University of Tuibingen, in Witrtemberg. In the spring of 1824 he was licensed to preach, and was ordained in 1826. On his arrival in America, in August of that year, he commenced the study of the English language. The first year he was employed as a missionary. From 1827 to 1838 he was professor of languages in Hartwick Seminary; and then accepted a professorship in the Lutheran Seminary at Lexington, S.C. In 1845 he removed to Prairieville, Illinois, where he remained until the close of his life, May 23, 1881. For fifteen years he was secretary and treasurer of the Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Palmyra, 111. See Lutheran Observer, July 29, 1881.

## Thummim[[@Headword:Thummim]]

             SEE URIM AND THUMMIM.

## Thunder[[@Headword:Thunder]]

             (prop. רִעִם, rdam, βροντή; occasionally [Exo 9:28-29; Exo 9:33-34; Exo 19:16; Exo 20:18; 1Sa 7:10; 1Sa 12:17-18; Job 28:26; Job 38:25] קוֹל, kôl, voice, as an elliptical expression for Jehovah's voice [Psa 29:3 sq., etc.]; so also in the plur. קוֹלַים, thunders, Exo 9:23, etc.; which is likewise elliptical for the full voices of God [exe 9:28];once [Job 39:19 (23)] erroneously in the A. V. for רִעֲמָה, raamâh, a shuddering, i.e. probably the mane of a horse as bristling and streaming in the wind). This sublimest of all the extraordinary phenomena of nature is poetically represented as the voice of God, which the waters obeyed at the Creation (Psa 104:7; comp. Gen 1:9). For other instances see Job 37:4-5; Job 40:9; Psa 18:13; and especially ch. 29 which contains a magnificent description of a thunder-storm. Agreeably to the popular speech of ancient nations, the poet ascribes the effects of lightning to the thunder, “The voice of the Lord breaketh the cedars” (Psa 18:5; comp. 1Sa 2:19). In Jer 10:13 the production of rain by lightning is referred to: “When he uttereth his voice, there is a multitude of waters in the heavens, he maketh lightnings with (or for) rain.” SEE RAIN.

Thunder is also introduced into the poetical allusion to the passage of the Red Sea in Psalm 67:18. The plague of hail on the land of Egypt is very naturally represented as accompanied with “mighty thunderings,” which would be literally incidental to the immense agency of the electric fluid on that occasion (Exo 9:22-29; Exo 9:33-34). It accompanied the lightnings at the giving of the law (Exo 19:16; Exo 20:18). See also Psa 81:7, which probably refers to the same occasion, “I answered thee in the secret place  of thunder,” literally, “in the covering of thunder,” בסתר רעם, i.e. the thunder-clouds. It was also one of the grandeurs attending the divine interposition described in 2Sa 22:14; comp. Psa 18:13. The enemies of Jehovah are threatened with destruction by thunder; perhaps, however, lightning is included in the mention of the more impressive phenomenon (1Sa 2:10). Such means are represented as used in the destruction of Sennacherib's army (Isa 29:5-7; comp. Isa 30:30-33). Bishop Lowth would understand the description as metaphorical, and intended, under a variety of expressive and sublime images, to illustrate the greatness, the suddenness, the horror of the event, rather than the manner by which it was effected (new transl., and notes ad loc.). Violent thunder was employed by Jehovah as a means of intimidating the Philistines in their attack upon the Israelites, while Samuel was offering the burnt-offering (1Sa 7:10; Sir 46:17). Homer represents Jupiter as interposing in a battle with thunder and lightning (Iliad, 8:75, etc.; 17:594; see also Spence, Polymetis, Dial. 13:211). The term thunder was transferred to the war-shout of a military leader (Job 39:25), and hence- Jehovah is described as “causing his voice to be heard” in the battle (Isa 30:30). Thunder was miraculously sent at the request of Samuel (1Sa 12:17-18). It is referred to as a natural phenomenon subject to laws originally appointed by the Creator (Job 28:26; Job 38:25; Sir 43:17); and is introduced in visions (Rev 4:5; Rev 6:1; Rev 8:5; Rev 11:19; Rev 14:2; Rev 16:18; Rev 19:6; Esther [Apoc.] 11:5). So in Rev 10:3-4, “seven thunders.” SEE SEVEN.

It is adopted as a comparison. Thus” as lightning is seen before the thunder is heard, so modesty in a person before he speaks recommends him to the favor of the auditors” (Sir 32:10; Rev 19:6,etc.). The sudden ruin of the unjust man is compared to the transitory noise of thunder (Sir 40:13); but see Arnald, ad loc. One of the sublimest metaphors in the Scriptures occurs in Job 26:14,” Lo, these are parts of his ways; but how little a portion is heard of him [שמוֹ, a mere whisper]; but the thunder of his power, who can understand?” Here the whisper and the thunder are admirably opposed to each other. If the former be so wonderful and overwhelming, how immeasurably more so the latter? In the sublime description of the war-horse (Job 39), he is said to perceive the battle afar off “by the thunder of the captains, and the shouting” (Job 39:25). That part of the description, however (Job 39:19), “hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?” appears to be a mistranslation. To the class of mistranslations must be referred every instance of the word “thunderbolts”  in our version, a word which corresponds to no reality in nature. SEE THUNDERBOLT.

It is related (Joh 12:28) that Jesus said, “Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I haves both glorified it, and will glorify it again.” Some of the people that stood by, but had not heard the words distinctly, said it had “thundered,” for the voice came from heaven; others who had caught the words supposed that God had spoken to Jesus by an angel, conformably to the Jewish opinion that God had never spoken but by the ministry of angels. Perhaps, however, thunder attended the voice, either a little before or after; comp. Exo 19:16; Exo 19:19; Rev 4:5; Rev 6:1. SEE BATH-KOL.

Thunder enters into the appellative or surname given by our Lord to James and John-Boanerges, ὅ ἐστιν, υἱοὶ βροντῆς, says Mark, “sons of thunder” (Mar 3:17). Schleusner here understands the thunder of eloquence as in Aristoph. (Achar. 530). Virgil applies a like figure to the two Scipios,” Duo fulmina belli” (En. 6:842). Others understand the allusion to be to the energy and courage, etc., of the two apostles (Lardner, Hist. of theApostles and Evangelists, 9:1; Suicer, Thesaurus, s.v. Βροντή). Theophylact says they were so called because they were great preachers and divines, ὡς μεγαλοκήρυκας καὶ θεολογικοτάτους. Others suppose the allusion to be to the proposal of these apostles to call fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritans (Luk 9:53-54). It is not certain when our Lord so surnamed them. SEE BOANERGES.

In a physical point of view, the most noticeable feature in connection with thunder is the extreme rarity of its occurrence during the summer months in Palestine and the adjacent countries. From the middle of April to the middle of September it is hardly ever heard. Robinson, indeed, mentions an instance of thunder in the early part of May (Researches, 1, 430), and Russell in July (Aleppo, 2, 289); but in each case it is stated to be a most unusual event. Hence it was selected by Samuel as a striking expression of the Divine displeasure towards the Israelites: “Is it not wheat harvest to- day? I will call upon the Lord, and he shall send thunder and rain” (1Sa 12:17). Rain in harvest was deemed as extraordinary as snow in summer (Pro 26:1), and Jerome asserts that he had never witnessed it in the latter part of June, or in July (Comment. on Amo 4:7); the same observations apply equally to thunder, which is rarely unaccompanied with rain (Russell, 1, 72; 2, 285). Lieutenant Lynch, in the  month of May, witnessed a thunder storm in the mountains of Moab, near the Dead Sea. He, says, “Before we had half ascended the pass, however, there came a shout of thunder from the dense cloud which had gathered at the summit of the gorge, followed by a rain, compared to which the gentle showers. of oar more favored clime are as dew-drops to the overflowing cistern. The black and threatening cloud soon enveloped the mountain- tops, the lightning playing across it in incessant flashes, while the loud thunder reverberated from side to side of the appalling chasm. Between the peals we soon heard a roaring: and continuous sound. It was the torrent from the rain-cloud, sweeping in a long line of foam down the steep declivity, bearing along huge fragments of rock, which, striking against each other, sounded like mimic thunder” (Expedition, p. 353). SEE LIGHTNING.

## Thunderbolt[[@Headword:Thunderbolt]]

             (רֶשֶׁ, risheph, a flame, or “coal,'” Son 8:6; hence lightning; fig. for arrow, Psa 76:3; or, fever, Deu 32:24). In accordance with thepopular notion, “hot thunderbolts” (Psalm 68:48, רשפי, Sept. τῷ πυρί, Vulg. igni) means “lightnings.” “Then shall the right-aiming thunderbolts go abroad” “(Wisd. 5, 21), βολίδες ἀστραπῶν, “flashes” or “strokes of lightning.” “Threw stones like thunderbolts” (2: Macc. 1: 16), συνεκεραύνωσαν. The word conveys an allusion to the mode in which lightning strikes the earth. SEE LIGHTNING.

## Thundering Legion[[@Headword:Thundering Legion]]

             SEE LEGION, THUNDERING.

## Thurarii[[@Headword:Thurarii]]

             a name given by Tertullian to those who sold frankincense to heathen temples, and whose business could not be free from the imputation of idolatry, because it furnished what was necessary to the worship of idols.

## Thurible[[@Headword:Thurible]]

             a censer used in some of the services of the Roman Catholic Church, made of metal, usually in, the form of a vase, with a cover perforated to allow the scented fumes of the burning incense to escape. It. is usually carried by three chains which are attached to points around the lower portion, while a fourth is sometimes connected with the above, being united to, the ring or handle, and is used at intervals to raise the upper portion or covering of the censer and allow the incense to escape more freely. In the 8th century thuribles were commonly used and directions for their due adoption enjoined by the authority of the local synods. At Rome there are thuribles of gold in the treasury; of the Church of St. John Lateran, reputed to have been given by the emperor Constantine. There is an old silver censer at Louvain, more than twelve at Milan Cathedral, seven at Metz Cathedral, four of silver-gilt at Notre Dame, Paris, of the 14th century, and some remarkable specimens at Rheimsiand at Treves. There are a few examples still in use in England, and several at the South Kensington and the British Museum and in private collections. The thurible is used at high mass, at vespers, at the benediction with the blessed sacrament, at funerals, public thanksgivings, etc. It has often been used in the Church of England since the Reformation. See Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.; Parker, Gloss. of Architect. s.v.

## Thurifer[[@Headword:Thurifer]]

             (incense-bearer), the ministering attendant in the Roman Catholic Church whose duty it is to carry the thurible or censer and swing it at the appointed time during service. He is ordinarily a chorister or acolyte, but on great occasions a subdeacon, deacon, or even a priest.

## Thurificati, or Thurificatores[[@Headword:Thurificati, or Thurificatores]]

             (incense-offerers), names for those who, during the pagan persecutions, consented to offer frankincense on an altar dedicated to an idol, in order to escape torture or death. This act of apostasy severed them from the Christian Church; and it was not till, by long penance, they had given satisfactory proof of sorrow for their crime that they were readmitted. SEE LAPSED; SEE LIBELIATICI.

## Thuringia, Council of[[@Headword:Thuringia, Council of]]

             (Concilium Quintilineburgense or Northusense), was held in 1105 by the emperor Henry, who had lately succeeded in reuniting Saxony to the Roman obedience. The council was held in the palace. The decrees of the preceding councils were confirmed, and the heresy of the Nicolaitans (meaning the concubinage of the clergy) was condemned.

## Thuroferary[[@Headword:Thuroferary]]

             (incense-bearer), a priest who bears the censer during the services of the Greek Church. He also assists the officiating priest to put on his sacerdotal vestments, and, during the anthem, spreads a veil over the consecrated vessels.

## Thursday[[@Headword:Thursday]]

             (Anglo-Saxon Thors-daeg, i.e. Thor's Day), the Dies Jovis of the Roman calendar, and sacred, in the Northern mythology, to Thor. It is called in German Donnerstag, thunder day. In the early Church, Augustine complained that some of the Christians persisted in keeping Thursday as a holyday in honor of Jupiter.

## Thursday Of The Great Canon[[@Headword:Thursday Of The Great Canon]]

             an Eastern phrase for the Thursday after Trinity Sunday.

## Thurston, David, D.D[[@Headword:Thurston, David, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Georgetown, Mass., Feb. 6,1779. He was the uncle of the Rev. R. B. Thurston and half-brother of the Rev. Stephen Thurston, D.D. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1804, and was ordained at Winthrop, Me., in 1807, where he remained pastor until 1851, with no intermission except the year in which he was agent for the American Antislavery Society (1837), and the four months in 1850 when he attended the Peace Congress in Frankfort, Germany. During the remainder of his life he labored four years each at Vassalborough, Searsport, and Litchfield, Me. He died at the latter place, May 7, 1865. Dr. Thurston was a man of eminent piety, an earnest speaker, and no mean theologian. In 1819 he declined a professorship in Bangor Theological Seminary, and in 1853 wished to decline the degree of D.D. from Dartmouth College. He published twenty-two sermons, some in pamphlet  form and some in periodicals: —Growth in Grace: —History of Winthrop (247 pp.): —Letters of a Father to a Son: —and newspaper articles without number. See Cong. Quarterly, 1867, p. 313-328.

## Thurston, Eli, D.D[[@Headword:Thurston, Eli, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Brighton, Massachusetts, June 14, 1808. At the age of seventeen he went to Millbury to learn the gunsmith's trade, but having been converted in his twentieth year, he immediately began to study for the ministry, attending Day's Academy at Wrentham, and graduating from Amherst College in 1834. The year following he spent in Andover Theological Seminary, and the two succeeding studied  theology with the Reverend Dr. Jacob Ide, of West Medway. He was ordained pastor in Hallowell, Maine, January 3, 1838, and filled this position for ten years. The following twenty years, dating from March 21, 1849, he was pastor of the Central Church in Fall River, Mass. He died there, December 19,1869. In theology Dr. Thurston was ranked as a Hopkinsian Calvinist, and his sermons were all constructed on the basis of his theology. As a preacher he was remarkable for clearness of statement and directness of argument. See Cong. Quarterly, 1871, page 433.

## Thurston, Stephen, D.D[[@Headword:Thurston, Stephen, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Sedgewick, Maine, December 22, 1797. He graduated from Bangor Theological Seminary in 1825, became pastor at Searsport (then Prospect), Maine, in 1826, was secretary of the Maine Missionary Society from 1864 to 1876, and died May 27, 1884. He published several sermons. See Cong. Year-book, 1885, page 35.

## Thyatira[[@Headword:Thyatira]]

             (θυατείρα ῾τὰ], Vulg. civitas Thyatirenorum), a city in Asia Minor, the seat of one of the seven Apocalyptic churches (Rev 1:11; Rev 2:18). It was situated on the confines of Mysia and Ionia, a little to the south of the river Hyllus, and at the northern extremity of the valley between Mount Timolus and the southern ridge of Temnus. It was founded by Seleucus Nicator, and was regarded as a Macedonian colony (Strabo, 13:928), from the strong Macedonian element in its population, it being one of the many Macedonian colonies established in Asia Minor, in the sequel of the destruction of the Persian empire by Alexander. The original inhabitants had probably been distributed in hamlets round about when Thyatira was founded. Two of these, the inhabitants of which are termed Areni and Nagdemi, are noticed in an inscription of the Roman times. According to Pliny, it was known in earlier times by the names Pelopia and Euhippia (Hist. Nat. 5, 29). The Roman road from Pergamos to Sardis passed through it. The resources of the neighboring region may be inferred both from the name Euhippia and from the magnitude of the booty which was carried off in a foray, conducted jointly by Eumenes of Pergamos and a force detached by the Roman admiral from Canae, during the war against Antiochus. During the campaign of B.C. 190, Thyatira formed the base of the king's operations; and after his defeat, which took place only a few miles to the south of the city, it submitted, at the same time with its neighbor Magnesiaon-Sipylus, to the Romans, and was included in the territory made over by them to their ally the Pergamene sovereign.

During the continuance of the Attalic dynasty, Thyatira scarcely appears in history; and of the various inscriptions which have been found on the site, not one unequivocally belongs to earlier times than those of the Roman empire. The prosperity of the city seems to have received a new impulse under Vespasian, whose acquaintance with the East, previously to mounting the imperial throne, may have directed his attention to the development of the resources of the Asiatic cities. A bilingual inscription, in Greek and Latin, belonging to the latter part of his reign, shows him to  have restored the roads in the domain of Thyatira. From others, between this time and that of Caracalla, there is evidence of the existence of many corporate guilds in the city. Bakers, potters, tanners, weavers, robe makers, and dyers (οἱ βαφεῖς) are specially mentioned. Of these last there is a notice in no less than three inscriptions, so that dyeing apparently formed an important part of the industrial activity of Thyatira, as it did of that of Colossse and Laodicea. With this guild there can be no doubt that Lydia, the seller of purple stuffs (πορφυρόπωλις), from whom Paul met with so favorable a reception at Philippi (Act 16:14), was connected. The country around this city is fertile and well watered, abounding in oaks and acacias, and in its numberless streamlets are found the leeches used in medicine throughout Austria and the east of Europe in general. The mode of taking them is curious; a number of children are sent to walk barefooted among the brooks, and come back to their employers with their feet covered with leeches. The waters here are said to be so well adapted for dyeing that in no place can the scarlet cloth out of which fezzes are made be so brilliantly or so permanently dyed as here. The place still maintains its reputation for this manufacture, and large quantities of scarlet cloth are sent weekly to Smyrna.

Thyatira is at present a populous and flourishing town; its inhabitants amount to eight thousand, and they are on the increase. Its modern name is Akhissar, or “the white castle.” The town consists of about two thousand houses, for which taxes are paid to the government, besides two or three hundred small huts; of the former, three hundred are inhabited by Greeks, thirty by Armenians, and the rest by Turks. The common language of all classes is the Turkish; but in writing it the Greeks use the Greek, and the Armenians the Armenian characters. There are nine mosques and one Greek church. It exhibits few remains of antiquity, save fragments built into the walls of houses. There is, indeed, an ancient building in a very ruinous condition at a little distance from the city, to which tradition has given the name of the Palace of the Caesars; it is impossible to determine either its date or its purpose. But though there is little that can be identified, yet for miles around Thyatira are precious relics in the form of sarcophagi, capitals of columns, and similar fragments, used as troughs, coverings for wells, and such purposes.

Thyatira was never a place of paramount political importance, and hence her history is less interesting to the classical student than those of Ephesus, Sardis, and Pergamos, which were the capitals of great kingdoms. Her  chief hold on our consideration is that at Thyatira was seated one of those churches to which the Spirit sent prophetic messages by the beloved apostle. The message itself is one of peculiar interest, but presenting at the same time a remarkable difficulty. After much commendation on the virtues and progress of the Church or the elder, pastor, bishop, or angel-the epistle continues, “Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman (or as the correct text has it, thy wife) Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols” (Rev 2:20). This is followed by threats of judgment upon herself, her lovers, and her children. The question naturally arises, What party is represented by this Jezebel? To understand this message rightly, it will have to be borne in mind that Thyatira was very near Pergamos and that the latter was by far the more important city, and probably possessed the more numerous Church; the influence and example of Pergamos would be likely to have a great influence on the smaller city and Church.. SEE PERGAMOS.

Now, at Pergamos, the Balaamites, who taught precisely the doctrine here attributed to Jezebel, were numerous, as well as the Nicolaitans (q.v.); We are not, therefore, at all to be surprised at finding a party espousing and endeavoring to propagate similar sentiments in Thyatira; but it would be a miserable literalism, and contrary to the whole genius of the Apocalyptic imagery, to suppose the leader of this heretical sect to be a woman of the name of Jezebel. We can only understand by this a person holding substantially the same relation to the official head of the Church in Thyatira which Jezebel of old did to the king of Israel; that is, a party that ought to have been in subjection usurping it, for wicked purposes, over the proper ruler. For this the leader is severely rebuked, and the heaviest judgments threatened both against him and the usurping party unless they repent. There was still, however, a faithful portion who stood aloof from the licentious teaching which was propagated. To them the Lord turns with words of encouragement, and exhorts them to hold fast what they had received. There is a small error also in the text at the commencement of this address. It should be “But unto you I say, the rest in ‘Thyatira;” those, namely, who resisted the pollution. The received text confuses the meaning by putting it, “But unto you I say, and to the rest,” as if both parties were alike called to continue steadfast. SEE JEZEBEL.

The principal deity of the city was Apollo, worshipped as the sun-god under the surname Tyrimnas. He was no doubt introduced by the  Macedonian colonists, for the name is Macedonian. One of the three mythical kings of Macedonia, whom the genealogists placed before Perdiccas — the first of the Temenidse that Herodotus and Thuicydides recognize — is so called; the other two being Carants and Ccenus, manifestly impersonations of the chief and the tribe. The inscriptions of Thyatira give Tyrimnas the titles of πρόπολις and προπάτωρ θεός, and a special priesthood was attached to his service. A priestess of Artemis is also mentioned, probably the administratrix of a cult derived from the earlier times of the city, and similar in its nature to that of the Ephesian Artemis. Another superstition of an extremely curious nature which existed at Thyatira, seems to have been brought thither by some of the corrupted Jews of the dispersed tribes. A fane Stood outside the walls dedicated to Sambatha the name of the sibyl who is sometimes called Chaldean, sometimes Jewish, sometimes Persian in the midst of an enclosure designated “the Chaldaeans court” (τοῦ Χαλδαίου περίβολος).

This lends an additional illustration to the above passage (Rev 2:20-21), which seems to imply a form of religion that had become condemnable from the admixture of foreign alloy, rather than one idolatrous ab initio. Now there is evidence to show that in Thyatira there was a. great amalgamation of races. Latin inscriptions are frequent, indicating a considerable influx of Italian immigrants; and in some Greek inscriptions many Latin words are introduced. Latin and Greek names, too, are found accumulated on the same individuals, such as Titus Antonius Alfeus Arignotus and Julia Severina Stratonicis. But amalgamation of different races in pagan nations always went together with a syncretism of different religions, every relation of life having its religious sanction. If the sibyl Sambatha was really a Jewess, lending her aid to this proceeding, and not discountenanced by the authorities of the Judaeo-Christian Church at Thyatira, both the censure and its qualification become easy of explanation. It seems also not improbable that the imagery of the description in Rev 2:18, ὁ ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ώς φλόγα, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ , may have been suggested by the current pagan representations of the tutelary deity of the city. . See a parallel case at Smyrna (q.v.). Besides the cults which have been mentioned, there is evidence of a deification of Rome, of Hadrian, and of the imperial family. Games were celebrated in honor of Tyrimnas, of Hercules, and of the reigning emperor. On the coins before the imperial times, the heads of Bacchus, of Athena, and of Cybele are also found; but the inscriptions only indicate a cult of the last of these.

See Strabo, 13:4; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5, 31; Livy, 37:8, 21, 44; Polybius, 16:1; 32:25; Elian, Var. Hist. 12:35; Bbckh, Inscript. Graec. Thyatir., especially Nos. 3484-3499; Jablonski, De Ecclesia Thyatirensi (Francof. ad V. 1739); Stosch, Antiq. Thyatiren. (Zwoll. 1763); Hoffmann, Griechenland, 2, 1714; Svoboda, Seven Churches of Asia Minor, p. 48 sq.; Barber, Patmos and Seven Churches (Bridgeport, 1851), p. 187 sq.; and the works cited under SEE ASIA MINOR and SEE REVELATION.

## Thyine Wood[[@Headword:Thyine Wood]]

             (ξύλον θύϊνον ; Vulg. lignum thyinum) occurs once in Rev 18:12 (margin “sweet” [wood]), where it is mentioned as one of the valuable articles of commerce that should be found no more in Babylon (Rome), whose fall is there predicted by John. Symmachus and the Vulg. also understand it to be meant by the algum-trees of 1Ki 10:11. There can be little doubt that the wood here spoken of is that of the Thuya articulata, Des Font., the Callitris quadrivalvis of present botanists. Most of our readers are familiar with the “arbor vite,” Thuja occidentalis, so common in our shrubberies. Closely allied to this in the same cypress-like division of the Coniferae; indeed, until lately included in the genus Thuja-is the tree in question. This wood was in considerable demand by the Romans, being much employed by them in the ornamental wood-work of their villas, and also for tables, bowls, and vessels of different kinds. It was also fragrant (Elian, Var. Hist. 5, 6). It is. noticed by most ancient authors from the time of Theophrastus (Plait. 5, 5; see Elian, Animn. 2, 11; Strabo, 4:202). It was the citron-wood of the Romans; thus Salmasius, θύα Theophrasti est illa citrus, quse citreas mensas dabat Romahis inter lautissima opera” (Celsius, Hierobot. 2, 25). It was produced only in Africa, in the neighborhood of Mount Atlasi and in Granada, “citrum, arborem Africae peculiarem esse, nec alibi nasci.” It grew to a goodly size, “quarum amplitudo ac radices aestimari possunt ex orbibus” (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 13:15). Fabulous prices were given for tables and other ornamental furniture made of citrus-wood (see Pliny, loc. cit.).

This cedar or citron-wood (Callitris quadrivalvis, the Thuja articulata of Linnaeus) is a native of Mount Atlas, and of other uncultivated hills on the  coast of Africa. It grows to a height of from fifteen to twenty-five feet. In the kingdom of Morocco, according to Broussouel, this tree produces the Sandarach resin of commerce. Captain Cook, in his Sketches in Spain (vol. 2), brought to light the fact that the wood-work of the roof of the celebrated mosque now the Cathedral of Cordova built in the 9th century is of this wood; it had previously been thought to be that of the larch, from the resemblance of the Spanish word alerce, which is applied to the wood of Callitris quadrivalvis in Spain and Barbary, to the Latin word larix. “By a singular coincidence, the subject has been undergoing investigation about the same time in Africa. Mr. Hay, the British consul at Tangiers, had, by tracing the Arabic etymology of the word alerce (no doubt alarz or eres), by availing himself of the botanical researches of the Danish consul in Morocco, and by collating the accounts of the resident Moors, made out that the alerce was the Thuja articulata which grows on Mount Atlas. In corroboration of his views, a plank of its timber was sent to London. This plank, which is in possession of the Horticultural Society, is one foot eight inches in width. The Cordova wood is highly balsamic and odoriferous, the resin, no doubt preventing the ravages of insects as well as the influence of the air” (Loudon, Arboret. 4:2463). The wood is dark nut-brown, close grained, and is very fragrant (Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 402). Lady Calcott (Script. Herbal, p. 2) regards it as the almug (q.v.) of the Old Test. SEE BOTANY.

## Thym, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Thym, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in Berlin, Sept. 5, 1768 and died there May 21,1803. He wrote, De Vita Mosis a Philone Conscripta (Halle, 1796): —Versucheiner historisch-kritischen Darstellung der jüd. Lehre von einer Fortdauer nachdem Tode (Berlin, 1795): —Theol. Encyklop. u. Methodologie (Halle, 1797): —Historisch kritisches Lehrbuch der Homiletik (ibid. 1800). See. Furst, Bibl.Jud. 3, 430; Winier, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 2, 474, 604; 2, 48, 59, 312, 802. (B. P.)

## Thyrori[[@Headword:Thyrori]]

             (θυρωροί, door-keepers), a lower order of the clergy in the Greek Church, which was done away with from the time of the Council of Trullo, A.D. 692. Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 3, ch. 6:§ 1.

## Thysiasterium[[@Headword:Thysiasterium]]

             (Gr. θυσιαστήριον, altar-part), a word usually applied to the altar itself, or the Lord's table; yet, in some ancient canons, used to denote the whole sanctuary within the rails, where none but the clergy were allowed. — Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 8:ch. 6:§ 3.

## Tiamat[[@Headword:Tiamat]]

             was, in Acadian mythology, the goddess who presided over the creation. She was a form, or rather another name, of the goddess Tihamtu (the Sea).

## Tiara[[@Headword:Tiara]]

             the name of the pope's triple crown, which is the badge of his civil rank as the keys are of his ecclesiastical functions. It is composed of a high cap of gold cloth, encircled by three coronets, with a mound (and cross) of gold on the top. The tiara was originally a round high cap, and was first used by pope Damasus II, A.D. 1048. Pope John XIII first girded it with a crown pope Boniface VIII added a second crown in 1295; and pope Benedict XII added the third in 1335, although some ascribe the latter to Urban V (1362-70); The tiara, when used as an imperial portion of dress, had at the bottom of it one golden circle of a crown like shape. SEE POPE.

## Tiben (also Written Twin or Dwin), Councils OF[[@Headword:Tiben (also Written Twin or Dwin), Councils OF]]

             (Concilium Thevinense). Tiben (perhaps the same as Thevis or Divo, supposed by some to be the present Erivan), under Chosroes II, became the capital of Armenia, and the religious centre of the realm. Several councils were held there.

I. The first council, held in 452, declared Tiben the seat of the catholicos.

II. The second council was summoned by the catholicos, Nerses II, in 527, and passed thirty-eight canons, the last of which ordered a fast of one week-every month.

III. The third council was held in 551, under Moses II, with a view of regulating the Easter festival. The 11th day of July, 553; was to begin the Armenian sera, and was declared the New Year's day of the first year.

IV. The fourth council, held in 596, was important for bringing about a separation between the Armenians and Georgians. Up to the year 580 the Georgians elected their own catholicos, who was always ordained by the Armenian. About that time, when the Georgian catholicos had died, the Georgians asked Moses II to elect one for them. He appointed Cyrion, a very learned theologian, who decreed the acceptance of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Moses' successor, Abraham I, who differed with Cyrion concerning the Council of Chalcedon, urged the Georgian catholicos to reject the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, but in vain. At the fourth Council of Tiben, Cyrion and his followers were condemned. This act was the occasion of much controversy among the Armenians.

V. The fifth council, held under Nerses III, in 645, condemned all heretics, and especially the Council of Chalcedon and its supporters.

VI. The sixth council was convened by Nerses III, in 648, which again condemned the Council of Chalcedon.

VII. In 719 the seventh council was held, under John IV; thirty-two canons were passed, which provided, among other things, that the altar and baptismal font should be made of stone, unleavened bread and unmixed wine should be used in the communion, the clause "Thou that wast crucified for us," in the Trisagion, should be sung three times, morning and evening, as well as at the mass, etc. The last canon strictly forbade the intercourse with the Paulicians.

VIII. The last or eighth council was held in 726, and condemned Julian Halicarnassensis, his followers, and his writings. Tiben is also celebrated for the martyrdom which some faithful Christians suffered there. See Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Tiberias[[@Headword:Tiberias]]

             (New Test. and Josephus Τιβεριάς, Talmud טבריא), the most important city on the Lake of Galilee in the time of Christ, and the only one that has survived to modern times, still retaining the same name.

1. Origin and Early Associations. —The place is first mentioned in the ‘New Test. (Joh 6:1; Joh 6:23; Joh 21:1), and then by Josephus (Ant. 18:2, 3; War, 2, 9, 1), who states that it was built by Herod Antipas, and was named by him in honor of the emperor Tiberius. It was probably not a new town, but a restored or enlarged one merely; for Rakkath (Jos 19:35), which is said in the Talmud (Jerusalem Megillah, fol. 701; comp; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 755) to have occupied the same position, lay in the tribe of Naphtali (if we follow the boundaries as indicated by the clearest passages), and Tiberius appears to have been within the limits of the same tribe (Mat 4:13). If the graves mentioned by Josephus (Ant. loc.  cit.) are any objection, they must. militate against this assumption likewise (Lightfoot, Chorog. Cent. c. 72-74). The same remark may be made, respecting Jerome's statement that Tiberias succeeded to the place of the earlier Chinnereth (Onomasticon, s.v.); but this latter town has been located by some farther north and by others farther south than the site of Tiberias. The tenacity with which its Roman name has adhered to the spot (see below) indicates its entire reconstruction; for, generally speaking, foreign names in the East applied to towns previously known under names derived from the native dialect-as, e.g., Epiphania for Hammath (Jos 19:35), Palmyra for Tadmor (2Ch 8:4), Ptolemais for Akko (Act 21:7)--lost their foothold as soon as the foreign power passed away which had imposed them, and gave place again to the original appellations.

Tiberias was the capital of Galilee from the time of its origin until the reign of Herod Agrippa II, who changed the seat of power back again to Sepphoris, where it had been before the founding of the new city. Many of the inhabitants were Greeks and Romans, and foreign customs prevailed there to such an extent as to give offence to the stricter Jews. SEE HERODIAN. Herod, the founder of Tiberias, had passed most of his early life in Italy, and had brought with him ‘thence a taste for the amusements and magnificent buildings with which he had been familiar in that country. ‘He built a stadium there, like that in which the Roman youth trained themselves for feats of rivalry and war. He erected a palace, which he adorned with figures of animals, “contrary,” as Josephus says (Life, § 12,13, 64), “to the law of our countrymen.” The place was so much the less attractive to the Jews, because, as the same authority states (Ant. 18:2, 3), it stood on the site of an ancient burial-ground, and was viewed, therefore, by the more scrupulous among them almost as a polluted and forbidden locality. Tiberias was one of the four cities which Nero added to the kingdom of Agrippa (Josephus, War, 20:13, 2). Coins of the city of Tiberias are still extant, which are referred to the times of Tiberius, Trajan, and Hadrian.

2. Scriptural Mention. —It is remarkable that the Gospels give us no information that the Savior, who spent so much of his public life in Galilee, ever visited Tiberias. The surer meaning of the expression, “He went away beyond the sea of Galilee of Tiberias,” in Joh 6:1 (πέραν τῆς  θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος), is not that Jesus embarked from Tiberias, but, as Meyer remarks, that he crossed from the west side of the Galilean sea of Tiberias to the opposite side. A reason has been assigned for this singular fact, which may or may not account for it. As Herod, the murderer of John the Baptist, resided most of the time in this city, the Savior may have kept purposely away from it, on account of the sanguinary and artful (Luk 13:32) character of that ruler. It is certain, from Luk 23:8, that though Herod had heard of the fame of Christ, he never saw him in person until they met at Jerusalem, and never witnessed any of his miracles. It is possible that the character of the place, so much like that of a Roman colony, may have been a reason why he who was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel performed so little labor in its vicinity. The head of the lake, and especially the Plain of Gennesaret, where the population was more dense and so thoroughly Jewish, formed the central point of his Galilean ministry. The feast of Herod and his courtiers, before whom the daughter of Herodias danced, and, in fulfillment of the tetrarch's rash oath, demanded the head of the dauntless reformer, was held in all probability at Tiberias, the capital of the province. If, as Josephus mentions (Ant. 18:5, 2), the Baptist was imprisoned at the time in the castle of Machaerus beyond the Jordan, the order for his execution could have been sent thither, and the bloody trophy forwarded to the implacable Herodias at the palace where she usually resided. Gams (Johannes der Taufer im Gefangniss, p. 47, etc.) suggests that John; instead of being kept all the time in the same castle, may have been confined in different places at different times. The three passages already referred to are the only ones in the New Test. which mention Tiberias by name, viz. Joh 6:1; Joh 21:1 (in both instances designating the lake on which the town was situated), and Joh 6:23, where boats are said to have come from Tiberias near to the place at which Jesus had miraculously supplied the wants of the multitude. Thus the lake in the time of Christ, among its other appellations, bore also that of the principal city in the neighborhood; and in like manner, at the present day, Bahr Tubarieh, “Sea of Tiberias,” is almost the only name under which it is known among the inhabitants of the country.

3. Later Jewish Importance. —Tiberias has an interesting history, apart from its strictly Biblical associations. It bore a conspicuous part in the wars between the Jews and the Romans, as its fortifications were an important military station (Josephus, War, 2, 20, 6; 47, 10, 1; Life, § 8 sq.). The  Sanhedrim, subsequently to the fall of Jerusalem, after a temporary sojourn at Jammia and Sepphoris, became fixed there about the middle of the 2nd century. Celebrated schools of Jewish learning flourished there through a succession of several centuries. The Mishna was compiled at this place by the great rabbi Judah hak-Kodesh (A.D. 190). The Masortah, or body of traditions, which has transmitted the readings of the Hebrew text of the Old Test., and preserved, 4by means of the vowel system, the pronunciation of the Hebrew, originated, in a great measure, at Tiberias. The place passed, under Constantine, into the power of the Christians; and during the period of the Crusades it was lost and won repeatedly by the different combatants. Since that time it has been possessed successively by Persians, Arabs, and Turks; and it contains now, under the Turkish rule, a mixed population of Mohammedans, Jews, and Christians, variously estimated at from two to four thousand. The Jews constitute, perhaps, one fourth of the entire number. They regard Tiberias as one of the four holy places (Jerusalem, Hebron, Safed, are the others), in which, as they say, prayer must be offered without ceasing, or the world would fall back instantly into chaos. One of their singular opinions is that the Messiah, when-he appears, will emerge from the waters of the lake, and, landing at Tiberias, proceed to Safed, and there establish his throne on the highest summit in Galilee. In addition to the language of the particular country, as Poland, Germany, Spain, from which they or their families emigrated, most of the Jews here speak also the Rabbinic Hebrew and modern Arabic. They occupy a quarter in the middle of the town, adjacent to the lake; just north of which, near the shore, is a Latin convent and church, occupied by a solitary Italian monk. There is a place of interment near Tiberias, in which a distinguished rabbi is said to be buried with 14,000 of his disciples around him. The grave of the Arabian philosopher Lokman, as Burckhardt states, was pointed out here in the 14th century.

4. Position and Present Condition. — As above intimated, the ancient name has survived in that of the modern Tubarieh, which occupies unquestionably the original site, except that it is confined to narrower limits than those of the original city. According to Josephus (Life, § 65), Tiberias was 30 stadia from Hippo, 60 from Gadara, and 120 from Scythopolis; according to the Talmud, it was 13 Roman miles from Sepphoris. The place is four and a half hours from Nazareth, one hour from Mejdel,  possibly the ancient Magdala, and thirteen hours, by the shortest route, from Banias or Caesarea Philippi. Near Tuibarieh, about a mile farther south along the shore, are the celebrated warm baths, which the Roman naturalists (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5, 15) reckoned among the greatest known curiosities of the world. The intermediate space between these baths and the town abounds with the traces of ruins, such as the foundations of walls, heaps of stone, blocks of granite, and the like; and it cannot be doubted, therefore, that the ancient Tiberias occupied also this ground, and was much more extensive than its modern successor. From such indications, and from the explicit testimony of Josephus, who says (Ant. 18:2, 3) that Tiberias was near Ammaus (Α᾿μμαούς), or the Warm Baths, there can be no uncertainty respecting the identification of the site of this important city. (See also the Mishna, Shabb. 3, 4; and other Talmudical passages in Lightfoot's Horas Heb. p. 133 sq. Comp. Wichmannshausen, De Thermnis Tiberiensibus, in Ugolino, Thesaur. tom. 7.) These springs contain sulfur, salt, and iron; and were employed for medicinal purposes. SEE HAMMATH.

It stood anciently, as now, on the western shore, about two thirds of the way between the northern and southern end of the Sea of Galilee. There is a margin or strip of land there between the water and the steep hills (which elsewhere in that quarter come down so boldly to the edge of the lake), about two miles long and a quarter of a mile broad. The tract in question is somewhat undulating, but approximates to the character of a plain. Tubarleh, the modern town, occupies the northern end of this parallelogram, and the Warm Baths the southern extremity; so that the more extended city of the Roman age must have covered all, or nearly all, of the peculiar ground whose limits are thus clearly defined.

The present Tubarleh has a rectangular form, is guarded by a strong wall on the land side, but is left entirely open towards the sea. A few palm-trees still remain as witnesses of the luxuriant vegetation which once adorned this garden of the Promised Land, but they are greatly inferior in size and beauty to those seen in Egypt. The oleander grows profusely here, almost rivaling that flower so much admired as found oil the neighboring Plain of Gennesaret. The people, as of old, draw their subsistence in part from the adjacent lake. The spectator from his position here commands a view of almost the entire expanse of-the sea, except the southeast part, which is cut off by a slight projection of the coast. The precipices on the opposite side” appear almost to overhang the water, but, on being approached, are found  to stand back at some distance, so as to allow travelers to pass between them and the water. The lofty Hermon, the modern Jebel esh-Sheikh, with its glistening snow-heaps, forms a conspicuous object of the landscape in the north-east. Many rocktombs exist in the sides of the hills, behind the town, some of them, no doubt, of great antiquity, and constructed in the best style of such monuments. The climate here in the warm season is very hot and unhealthy; but most of the tropical fruits, as in other parts of the valley of the Jordan, become ripe very early, and, with industry, might be cultivated in great abundance and perfection.

This place, in common with many others in Galilee, suffered greatly by an earthquake on New-year's-day, 1837. Almost every building, with the exception of the walls and some parts of the castle, was leveled to the ground. The inhabitants were obliged to live for some time in wooden booths. It is supposed that at least seven hundred of the inhabitants were destroyed at tat t time. The place has even yet not fully recovered from the disaster.

Tiberias is fully described in Raumer's Pallstina, p. 125; Robinson's Biblical Researches, 2, 380 sq.; Porter's Handbook, p. 421 sq.; Thomson's Land and Book, 2, 71 sq.; and most books of travel in Palestine. SEE TIBERIAS, THE SEA OF (ἡ θαλάσση τῆς ΤιβεριάΔος ; Vulg. mare Tiberiadis). This term is found only in Joh 21:1, the other passage in which it occurs in the A. V. (vi, 1) being, if the original is accurately rendered, “the sea of Galilee, of Tiberias.” John probably uses the name as more familiar to non-residents in Palestine than the indigenous name of the “sea of Galilee:” or “sea of Gennesaret,” actuated, no doubt, by the same motive which has induced him so constantly to translate the Hebrew names and terms which he uses (such as Rabbi, Rabboni, Messias, Cephas, Siloam, etc.) into the language of the Gentiles. SEE GALILEE, SEA OF.

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

             The present Tubariya is described in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 1:361, 418.

## Tiberius[[@Headword:Tiberius]]

             (Τιβέριος), in full, TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS NERO CASESAR, the Roman emperor, successor of Augustus, who began to reign A.D. 14, and reigned until 37. He was the son of Tiberius Claudius Nero and Livia, and hence a stepson of Augustus. He was born at Rome Nov. 16, B.C. 45. He became emperor in his fifty-fifth year, after having distinguished himself as a commander in various wars, and having evinced talents of a high order as  an orator and an administrator of civil affairs; His military exploits and those of Drusus, his brother, were sung by Horace (Carm. 4:4,14). He even gained the reputation of possessing the sterner virtues of the Roman character, and was regarded as entirely worthy of the -imperial honors to which his birth and supposed personal merits at length opened the way. Yet on being raised to the supreme power, he suddenly became, or showed himself to be, a very different man. His subsequent life was one of inactivity, sloth, and self-indulgence. He was despotic in his government, cruel and vindictive in his disposition. He gave up the affairs of the State to the vilest favorites, while he himself wallowed in the very kennel of all that was low and debasing. The only palliation of his monstrous crime and vices which can be offered is that his disgust of life, occasioned by his early domestic troubles, may have driven him at last to despair and insanity. Tiberius died at the age of seventy-eight, after a reign of twenty-three years. The ancient writers who supply most -of our knowledge respecting him are Suetonius, Tacitus (who describes his character as one of studied dissimulation and hypocrisy from the beginning), Annal. ch. 1-vi; Veil. Paterc. 2, 94, etc.; and Dion Cass.; ch. 46-48. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. s.v.; and the monographs on Tiberius in German by Freytag (Berl. 1870) and Stahr (ibid. 1873), and in English by Beesley (Lond. 1878).

It will be seen that the Savior's public life, and some of the introductory events of the apostolic age, must have fallen within the limits of his administration. The memorable passage in Tacitus (Annal. 15; 44) respecting the origin of the Christian sect places the crucifixion of the Redeemer under Tiberius: “Ergo abolendo rumori (that of his having set fire to Rome) Nero subdidit reos, et qusesitissimis pcenis affecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat” (see the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 95; SEE CHRESTUS ).

In Luk 3:1 he is termed Tiberius Caesar; John the Baptist, it is there said, began his ministry in the fifteenth year of his reign (ἡγεμονία). This chronological notation is an important one in determining the year of Christ's birth and entrance on his public work. SEE JESUS CHRIST. Augustus admitted Tiberius to a share in the empire two or three years before his own death; and it is a question, therefore, whether the fifteenth year of which Luke speaks should be reckoned from the time of the co-partnership or from that when Tiberius began to reign alone. The  former is the computation justified by other data. SEE CHRONOLOGY. The other passages in which he is mentioned under the title of Caesar offer no points of personal allusion, and refer to him simply as the emperor (Mat 22:17 sq..; Mar 12:14.sq.; Luk 20:22 sq.; Luk 23:2 sq.; Joh 19:12 sq.). SEE CESAR.

## Tibetan Version[[@Headword:Tibetan Version]]

             SEE THIBETAN VERSION.

## Tibhath[[@Headword:Tibhath]]

             (Heb. Tibchath', טַבְחִת, slaughter or [Furst] extension; Sept. [repeating the preposition],. Ματαβέθ ; Vulg. Thebath), a city of Hadadezer, king of Zobah (1Ch 18:8), which in 2Sa 8:8 is called BETAH, probably by an accidental transposition: of the first two letters. If Aram- Zobah be the country between the Euphrates and Coele-Syria, we must look for Tibhath on the eastern skirts of the Antilibanus, or of its continuation, the Jebel Shahshabu and the Jebel Rieha. But Furst (Heb. Lex. s.v.) thinks that “the city Thcebata, in the north-west of Mesopotamia (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 6:30), or the place θεβηθά of Arrian (in Steph. Byz.), which lay, according to the Peutinger Tables (11, e), south of Nisibis, may refer to this name.”

## Tibni[[@Headword:Tibni]]

             (Heb. Tibni', תַּבְנַי, perhaps intelligent; Sept. θαμνί ; Josephus, θαβναῖος, Ant. 8:12, 5; Vulg. Thebni), the sixth king of Israel, B.C. 926- 922. After Zimri had burned himself in his palace, there was a division in the northern kingdom, half of the people following Tibni the son of Ginath, and half following Omri (1Ki 16:21-22). Omri was the choice of the army. Tibni was probably put forward by the people of Tirzah, which was then besieged by Omri and his host. The struggle between the contending factions lasted four years (comp. 1Ki 16:15; 1Ki 16:23); but the only record of it is given in the few words of the historian: “The people that followed Omri prevailed against the people that followed Tibni the son of Ginath; so Tibii died, and Omiri reigned.” The Sept. adds that Tibni was bravely seconded by his brother Joram. But Josephlus knows nothing of this apocryphal addition. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

## Tickets of Membership[[@Headword:Tickets of Membership]]

             (English Wesleyan). The possession of a “ticket” is one of the evidences of membership in the Methodist society. Wesley decided, in 1743, to meet  and talk with every member once in three months. If considered fit and proper, every member received a ticket. This quarterly ticket, with the member's name written upon it, and signed by the minister, enables such a one to obtain everywhere the privilege of membership. When a member of the society removes from one circuit to another, a “note of removal,” signed by the minister, introduces him or her to the minister of the circuit to which either goes. Ministers must not give tickets to those who have ceased to meet in class. All the financial questions are explained to those who are seeking to join the society, and notes of admission on trial, with a copy of the “rules,” are given. If any member has walked disorderly, the minister has power to withhold his ticket until he has conversed privately with the offender; if not satisfied, he must inform the party that he may appeal to the leaders meeting. But he must report the case first the next weekly meeting of ministers in the circuit, and then to the leaders meeting. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism,

## Tidal[[@Headword:Tidal]]

             (Heb. Tidal', תּדְעָל, if Shemitic=fear [Gesenius] or renown [Fürst]; but, according to Lenormant, Accadian (greatson; Sept. θαργάλ v.r. θαλγά ; Josephus, θάδαλος, Ant. 1, 9, 1; Vulg. Thadal), the last named (Gen 14:1; Gen 14:9) of the three subordinate “kings” who, in confederation with Chedorlaomer, attacked and defeated the rebellious princes of the Sodomitic pentarchy in the days of Abraham, B.C. cir. 2070. He is called “king of nations” (גּוֹיַם, goyim),'which Symmachus interprets Scythians, and others Galilee, both on very slender, if not inaccurate, grounds. Rawlinson suggests, for equally precarious reasons (Ancient Monarchies, 1, 55, note),that the name is probably Turanian; but he justly remarks that, from the title given to Tidal, “it is reasonable to understand that he was a chief over various nomadic tribes to whom no special tract of country could be assigned, since at different times of the year they inhabited different portions of Lower Mesopotamia. This is the case with the Arabs of these parts at the present day.” SEE CHEDORLAOMER.

## Tidhar[[@Headword:Tidhar]]

             SEE PINE.

## Tidman, Arthur, D.D[[@Headword:Tidman, Arthur, D.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Mickelton, November 14, 1792. He was educated for the medical profession, but afterwards studied theology with Reverend George Collison, and in 1813 commenced missionary work in Sidmouth. In 1818 he received a call from Frome, and in 1828 settled at Barbican Chapel, London. During the last years of his pastorate he held the office of foreign secretary of the London Missionary Society. He died March 6, 1868. Dr. Tidman was well versed in all civil and diplomatic questions of the day; cool, far-seeing, and practical in all questions of Church doctrine or government, and especially distinguished by the wisdom, energy, and depth of his spiritual perception. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1869, page 281.

## Tiedebaik[[@Headword:Tiedebaik]]

             in Chinese and Japanese mythology, was one of the head deities, who is said to be in the temple of Osaka. It is unknown what this deity represented, unless the description of the image permits a conjecture. Tiedebaik, a powerful four-armed giant, with a crown upon his head, Stands in splendidly ornamented dress upon a figure whose horned head and dragon tail characterize it as an evil deity.

## Tieftrunk, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Tieftrunk, Johann Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian and philosopher of Germany, was born in 1760 at Oeftenhifen, near Rostock. He studied at Rostock and Halle, was in 1792 professor at Halle, and died October 7, 1837. He published, Einzig moglicher Zweck Jesu aus dem Grundgesetze der Religion entwickelt (2d ed. Halle, 1793): — Versuch einer Kritik der Religion (1790): — Censur des christlichen protestantischen Lehrbegriffs nach den Prinzipien der Religionskritik (Berlin, 1791-95, 3 parts; 2d ed. 1796): — De Modo Deum Cognoscendi (1792): — Dilucidationes ad Theoreticam Religionis Christianae Partem (1793, 2 parts): — Religion der Miindigen (1800, 2 parts). See Krug, Philosophisches Warterbuch, 4:173 (2d ed. 4:197); Baur, Vorlesungen uber Dogmengeschichte, 3:336 sq.; Gass, Gesch. der prot. Dogmatik, 4:300 sq.; Punjer, Geschichte der Religions philosophie, 2:52 sq.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Tierce[[@Headword:Tierce]]

             the service for the third hour, or nine o'clock in the morning, in the early Church. SEE MATIN; SEE NONES; SEE VESPERS.

## Tiercilits[[@Headword:Tiercilits]]

             the name given to the third order of Minims (q.v.).

## Tiffany, Otis Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Tiffany, Otis Henry, D.D]]

             a prominent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Baltimore, Maryland, July 3, 1825. After graduating from Dickinson College in 1844, he entered the Baltimore Conference; and with the exception of ten years spent at Dickinson as assistant professor of Greek and mathematics, he was in the pastoral work to the end of his life, serving successively some of the most prominent churches in his denomination. He died in Minneapolis, October 24, 1891. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences (Fall), 1892.

## Tiffin, Edward, M.D[[@Headword:Tiffin, Edward, M.D]]

             a local preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Carlisle, England, June 19, 1766. At an early age he commenced the study of medicine; removed to the United States in 1784, and settled in Charlestown, Jefferson Co., Va., where he became a practitioner. In 1790 he entered the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was ordained deacon by bishop Asbury, Nov. 19, 1792; In 1796 Dr. Tiffin took up his residence in Chillicothe, in the territory north-west of the Ohio River, where he continued the practice of medicine, and preached regularly on Sundays. In the autumn of 1799, Dr. Tiffin was elected a member of the territorial legislature; in 1802 he was chosen a delegate from Ross County to the convention which adopted the first constitution and formed a. state government for Ohio, of which convention he was elected president. In 1803 he was elected the first governor. At the session of the legislature in 1806-7, governor Tiffin was chosen United States senator, but resigned March 3,1809, on account of the death of his wife. The same year he was elected to the legislature and chosen speaker of the House. The next year (1810) he was returned to the House of Representatives and elected speaker. He was selected by president Madison a commissioner of the General Land Office; but, not enjoying the society of Washington, he exchanged offices with Josiah Meigs, surveyor-general of public lands. He took up his residence in Chillicothe, still attending to ministerial duties. He  held the office of surveyor-general for nearly fifteen years, when he obtained leave to retire, July 1,1829. He died Aug. 9 of the same year. Three of his Sermons, preached in 1817, were published in the Ohio Conference Offering, (1851). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:205.

## Tiglath-pileser[[@Headword:Tiglath-pileser]]

             (Heb. Tiglath'Pile'ser, פַּלְאֶסֶר תַּגְלִת, 2Ki 15:29; 2Ki 16:10; or briefly Tiglath'Pele'ser, תַּגַלִת פֵּלֶסֶר, 2Ki 16:7), or (less correctly) Til'gath- pilne'ser (Heb. Tilgath'Pilne'ser, תַּלַגִּת פַּלְנְאֶסֶר, 1Ch 5:6; 2Ch 28:20; or briefly Tilgath'Pilne'ser, תַּלְגִּת פַּלְנֶסֶר, 1. Chronicles 5, 26), an Assyriant king. The Sept. Graecizes the name θαλγαθφελλα σάρ (v.r. θαλγαλφελλασάρ, Α᾿λγαθφελλασάρ, Α᾿γλὰθ Φαλλασάρ), Josephus, θεγλαφαλασσάρης (Ant. 9:12,. 3), and the Vulg. Theglath-Phalasar. The monumental name is, according to Rawlinson, Tukulti-pal-zira ;. according to Oppert, Tuklat-pal-asar (i.e. assur); according to Hincks, Tiklat-pal-isri; according to others, Tigulti-pal-tsira. The signification of the name is somewhat doubtful. M. Oppert renders it, “Adoratio [sit] filio Zodiaci,” and explains “the son of the Zodiac” as Nin, or Hercules (Expedition Scientifique en Mesopotamie, 2, 352). It would seem to signify “worship of the son of Assur,” perhaps as a royal sobriquet. The Assyrian king of this name mentioned in Scripture is Tiglath-pileser II, an earlier king of the same name having ascended the Assyrian throne about B.C. 1130; of whose reign, or a portion of it, two cylinders are preserved in the British Museum (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 2, 62- 79). We here condense all the information accessible, from whatever source, concerning the later monarch of this name.

1. Biblical Statements. —Tiglathi-pi'eser is the second; Assyrian king mentioned in Scripture as having come into contact with the Israelites, the first being Put (q.v.). He attacked Samaria in the reign of Pekah (B.C. 756- 736), on what ground we are not told, but probably because Pekah had withheld his tribute, and, having entered his territories, took Ijon, and Abel-bethmaachah, and Janoah and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, and all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria” (2Ki 15:29) thus “lightly afflicting the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali” (Isa 9:1) the most northern, and so the most exposed, portion of the country.. The date of this invasion cannot at present be  fixed; but it was apparently many years afterwards that Tiglath-pileser made a second expedition into these parts, which had more important results than his former one. It appears that after the date of his first expedition a close league was formed between Rezin,-king of Syria, and Pekah, having for its special object the humiliation of Judaea, and intended to further generally the interests of the two allies. At first great successes were gained by Pekah and his confederate (2Ki 15:37; 2Ch 28:6-8); but on their proceeding to attack Jerusalem itself, and to threaten Ahaz, who was then king, with deposition from his throne, which they were about to give to a pretender, “the son of Tabeal” (Isa 7:6), the Jewish monarch applied to Assyria for assistance, and Tiglath-pileser, consenting to aid him, again appeared at the head of an army in these regions. He first marched, naturally, against Damascus, which he took (2Ki 16:9), razing it (according to his own statement) to the ground, and killing Rezin, the Damascene monarch. After this, probably, he proceeded to chastise Pekah, whose country he entered on the northeast, where it bordered upon “Syria of Damascus.” Here he overran the whole district to the east of Jordan, no longer “lightly afflicting” Samaria, but injuring her far “m more grievously, by the way of the sea, in Galilee of the Gentiles” (Isa 9:1), carrying into captivity “the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh” (1Ch 5:26), who had previously held this country, and placing them in Upper Mesopotamia from Harran to about Nisibis (ibid.). Thus the result of this expedition was the absorption of the kingdom of Damascus, and of an important portion of Samaria, into the Assyrian empire; and it further brought the kingdom of Judah into the condition of a mere tributary and vassal of the Assyrian monarch.

Before returning into his own land, Tiglath-pileser had an interview with Ahaz at Damascus (2Ki 16:10). Here, doubtless, was settled the amount of tribute which Judaea was to pay annually; and it may be suspected that here, too, it was explained to Ahaz by his suzerain that a certain deference to the Assyrian gods was due on the part of all tributaries, who were usually required to set up in their capital “the laws of Asshur,” or “altars to the great gods.” The “altar” which Ahaz “saw at Damascus,” and of which he sent the pattern to Urijah the priest (2Ki 16:10-11), has been conjectured to have been such a badge of subjection; but it seems to have been adopted only out of love for a prevalent fashion.  This is all that Scripture tells us of Tiglath-pileser. He appears to have succeeded Pul, and to have been succeeded by Shalmaneser; to have been contemporary with Rezin, Pekah, and Ahaz; and therefore to have ruled Assyria during the latter half of the 8th century before our era. SEE ASSYRIA.

2. Monumental Records. — From his own inscriptions we learn that his reign lasted at least seventeen years; that, besides warring in Syria and Samaria, he attacked Babylonia, Media, Armenia, and the independent tribes in the upper regions of Mesopotamia, thus, like the other great Assyrian monarchs, warring along the whole frontier of the empire; and, finally, that he was (probably) not a legitimate prince, but a usurper and the founder of a dynasty. This last fact is gathered from the circumstance that, whereas the Assyrian kings generally glory in their ancestry, Tiglath-pileser omits all mention of his, not even recording his father's name upon his monuments. It accords remarkably with the statements of Berosus (in Euseb. Chronicles Song of Solomon 1, 4) and Herodotus (1, 95), that about this time, i.e. in the latter half of the 8th century B.C., there was a change of dynasty in Assyria, the old family, which had ruled for 520 (526) years, being superseded by another not long before the accession of Sennacherib. The authority of these two writers, combined with the monumental indications, justifies us in concluding that the founder of the lower dynasty or empire, the first monarch of the new kingdom, was the Tiglath-pileser of Scripture, whose date must certainly be about this time, and whose monuments show him to have been a self-raised sovereign. The exact date of the change cannot be positively fixed; but it is probably marked by the era of Nabonassar in Babylon, which synchronizes with B.C. 747. According to this view, Tiglath-pileser reigned certainly from B.C. 747 to 730, and possibly a few years longer, being succeeded by Shalmaneser at least as early as 725. In the Assyrian Chronological Canon, of which there are four copies in the British Museum, all more or less fragmentary, the reign of Tiglath-pileser seems to be reckoned at either sixteen or seventeen years (see Atheneum, No. 1812, p. 84). Rawlinson's latest computation places his accession in 744 (ibid. Aug. 23, 1863). SEE SHALMANESER.

The circumstances under which Tiglath-pileser obtained the crown have not come down to us from any good authority; but there is a tradition on the subject which seems to deserve mention. Alexander Polyhistor, the friend of Sylla, who had access to the writings of Berosus, related that the first Assyrian dynasty continued from Ninus, its founder, to a certain belief  (Pul), and that he was succeeded by Beletaras, a man of low rank, a mere vine-dresser (φυτουργός), who had the charge of the gardens attached to the royal palace. Beletaras, he said, having acquired the sovereignty in an extraordinary way, fixed it in his own family, in which it continued to the time of the destruction of Nineveh (Fr. Hist. Gr. 3, 210). It can scarcely be doubted that Beletaras here is intended to represent Tiglath-pileser, Beltar being, in fact, another mode of expressing the native Pal-tsira or Palli-tsir (Oppert), which the Hebrews represented by Pileser. Whether there is any truth in the tradition may, perhaps, be doubted. It bears too near a resemblance to the Oriental stories of Cyrus, Gyges, Amasis, and others, to have in itself much claim to our acceptance. On the other hand, as above mentioned, it harmonizes with the remarkable fact-unparalleled in the rest of the Assyrian records that Tiglath-pileser is absolutely silent on the subject of his ancestry, neither mentioning his father's name nor making any allusion whatever to his birth, descent, or parentage.

Tiglath-pileser's wars do not generally appear to have been of much importance. In Armenia he reduced the rebel princes, and afterwards conquered the city of Arpad after a year's resistance. In Babylonia he took Sippara (Sepharvaim) and several places of less note in the northern portion of the country; but he does not seem to have penetrated far, or to have come into contact with Nabonassar, who reigned from B.C. 747 to 733 at Babylon. In Media and Upper Mesopotamia he obtained certain successes, but made no permanent conquests. It was on his western frontier only that his victories advanced the limits of the empire. Among the conquered cities appear to be reckoned Megiddo (Magidu) and Dor (Duru), both connected with Manasseh (Manatsuah). Before he left Syria, Tiglathpileser received submission, not only from Ahaz, but from the kings of the neighboring countries. He records his taking tribute from a king of Judah called Yahu-khazi-a name which might represent Jehoahaz; but, as shown by the chronology, it probably stands for Ahaz, whose name may have been changed by his Assyrian suzerain, as happened afterwards to Eliakim and Zedekiah (2Ki 23:34; 2Ki 24:17). The destruction of Damascus, the absorption of Syria, and the extension of Assyrian influence over Judaea are the chief events of Tiglath-pileser's reign, which seems to have had fewer external triumphs than those of most Assyrian monarchs. Probably his usurpation was not endured quite patiently, and domestic, troubles or dangers acted as a check upon his expeditions against foreign countries.  No palace or great building can be ascribed to this king. His slabs, which are tolerably numerous, show that he must have built or adorned a residence at Calah (? Nimrid), where they were found; but, as they were not discovered in situ, we cannot say anything of the edifice to which they originally belonged. They bear marks of wanton defacement; and it is plain that the later kings purposely injured them; for, not only is the writing often erased, but the slabs have been torn down, broken, and used as building materials by Esar-haddon in the great palace which he erected at Calah, the southern capital. The dynasty of Sargon was hostile to the first two princes of the Lower Kingdom, and the result of their hostility is that we have far less monumental knowledge of Shalmaneser and Tiglath-pileser than of various kings of the Upper Empire. SEE NINEVEH.

See Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 2, 127-132; Smith, Assyria from the Monuments, p. 77 sq. (Am. ed.); Journ. Sac. Lit. April, 1854, p. 253. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

## Tigre Version[[@Headword:Tigre Version]]

             Tigré is a language spoken throughout Eastern Abyssinia, from the eastern banks of the River Tacazze to the Shoho country, which separates Abyssinia from the Red Sea. Consequently, the Tigré is spoken throughout five degrees of latitude, beginning three days journey from the Red Sea, and by a population amounting to about three millions. The characters of the Tigré alphabet are, like the Amharic, of Ethiopic origin, and the Tigré language itself is more closely related to the Ethiopic than the Amharic or any other dialect of Abyssinia. The first attempt to translate the New Test. into that language was made by an Englishman named Nathaniel Pearce about the year 1819. He had acquired varied and extensive information by constant wanderings through various countries, and had resided for fourteen years in Abyssinia. He translated Mark and John; but as, owing to his restless habits, he had never acquired skill in forming the Ethiopic characters, he was obliged to write his translation in Roman characters. His MS. is in the possession of the British and Foreign Bible Society; it has never been published, and its comparative value is still unascertained. In 1831 part of Luke was translated by Mr. Kugler, a missionary of the Church Missionary Society; and after his death the work was continued by Mr. Isenberg, of the same society, who, at his death, in 1863, left a revised manuscript copy of the four gospels. This MS. having been put into the hands of the Rev. Dr. Krapf, the colleague of the deceased in Abyssinia, an  application was made at once to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society to have this translation printed. Dr. Krapf, who is well versed in the African languages, accompanied his application with a commendation of the character of Mr. Isenberg's translation. The committee consented to meet the expense of an edition of the four gospels, and thus for the first time a portion of the word of God was published in this vernacular in 1865. Since that time nothing further has been done towards completing the New Test. Bee Bible of Every Land, p. 60. (B. P.)

## Tigris[[@Headword:Tigris]]

             (Τίγρις; Vuig. Tygris, Tigris) is used in the Sept. as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew Chiddekel (חַדֶּקֶל) among the rivers of Eden (Gen 2:14), and is there described (so some render) as “running eastward to Assyria.” After this we hear no more of it, if we except one doubtful allusion in Nahum (Nah 2:6), until the Captivity, when it becomes well known to the prophet Daniel, who had to cross it in his journeys to and from Susa (Shushan). With Daniel it is “the Great River” הִנָּהָר הִגָּדוֹל— an expression commonly applied to the Euphrates; and by its side he sees some of his most important visions (Daniel 10-12). No other mention of the Tigris seems to occur except in the Apocryphal books, and there it is unconnected with any real history, as in Tobit (Tob 6:1), Judith (Jdt 1:6), and Ecclesiasticus (24, 25). The meaning and various forms of the word have been considered under HIDDEKEL SEE HIDDEKEL (q.v.). It only remains, therefore, in the present article, to describe more particularly the course, character, and historical relations of the stream.

1. The Tigris, like the Euphrates, rises from two principal sources. The most distant, and therefore the true, source is the western one, which is in lat. 38° 10', long. 39° 20'nearly, a little to the south of the high mountain lake called Goljik, or Golenjik, in the peninsula formed by the Euphrates, where it sweeps round between Palou and Telek. The Tigris's source is near the south-western angle of the lake, and cannot be more than two or three miles from the channel of the Euphrates. The course of the Tigris is somewhat north of east, but, after pursuing this direction for about twenty- five miles, it makes a sweep round to the south and descends by Arghani Maden upon Diarbekr. Here it is already a river of considerable size, and is crossed by a bridge of ten arches a little below that city (Niebuhr, Voyage en Arabie, p. 326). It then turns suddenly to the east and flows in this  direction past Osman Kieui to Til, where it once more alters its course and takes that south-easterly direction which it pursues, with certain slight variations, to its final junction with the Euphrates. At Osman Kieui it receives the second, or Eastern, Tigris which descends from Niphates (the modern Ala-Tagh) with a course almost due south, and, collecting on its way the waters of a large number of streams, unites with the Tigris half- way between Diarbekr and Til, in long. 41° nearly.

The courses of the two streams to the point of junction are respectively 150 and 100 miles. A little below the junction, and before any other tributary of importance is received, the Tigris is 150 yards wide and from three to four feet deep. Near Til, a large stream flows into it from the north-east, bringing almost as much water as the main channel ordinarily holds (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 49). This branch rises near Billi, in northern Kurdistan, and runs at first to the north-east, but presently sweeps round to the north and proceeds through the districts of Shattak and Boktan with a general westerly course, crossing and re-crossing the line of the 38th parallel, nearly to Sert, whence it flows south-west and south to Til. From Til the Tigris runs southward for 20 miles through a long, narrow, and deep gorge, at the end of which it emerges upon the comparatively low, but still hilly, country of Mesopotamia, near Jezireh. Through this it flows with a course which is south-southeast to Mosul, thence nearly south to Kileh- Sherghat, and again south-southeast to Samara, where the hills end and the river enters on the great alluvium.

The course is now more irregular. Between Samara and Baghdad a considerable bend is made to the east; and, after the Shat el-Hie is thrown off in lat. 32° 30', a second bend is made to the north, the regular southeasterly course being only resumed a little above the 32nd parallel, from which point the Tigris runs in a tolerably direct line to its junction with the Euphrates at Kurnah. The length of the whole stream, exclusive of, meanders, is reckoned at 1146 miles. It can be descended on rafts during the flood season from Diarbekr, which is only 150 miles from its source; and it has been navigated by steamers of small draught nearly up to Mosul. From Diarbekr to Samara the navigation is much impeded by rapids, rocks, and shallows, as well as by artificial bunds, or dams, which in ancient times were thrown across the stream, probably for purposes of irrigation. Below Samara there are no obstructions; the river is deep, with a bottom of soft mud, the stream moderate, and the course very meandering. The average width of the Tigris in this part of its course is 200 yards, while its depth is very considerable.  Besides the three head-streams of the Tigris which have already been described, the river receives, along its middle and lower course, no fewer than five important tributaries. These are, the river of Zakko, or Eastern Ktabfir, the Great Zab (Zab Ala), the Lesser Zab (Zab Asfal), the Adhem, and the Diyaleh, or ancient Gyndes. All these rivers flow from the high range of Zagros, which shuts in the Mesopotamian valley on the east, and is able to sustain so large a number-of great streams from its inexhaustible springs and abundant snows. From the west the Tigris obtains no tributary of the slightest importance, for the Tharthar, which is said to have once reached it, now ends in a salt lake a little below Tekrit. Its volume, however, is continually increasing as it descends in consequence of the great bulk of water brought into it from the east, particularly by the Great Zab and the Diyaleh; and in its lower course it is said to be a larger stream and to carry a greater body than the Euphrates (Chesney, Euphrates Expedition, 1, 62).

2. The Tigris, like the Euphrates, has a flood season. Early in the month of March, in consequence of the melting of the snows on the southern flank of Niphates, the river rises rapidly,. Its breadth gradually increases at Diarbekr from 100 or 120 to 250 yards. The stream is swift and turbid. The rise continues through March and April, reaching its full height generally in the first or second week of May. At this time the country about Baghdad is often extensively flooded, not, however, so much from the Tigris as from the overflow of the Euphrates, which is here poured into the eastern stream through a canal. Farther down the river, in the territory of the Beni-Lam Arabs, between the 32nd and 3ist parallels, there is a great annual inundation on both banks. About the middle of May the Tigris begins to fall, and by midsummer it has reached its natural level. In October and November there is another rise and fall in consequence of the autumnal rains; but, compared with the spring flood, that of autumn is insignificant.

The water of the Tigris, in its lower course, is yellowish, and is regarded as unwholesome. The stream abounds with fish of many kinds, which are often of a large size (see Tob 6:11, and comp. Strabo, 11:14, 8). Abundant water-fowl ‘float on the waters. The banks are fringed with palm-trees and pomegranates, or clothed with jungle and reeds, the haunt of the wild boar and the lion.

3. The Tigris, in its upper course, anciently ran through Armenia and Assyria. Lower down, from about the point where it enters on the alluvial  plain, it separated Babylonia from Susiana. In the wars between the Romans and the Parthians we find it constituting for a short time (from A.D. 114 to 117) the boundary line between these two empires. Otherwise it has scarcely been of any political importance. The great chain of Zagros is the main natural boundary between Western and Central Asia; and beyond this the next defensible line is the Euphrates. Historically it is found that either the central power pushes itself westward to that river, or the power ruling the west advances eastward to the mountain barrier.

The Tigris is at present better fitted for purposes of traffic than the Euphrates (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 475), but in ancient times it does not seem to have been much used as a line of trade. The Assyrians probably floated down it the timber, which they were in the habit of cutting in Amanus and Lebanon to be used for building purposes in their capital; but the general line of communication between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf was by the Euphrates. According to the historians of Alexander (Arrian, Exp. Alex. 7:7; comp. Strabo, 15:3, 4), the Persians purposely obstructed the navigation of the Lower Tigris by a series of dams which they threw across from bank to bank between the embouchure and the city of Opis, and such trade as there was along its course proceeded by land (Strabo, ibid.). It is probable that the dams were in reality made for another purpose, namely, to raise the level of the waters for the sake of irrigation; but they would undoubtedly have also the effect ascribed to them, unless in the spring flood-time, when they might have been shot by boats descending the river. Thus there may always have been a certain amount of traffic down the stream; but up it trade would scarcely have been practicable at any time farther than Samara or Tekrit, on account of the natural obstructions and of the great force of the stream. The lower part of the course was opened by Alexander (Arrian, 7:7); and Opis, near the mouth of the Diyaleh, became thenceforth known as a mart (ἐμπόριον), from which the neighboring districts drew the merchandise of India and Arabia (Strabo, 16:1, 9). Seleucia, too, which grew up soon after Alexander, derived, no doubt, a portion of its prosperity from the facilities for trade offered by this great stream.

4. The most important notices of the Tigris to be found in the classical writers are the following: Strabo, 11:14, 8, and 16:1, 9-13; Arrian, Exped. Alex. 7:7; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 6:27. See also Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Geog. s.v. Among modern writers may be mentioned Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 49-51,464476; Loftus, Chaldaea and Susiana, p. 3-8; Jones,  in, Transactions of the Geog. Soc. of Bombay, vol. 9; Lynch, in Journ. of Geog. Soc. vol. 9; Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1, 552, 553. SEE EUPHRATES.

## Tikkun Sopherim[[@Headword:Tikkun Sopherim]]

             (תיקון סופרים), or Emendations of the Scribes, refer to eighteen alterations which the scribes decreed should be introduced into the text,. in order to remove anthropomorphisms and other indelicate expressions. These eighteen emendations, or י ח מלין, are as follows, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible, Gen 18:22, where, for the original reading, עודני עמד לפני אברה ויהוה, “and Jehovah still stood before Abraham,” is now substituted, by the decree of the scribes =Tikkûn Sopherima, ואברהם עודנו עמד לפני יהוה, “and Abraham still stood before Jehovah,” because it appeared offensive to say that the Deity stood before Abraham.

2. Num 11:15, where Moses addresses God, “Kill me, I pray thee... that I may not see thy evil” (ברעתֶךָ), i.e. the punishment wherewith thou visitest Israel, is altered to “that I may not see my evil” (ברעתי), because it might seem as if evil were ascribed to the Deity.

3, 4. Num 12:12, where the original reading, “Let her not be as one dead who proceeded from the womb of our mother (אמנו), and half of our flesh (בשרנו) be consumed,” is changed to “Let her not be as one dead- born, which when it proceeds from the womb of its mother (אמו) has half of its flesh (בשרו) consumed.”

5. 1 Samuel 3, 13, where the original, “for his sons cursed God” (אלהים) — the Sept. has it still θεόν is altered to “for his sons cursed themselves” (להם), because it was too offensive to say that Eli's sons cursed God without being reprimanded by their father.

6. 2Sa 16:12,where “will God see with his eye” (בעיני) is made to read “will God look at my affliction” (בעוני). The Seventy probably read בעניי, for they translate ἐν τῇ ταπεινσώει μου.

7. 1Ki 12:16, where “to his God (לאלהיי), O Israel... and Israel went to their God” (לאלהיו)is given “to your tents (לאהלי)ִ... to their  tents” ( לאהליו), because the separation of Israel from the house of David was regarded as a necessary transition to idolatry; it was looked upon as leaving God and the sanctuary for the worship of idolatry in tents.

8. 2Ch 10:16 concerns the parallel passage, which is similarly altered for the same reason.

9. Jer 2:11, where “my glory” (כבודי) reads “their glory” (כבודו), because it was too offensive to say that God's glory was changed for an idol.

10. Eze 8:17,where “my nose” ( אפי) is changed into “their nose” (אפם);

11. Hos 4:7, where the same change is made as in Hos 9:12. Hab 1:12, where “thou diest not” ( לא תמות) is converted into “we shall not die” (לא נמות).

13. Zec 2:12, where “mine eye” ( עיני) is varied by his eye” (עינו), to avoid too gross an anthropomorphism.

14. Mal 1:13, where “you make me” (עיתי) is changed to “you make it” (אותי); reason as in 13.

15. Psa 106:20, where the same alteration is made as in 9 and 11.

16. Job 7:20, where “a burden to thee” (עלי)ִ is changed to” to myself” (עלי). That עליwִas the Original reading we see also from the Sept. εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ φορ τίον.

17. Job 32:3, where “they condemned God” (אלהי את) is altered to they “condemned Job” (את איוב).

18. Lam 3:19, where “and thy soul will mourn over me” (ותשיח עלי נִפְשֶךָ) reads “and my soul is humbled within me” (ותשוּח עלי נִפְשַי), because of the remark that God will mourn.

These eighteen decrees of the Sopherim are enumerated in the Massora Magna on Numbers 1, 1, and on Psa 106:20; they are also given in the book Ochlah ve-Ochath, p. 37, 113 (ed. Frensdorff, Hanover, 1864). The whole question on these Tikkûn Sopherim is discussed by Pinsker in  Kherem Chemed, 9:53 sq. (Berlin, 1856); Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, p. 308 sq. (Breslau, 1857); Wedell, De Emendationibus a Sopherim in Libris Sacris Veteris Testamenti Propositis (Vratislavise, 1869). SEE OCLAH. (B. P.)

## Tikvah[[@Headword:Tikvah]]

             (Heb. Tikvah', תַּקְוָה, a cord [as in Jos 2:18; Jos 2:21], or hope [as often]), the name of two Israelites.

1. (Sept. θεκκουέ v.r. θεκουάν; Vulg. Thecua.) The son of Harhas and father of Shallum, which last was the husband of the prophetess Huldah (2Ki 22:14). B.C. ante 632. He is elsewhere (2Ch 34:22) called TIKVATH SEE TIKVATH (q.v.).

2. (Sept. θεκουέ v.r. θέκωέ; Vulg. Thecue.) The father of Jahaziah, which latter was one of the “rulers” appointed to carry out the divorce of the Gentile wives after the Captivity (Ezr 10:15). B.C. 458.

## Tikvath[[@Headword:Tikvath]]

             (Heb. text Toka'hath, תּוֹקָהִת, marg. Tokhath', תָּקְהִת, assemblage [Gesen.], or firmness [Fürst]; Sept. θακουάθ v.r. θεκωέ and Καθουάλ; Vulg. Thecuath), the father of Shallum (2Ch 34:22); elsewhere (2Ki 22:14) called TIKVAH SEE TIKVAH (q.v.).

## Til[[@Headword:Til]]

             SEE VAN TIL.

## Tile[[@Headword:Tile]]

             (לְבֵנָה, lebenâh, so called from the whitish clay), a brick (Eze 4:1), as elsewhere rendered. SEE BRICK; SEE TILING. The above passage illustrates the use of baked clay for the delineation of figures and written characters among the ancient nations, especially the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Babylonians. Not only were ordinary building bricks stamped with the name of the founder of the edifice, as well as with other devices, but clay  (or stone) “cylinders,” as they are now called, covered with the most minute writing; were deposited in the corners of Assyrian and Babylonian buildings, giving the history of the kings who erected the palaces. SEE NINEVEH.

But the most striking illustration of the prophet's delineators is afforded by the recent discovery of whole libraries of Assyrian literature in the form of small inscribed tablets of clay, which contain writing and pictorial representations of the most interesting character. When the clay was in a soft, moist state, in its mould or frame, the characters were put upon it, perhaps in some instances by a stamp, but usually by means of a sharp-edged bronze style about a foot long, each character being traced separately by hand, as we use a pen. After the completion of the writing or pictures, the clay was baked, and such was the perfection of the manufacture that many of these articles have been preserved from decay for three thousand years. They vary in color, owing, as some suppose, to the varying length of time they were in the kiln, while others think that some coloring matter must have been mixed with the clay. They are bright brown, pale yellow pink, red, and a very dark tint nearly black. Usually the cylinders found are of a pale yellow, and the tablets a light red or pink. Some of them are unglazed, and others are coated with a hard white enamel. It is from these long-lost records that such details are in process of decipherment as are given in Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis, and other works of recent Assyriology.

## Tile, In Architecture[[@Headword:Tile, In Architecture]]

             is a thin plate of baked clay used to cover roofs. In England there are but two kinds of tiles in ordinary use, plain tiles and pan tiles. The former of these, which are by far the commonest, are perfectly flat, the latter are curved, so that when laid upon a roof each tile overlaps the edge of the next to it and protects the joint from the wet.

The Romans used flat tiles turned up at the edges, with a row of inverted, semi-cylindrical ones over the joint to keep out the wet. In the Middle Ages tiles were extensively employed in England for covering buildings, though they seem always to have been considered an. inferior material to lead. It does not appear that any but flat, plain tiles, with such others as  were requisite for the ridges, hips, and valleys, were used. The ridge-tiles, or crest, formerly also called roof-tiles, were sometimes made ornamental. It is not unusual to find the backs of fireplaces formed of tiles, and in such situations they are sometimes laid in herring bone courses, as in the great hall, Kenilworth: most of the fireplaces in Bodiam Castle, Sussex, are constructed in this manner, and the oven by the side of the larger fireplace in the hall is also built of tiles.

Glazed decorative tiles were anciently much used for paving sacred edifices. They are sometimes called Norman tiles, possibly from the supposition that they were originally made in Normandy; and, considering the age and variety of specimens that exist in Northern France; this idea may not be wholly erroneous. It is doubtful, however, whether any tiles have been discovered is England that present the features of the Norman style of architectural decoration, the most ancient being apparently of the 13th century. The name of encaustic has also been given to these tiles, and it would not be inappropriate were it not applied already to denote an antique process of art of a perfectly different nature; whereas a method wholly distinct, and peculiar to the glazed tiles of the Middle Ages, was commonly adopted in Northern Europe. The process of manufacture which, as it is supposed, was most commonly employed may be thus described: The thin squares of well-compacted clay having been fashioned, and probably dried in the sun to the requisite degree, their ordinary dimension being from four to six inches, with a thickness of one inch, a stamp which bore a design in relief was impressed upon them, so as to leave the ornamental pattern in cavetto. Into the hollows thus left on the face of the tile clay of another color, most commonly white, or pipe-clay, was then inlaid or impressed.

Nothing remained except to give a richer effect, and, at the same time, insure the permanence of the work by covering the whole in the furnace with a thin surface of metallic glaze, which, being of a slightly yellow color, tinged the white clay beneath it, and imparted to the red a more full and rich tone of color. In the success of this simple operation much depended upon this that the quality of the two kinds of clay that were used should be as nearly similar as possible, or else, if the white was liable to shrink in the furnace more than the red, the whole work would be full of cracks; in the other case, the design would bulge and be thrown upward imperfections, of which examples are not wanting. To  facilitate the equal drying of the tile, deep scorings or hollows were sometimes made on the reverse, and by this means, when laid in cement, the pavement was more firmly held together. Occasionally, either from the deficiency of white clay of good quality, or perhaps for the sake of variety, glazed tiles occur which have the design left hollow, and not filled in, according to the usual process, with clay of a different color. A careful examination, however, of the disposition of the ornament will frequently show that the original intention was to fill these cavities, as in other specimens; but instances also present themselves where the ornamental design evidently was intended to remain in relief, the field, and not the pattern, being found in cavetto. It must be observed that instances are very frequent where, the protecting glaze having been worn away, the white clay, which is of a less compact quality than the red, has fallen out and left the design hollow, so that an impression or rubbing may readily be taken. It appears probable that the origin of the fabrication of decorative pavements by the process which has been described is to be sought in the medieval imitations of the Roman mosaic-work by means of colored substances inlaid upon stone or marble. Of this kind of marquetry in stone, few examples have escaped the injuries of time; specimens may be seen on the eastern side of the altar-screen in Canterbury Cathedral, and at the abbey church of St. Denis and the cathedral of St. Omer.

Among the earliest specimens of glazed tiles may be mentioned the pavement discovered in the ruined priory church at Castle Acre, Norfolk, a portion of which is in the British Museum. These tiles are ornamented with escutcheons of arms, and on some appears the name “Thomas:” they are coarsely executed, the cavities are left and not filled in with any clay of different color.

A profusion of good examples still exists of single tiles, and sets of four, nine, sixteen, or a greater number of tiles, forming by their combination a complete design, and presenting, for the most part the characteristic style of ornament which was in vogue at each successive period, but examples  of general arrangement are very rare and imperfect. To this deficiency of authorities it seems to be due that modern imitations of these ancient pavements have generally proved unsatisfactory in the resemblance, which they present to oil-cloth or carpeting; and the intention of producing richness of effect by carrying the ornamental design throughout the pavement without any intervening spaces has been wholly frustrated. Sufficient care has not been given to ascertain the ancient system of arrangement: it is, however, certain that a large proportion of plain tiles, black, white, or red, were introduced, and served to divide the various portions which composed the general design.

Plain diagonal bands, for instance, arranged fret wise intervened between the compartments, or panels, of tiles ornamented with designs; the plain and the decorated quarries were laid alternately, or in some instances longitudinal bands were introduced in order to break that continuity of ornament which, being uniformly spread over a large surface, as in some modern pavements, produces a confused rather than a rich effect. It has been supposed, with much probability, that the more elaborate pavements were reserved for the decoration of the choir, the chancel, or immediate vicinity of an altar, while in the aisles or other parts of the church more simple pavements of plain tiles, black, white, or red, were usually employed. It may also deserve notice that in almost every instance when the ornamented tiles have been accidentally discovered or dug up on the site of a castle or mansion there has been reason to suppose a consecrated fabric had there existed, or that the tiles had belonged to that portion of the structure which had been devoted to religious services. We often meet with the item “Flanders tiles” in building-accounts of castles, but these were for the fireplace only. The lower rooms were usually “earthed,” the upper rooms boarded. Parker, Gloss. of Architect. s.v.

Most of the tiles in England were made in the county of Worcester. Examples may be found in almost every parish church. Occasionally the patterns were alternately raised and sunk, so that the surface of the tiles was irregular. Examples of this sort were found at St. Alban's Abbey, and have been recently reproduced, and laid before the high-altar. From the 13th century to the 16th encaustic tiles were commonly used for the floors of churches and religious houses. Tiles have been used for wall-decoration, and for the adornment of tombs on the Continent; and this custom has  likewise been restored in England. Since the manufacture of tiles has been carried out so efficiently in Worcestershire, their use has been common for all restored churches in that county. Modern specimens in some cases are remarkably fine, though sometimes wanting in that grace and character which were so remarkable in the old examples. —Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. Terams s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archceöl. s.v.

## Tilenus, Daniel[[@Headword:Tilenus, Daniel]]

             a learned French divine, was born at Goldberg, in Silesia, Feb. 4, 1563, and, going to France -about 1590, was naturalized by Henry IV. First distinguishing himself as an opponent of the tenets of Arminianism, he afterwards enlisted on the side of the Remonstrants. His principal controversy was with Peter Du Moulin, which was carried on with so much zeal that their friends, among whom was James I of England, interposed to reconcile them. Tilenushad, before this, been appointed by Marechal de Bouillon professor at the College of Sedan, but, about 1619 or 1620, was obliged to resign on account of his sentiments. He removed to Paris, where he lived on his property. He afterwards had a personal controversy with John Cameron, divinity professor at Saumur, concerning grace and free-will, which lasted five days. An account of this was published under the title of Collatio inter Tilenum et Cameronem, etc. Some time after, Tilenus addressed a letter to the Scotch nation, disapproving of the Presbyterian and commending the Episcopal form of the Reformed Church as established in England. This greatly pleased king James, who invited Tilenus to England, and offered him a pension. Tilenus accepted the offer, and returned to France in order to set-tie his affairs, but, becoming obnoxious to the people of Great Britain, he never returned. He died in Paris, Aug. 1, 1633. His latter days were spent in -defending the Reformed Church of France, and he wrote several books, the titles of which are given in Brandt's Hist. of the Reformation and Quick's Synodicon. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tilgath-pilneser[[@Headword:Tilgath-pilneser]]

             (1Ch 5:6; 1Ch 5:26; 2Ch 28:20). SEE TIGLATH-PILESER.

## Tiling[[@Headword:Tiling]]

             (κέραμος, pottery-ware, hence a roof-tile; zomp. Xenoph. Mem. 3, 1. 7). The rendering of the V. at Luk 5:19, “through the tiling” (διὰ τῶν κε ράμων), occasions difficulty when we remember that houses in Palestine are not covered with tiles, as they frequently are in Asia Minor and in Western countries. Hence many have suggested that Luke, being a native probably of Antioch, used the word “tile” in the general sense of roof- material (Eusebius; Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 4; Jerome, Prol. to Com. on St. Matthew, Mat 7:4; Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 1. 367). As to the particular part or substance thus “broken up,” most interpreters have thought that it was the layer of sticks, brush, and hard-rolled clay which constitutes the ordinary flat roof Kof an Oriental house (Aruindell, Tray. in Asia Minor, 1, 1171; Russell, Aleppo, 1, 35), which Dr. Thomson says he has often seen thus removed for letting down grain, straw, or other articles (Land and Book, 2, 7). But this “operation would have raised an intolerable dust, such as to drive the audience entirely away. Some suppose, therefore, that it was merely the scuttle through which \*the paralytic was lowered (Lightfoot, Horae Hebraicae, lad loc.), an explanation that scarcely meets the terms of the narrative. It probably was the awning (Shaw, Travels, p. 211) or rather board or leafy screen over the gallery or interior veranda (Kitto, Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.), which was easily removed and as easily replaced. SEE HOUSE.

## Tillage[[@Headword:Tillage]]

             (prop. עִבִוֹדָה, abodah, 1Ch 27:26; Neh 10:37, work, i.e. “service” or “bondage,” as elsewhere rendered; so occasionally עָבִד, to “till,” “tilleth,” “tiller,” etc., lit. worker; but ניר, nir, Pro 13:23, means fallow ground, as elsewhere rendered). SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Tillemont, Louis Sebastien Le Nain de[[@Headword:Tillemont, Louis Sebastien Le Nain de]]

             a French divine and scholar, was born in Paris, Nov. 30, 1637, and at the age of ten years entered the famous seminary of Port-Royal. He soon manifested great proficiency in the study of history, and at the age of eighteen began to read the fathers, the lives of the apostles, and their successors in the primitive Church, and drew up for himself an account of early ecclesiastical history, an the manner of Usher's Annals. When twenty- three, he entered the Episcopal seminary at Beauvais, where he remained  three or four years, and then went to reside with Godefroi Hermant, a canon of the Cathedral of Beauvais, with whom he remained five or six years he then returned to Paris, and, after receiving the other orders of the Church, was ordained priest in 1676, and settled at Tillemont, whence he took his name. About this time he was employed, along with M. de Sacy, on a Life of St. Louis, and two years after traveled in Flanders and Holland. Returning, he continued his studies, and in 1690 began to publish his History of the Emperors. To a complete knowledge of ecclesiastical history he joined an exemplary humility and regularity of conduct; and, regardless of dignities, wished for nothing but retirement. The practicing of watchings and austerities brought upon him a disease, of which he died Jan. 10, 1698. He published, Lives of the Emperors (1690-1701, 5 vols. 4to ): —M1emoires pour servir al'Histoire Ecclesiastique des six premiers Sicles, etc. (1693, 16 vols. 4to): —and supplied materials for several works published by others: Life of St. Louis, begun by De Sacy and finished and published by La Chaise; Lives of St. Athanasius and St. Basil, Toby G. Hermant; Lives of Tertullian and Origen, by Forse, under the name of La Mothe He left in MS. a Memoir concerning William de Saint- Amour, and the Disputes between the Dominicans and the University : — Lie of Isabella, sister of St. Louis: —Remarks on the Breviavries of Mans and Paris : —A Legend for the Breviary of Evreux: —and History of the Sicilian Kings of Anjou.

## Tillemont, Pierre Le Nain de[[@Headword:Tillemont, Pierre Le Nain de]]

             brother of the preceding, was born in Paris, March 25, 1640. Having chosen the ecclesiastical profession, he entered at St. Victor, Paris; but retired to La Trappe in 1668, being enamored with the austerities of that order. ‘He was for a long time subprior, and died there in 1713. His works are, Essai de l'Histoir de l'Ordre de Citeauz (9 vols. 12mo): Homilies sur Jeremie (2 vols. 8vo), a French translation of St. Dorotheus: —Relation de la Vie et de la Mort de Plusieurs Religieux de la Trappe (6 vols. 12mo), etc.

## Tillet, Jean du[[@Headword:Tillet, Jean du]]

             a French prelate, was born in Paris about the beginning of the 16th century; and by the influence of his brother, the earl of Brussiere (himself a learned historiographer), he became prothonotary of the cardinal of Lorraine, who rewarded him with the bishopric of Saint-Brieuc in 1553. The following  year he exchanged this see for that of Meaux. He died at Paris, Nov. 19, 1570. He was the author of many works on French Church history, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tillinghast, Nicholas Power[[@Headword:Tillinghast, Nicholas Power]]

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born in Providence, R. I., March 3, 1817. He was fitted for college chiefly by Mr. (afterwards Prof.) G. W. Keely, of Waterville College, and was graduated from Brown University in the class of 1837. On leaving college, he went to Society Hill, S. C., where he spent two years in superintending the education of a nephew (1837-39). The next three years (1839-42), he pursued his theological studies at the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va., and was ordained deacon and presbyter in the same year (1842) by bishop Meade, and became assistant minister of the Monumental Church, in Richmond, Va. He remained here but a short time, being called to the rectorship of the Episcopal Church at Society Hill, where he continued his most acceptable services for two years. Failing health led him to resign, and he went abroad, spending eighteen months in Europe. After his return, he did not settle for two or three years, but supplied pulpits in Washington, Marblehead (Mass.), and in Philadelphia, and in 1848 became rector of St. John's Church, in Georgetown, D. C., where he had a happy and useful ministry for nearly twenty years (1848- 67). A severe injury which he sustained in Groton, Conn., which made necessary the amputation of a limb, so affected his health that he was unable again to settle as a minister, although he officiated as a temporary supply as occasion offered. In the seclusion of his study he spent much time engaged in congenial studies. He made a translation of a large part of Cicero's De Officiis, and also translated from the German some things in which he was interested. He died near Philadelphia, Aug. 7, 1869. (J. C.S.)

## Tillotson, John[[@Headword:Tillotson, John]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was born at Sowerby, Yorkshire, in October, 1630. He entered Clare Hall, Cambridge, April 23, 1647, and, graduating in 1650, was made a fellow in 1651. He left college in 1656, and became tutor to the son of Edmund Prideaux, Cromwell's attorney-general. Receiving his first impression among the Puritans, he was led to conformity by the works of Chillingworth and the influence of scholars with whom he had become intimate. He submitted to the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and became curate of Cheshunt, in Hertfordshire. He was chosen (Dec. 16)  minister of St. Mary's, Aldermanbury; but, declining this, was presented, in June, 1663, to the rectory of Kiddington, Suffolk. His residence there was short, he being made preacher of the Society of Lincoln's Inn on-the 26th of the same month. In 1664 he was appointed Tuesday lecturer at St. Lawrence's, in the Jewry, and was now recognized as a distinguished preacher. He received his degree of D.D. in 1666, and in 1668 preached the sermon at the consecration of Wilkins to the bishopric of Chester. In 1670 he was made a prebendary of Canterbury, in 1672 was advanced to a deanery of that Church, and in 1673 was preferred to a prebend in the Church of St. Paul. When a declaration of liberty of conscience was published in 1672, with a view to indulge the papists, Tillotson and the clergy were directed by their bishops to preach against popery; and when archbishop Sheldon advised with the clergy as to what reply he should make to the king if his majesty should disapprove their course, Dr. Tillotson suggested this answer: “Since his majesty professed the Protestant religion, it would be a thing without precedent that he should forbid his clergy preaching in defense of it.” On April 2, 1680, he preached before the king, at Whitehall, a sermon on Jos 24:15, in which he expressed a sentiment of intolerance that exposed him to heavy censure. He was afterwards admitted into a high degree of confidence with king William and queen Mary; was appointed clerk of the closet to the king, March 27, 1689; and was authorized, in August, by the chapter of his cathedral, to exercise archiepiscopal jurisdiction over the province of Canterbury, Sancroft having been suspended for refusing the new oath. His ambition had never extended further than to desire the exchange of his deanery of Canterbury for that of St. Paul's, which was granted him in September. The king, however, nominated him to the archbishopric of Canterbury, April 23, 1691, and he was consecrated (May 31) in Bow Church, The rest of his life was spent in laboring for the good of the Church and the reformation of all abuses among the clergy. He died Nov. 24, 1694. He published, The Rule of Faith (1666, 8vo), and several volumes of Sermons. A collective edition of his works, 254 Sermons, Rule of Faith, and Prayers, composed for his use, etc., was published in 1707 (3 vols. fol.). There have been later editions both of his complete works and of selections there from. His Works, with Life by Thomas Birch, D.D., were published by Ravenet (1752, 3 vols. fol.). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tilon[[@Headword:Tilon]]

             (Heb. marg. Tilon', תַּילוֹן; text, Tulon', תּוּלוֹן, gift [Simonis] or scorn [Gesenius]; Sept. θιλών v.r. Ι᾿νάν; Vulg. Thiilon), the last named of the four sons of Shimon, a descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:20). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

## Tilton, Albert Freeman[[@Headword:Tilton, Albert Freeman]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Deerfield, N. H., Oct. 15, 1809. He was a graduate of Water Tille College in the class of 1835. He taught the next two years, first, in Townshend, Vt., where he was the principal of an academy in that place, and then in Boone County, Ky. For four years- (183741) he was the principal of a Baptist institution in Franklin, Ind., which became Franklin College in 1844. In 1841 he was ordained as an evangelist at Franklin, and preached in two or three places in Indiana. He was pastor of the Baptist Church in West Waterville for two years (1844- 46), and for the next three years he supplied two or three churches. In 1849 he returned to Franklin, Ind., where he died Sept. 26, 1850. (J. C. S.)

## Tilton, David[[@Headword:Tilton, David]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Gilmanton, N. H., July 6,1806. He studied theology one year in private, and one year at the Andover Theological Seminary, and was ordained, Oct. 14, 1855, over the Congregational Church in Edgartown (Martha's Vineyard), Mass., where he remained three years. ‘He was installed, Aug. 12, 1840, pastor of the Congregational Church in Lanesville, Gloucester, Mass., but in the spring of 1850 he removed to North Chelsea, Mass., and was employed as a canvassing agent for the (Congregationalist, and for various publishing houses. In 1862 he removed to Woburn, Mass., where he died, Feb. 10,1869. See Obituary Record, Yale College, 1869.

## Tilton, Nathan[[@Headword:Tilton, Nathan]]

             a Unitarian minister, was a graduate of Harvard College in 1796. He was ordained as pastor of the Church in Scarborough, Me., December, 1800, and died in 1851. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 8:209.

## Timaeus[[@Headword:Timaeus]]

             (Τιμαῖος), father of the blind beggar cured by Christ (Mar 10:46), the son being thence called Bartimaeus (q.v.). B.C. ante 29.

## Timann (or Tidemann), Johann[[@Headword:Timann (or Tidemann), Johann]]

             the reformer of Bremen, was born at. Amsterdam about the year 1500. In 1522 he went to Wittenberg, where he made the acquaintance of Luther and Melanchthon. In 1524 he went to Bremen, and was appointed pastor of St. Martin's. He now introduced those reformatory changes which have immortalized his name. In 1529 count Enno II, of East Frisia, called him to Emden to work there against the Anabaptists. In 1533 the city council adopted a church order, which was, no doubt, prepared by Timann, and was approved by Luther and Burgenhagen. Timan was also present at the colloquy in Worms, and at the meetings held at Ratisbon in 1541. He died February 17, 1557, at Nienburg. See Rotermund, Lexikon alle Gelehrten in Bremen, 2:216 sq. (where a list of Timann's writings is given); Plitt- Herzog, Real Encyklop s.v. (B.P.)

## Timberlake, John W[[@Headword:Timberlake, John W]]

             a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was transferred from the Tennessee to the Florida Conference in 1857, and was sent to Jacksonville; in 1858-59 to Tampa; in 1860 to Fernandina. In 1861 he was appointed Sunday-school agent; but, on the breaking out of the war, he was appointed chaplain to the Second Florida Regiment, in, which capacity he labored till his death, at West Point, Va., March 3,1862. See Minutes of Annual Conference of the M. E. Church, South, 1862, p. 410.

## Timbrel[[@Headword:Timbrel]]

             (תֹּ, t6ph, Exo 15:20; Jdg 11:34; 2Sa 6:5; 1Ch 13:8; Job 21:12; Psa 81:2; Psa 149:3; Psa 150:4; elsewhere rendered “tabret;” also. the cognate verb תָּפִ, taphâph, Psa 68:25; rendered “tabor,” Neh 2:7; τύμπανον, Judtih 3:7) The Heb. word is an imitative one occurring in many languages rot immediately connected with each other. It is the same as the Arabic and Persian duf, which in the Spanish becomes adufe, a tambourine. The root, which signifies to beat or strike, is found in the Greek τύπανον or τύμπανον, Lat. tympanum, Ital. tamburo, Span. tambor, Fr. tambour, Proverbs tabor, Engl. tabor, tabouret, timbrel, tambourine, A. S. dubban, to strike, Engli tap, and many others. It is usual for etymologists to quote likewise the Arab. tunbur as the original of tambour and tabor; but, unfortunately, the tunbur is a guitar, and not a drum (Russell, Aleppo [2nd ed.], 1, 152). The parallel Arabic word is tabl, which denotes a kind of drum, and is the same with the Rabb. Heb. tabla and (Span. atabal, a-kettle-drum. The instrument and the word may have come to us through the Saracens. In old English tabor was used for any drum. Thus Robof Gloucester (ed. Hearne, 1810), p. 396:

“Vor of trompes and of tabors the Saracens made there So gret noise that Cristenmen al disturbed were.”

In Shakespeare's time it seems to have become an instrument of peace, and is thus contrasted with the drum: “I have known when there was no music with him but the drum and fife; and now had he rather hear the tabor and the pipe” (Much Ado about Nothing, Acts 2 scene 3) Tabouret and tabourine are diminutives of tabor, and denote the instrument now known as the tambourine:

“Or Minoe's whistling to his tabouret,

Selling a laughter for a cold meal's meat”

 (Hall, Sat. 4:1, 78).

Tabret is a contraction of tabouret. The word is retained in the A.V. from Coverdale's translation in all passages except Isa 30:32, where it is omitted in Coverdale, and Eze 28:13, where it is rendered “beauty.”

Thee Heb. toph is undoubtedly the instrument de-scribed by travelers as the dufor dif of the Arabs. It was used in very early times by the Syrians of Padanaram at their merry-makings (Gen 31:27). It was played principally by women (Exo 15:20; Jdg 11:34; 1Sa 18:6; Psa 68:25 [26]) as an accompaniment to the song and dance (comp. ud. 3, 7), and. appears to have been worn by them as an ornament: (Jer 31:4). The toph was one of the instruments, played by the young prophets whom Saul met on his return from Samuel (1Sa 10:5), and by the Levites in the Temple-band (2Sa 6:5; 1Ch 13:8). It; accompanied the merriment of feasts (Isaiah 5:12; 24,. 8), and the joy of triumphal processions (Jdg 11:34;. 1Sa 18:6), when the women came out to meet the warriors returning from victory, and is everywhere a sign of happiness and peace (Job 21:12; Isa 30:32;. Jer 31:4). So in the grand triumphal entry of God into his Temple, described in strong figures in Psalms 18, the procession is made up by the singers who marched in front, and the players on stringed instruments who brought up the rear, while on either side danced the young maidens with their timbrels (Psa 18:25 [26]).

The passage of Eze 28:13, is obscure, and appears to have been early corrupted. Instead of תֻּפֶּיךָ, “thy tabrets,” the Vulg. and Targ. Read יָפְיֹךָ, “‘thy beauty,” which is the rendering adopted in Coverdale's and Cranmer's Bible. The Sept. seems to have read תּוֹכְךָ, as in Eze 28:16. If the  ordinary text be adopted, there is no reason for taking toph,; as Jerome suggests, in the sense of the setting of a gem, “pala qua gemma continetur.” SEE TABRET.

The tympanum was used in the feasts of Cybele (Herod. 4. 76) and is said to have been the invention of Dionysus and Rhea (Eurip. Bacch. 59). It was played by women, who beat it with the palms of their hands (Ovid, Met. 4:29), and Juvenal (Sat. 3, 64) attributes to it a Syrian origin:

“Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes Et linguam, et mores et cum tibicine chordas Obliquas, necnon gentilia tynpana secum Vexit.”

In the same way the tabor is said to have been introduced into Europe by the Crusaders, who adopted it from the Saracens, to whom it was peculiar (see Du Cange's note on De Joinville's Hist. du Roi Saint Louis, 61).

The author of Shilte Haggibborim (c. 2) gives the Greek κύμβαλον as the equivalent of toph, and says it was a hollow basin of metal, beaten with a stick of brass or iron.

The dif of the Arabs is described by Russell (Aleppo if st ed.], p. 94) as a hoop (sometimes with pieces of brass fixed in it to make a jingling) over which a piece of parchment is distended. It is beaten with the fingers, and is the true tympanum of the ancients, as appears from its figure in several relievos, representing the orgies of Bacchus and rites of Cybele.” The same instrument was used by the Egyptian dancing-women whom Hasselquist saw (Travels [ed. 1766], p. 59). In Barbary it is called tar, and “is made like a sieve, consisting (as Isidore [Orig. 3, 31] ‘describes the tympanum) of a rim or thin hoop of wood with a skin of parchment stretched over the top of it. This serves for the bass in all their concerts, which they accordingly touch very artfully with their fingers, or with the knuckles or (palms of their hands, as the time and measure require, or as force and softness are to be communicated to the several parts of the performance” (Shaw, Travels, p. 202). SEE MUSICAL, INSTRUMENTS.

## Time[[@Headword:Time]]

             (the proper and usual rendering of עֵת, eth [later זְמָן, zemdna]. a general word, Gr. χρόνος, space of duration; while מוֹעֵד, moed, Katpoe, signifies a fixed time, either by human or divine appointment, or the natural  seasons). A peculiar use of the term occurs in the phrase “a time, times, and a half” (Heb. וְחֵצַי מוֹעֵד מוֹעֲדַים, Dan 12:7; Chald. וּפְלִג

עֵדָּן וְעַדָּנַין, 7:25; Gr. καιρὸς καὶ καιροὶ καὶ ἣμισυ, Rev 12:14), in the conventional sense of three years and a half (see Josephus, War, 1, 1). The following are the regular divisions of time among the Hebrews, each of which invariably preserves its strict literal sense, except where explicitly modified by the immediate context. We here treat them severally but together, in the order of their extension, and refer to the several articles for more detailed information. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

1. Year ( שָׁנָה, so called from the change of the seasons). The years of the Israelites, like those of the modern Jews, were lunar (Rabbinical שְׁנֵי הִלַּבֵנָה), of 354 d. 8 h. 48 min. 38 sec., consisting of twelve (unequal) lunar months; and as this falls short of the true year (an astronomical month having 29 d. 12 h. 44 min. 2.84 sec.), they were obliged, in order to preserve the regularity of harvest and vintage (Exo 23:16), to add a month occasionally, so as to make it on the average coincide with the solar year (Rabbinical שְנִת הִחִמָּה), which has 365 d. 5 h. 48 min. 45 sec. The method of doing this among the very ancient Hebrews is entirely unknown (see a conjecture in Ideler, Chronol. 1, 490; another in Credner, Joel, p. 218). The Talmudists find mention of an intercalation under Hezekiah (2Ch 30:2; see Mishna, Pesach. 4:9), but without foundation (see, however, on the reconcilement of the lunar with the solar year, Galen, Comment. 1, in Hippoc. Epidem. [Opp. ed. Kihn. 13:23]). Among the later Jews (who called an intercalated year שנה מעיברת, in distinction from a common year, or שנה משוטה), an intercalary month was inserted after Adar, and was hence called Vedar (ואדר), or second Adar (אדר שני) (Mishna, Eduyoth, 7:7; see the distinctions of the Gemarists in Reland, Antiq. Sacr. 4:1; comp. Ben David, Zur Berechn. u. Gesch. d. jüd. Kalend. [Berl. 1817]; Ideler, ut sup. p. 537 sq.; Anger, De Temp. in Act. Ap. Ratione, 1, 31 sq.). The intercalation (עיבור) was regularly decreed by the Sanhedrim, which observed the rule never to add a month to the sabbatical year. It usually was obliged to intercalate every third year, but occasionally had to do so in two consecutive years.

The Israelitish year began, as the usual enumeration of the months shows (Lev 23:34; Lev 25:9; Num 9:11; 2Ki 25:8; Jer 39:2; comp. 1Ma 4:52; 1Ma 10:21), with Abib or Nisan (see Est 3:7),  subsequent to and in accordance with the Mosaic arrangement (Exo 12:2),'which had a retrospective reference to the departure out of Egypt (9, 31; see Baihr, Symbolik, 2, 639). Yet as we constantly find this arrangement spoken of as a festal calendar, most Rabbinical and many Christian scholars understand that the civil year began, as with the modern Jews, with Tisri (October), but the ecclesiastical year with Nisan (Mishna, Rosh Hash-shanah, 1, 1; comp. Josephus, Ant. 1, 3,3. See also Rosenmüller, on Exo 12:2; Hitzig, Jesa. p. 335; Seyffarth, Chronol. Sacra, p. 34 sq.). But this distinction is probably a post-exilian reckoning (Havernick argues against its inference from Eze 40:1), which was an accommodation to the time of the arrival of returned exiles in Palestine (Ezr 3:1 sq.; Neh 7:73; Neh 8:1 sq.), and later fell into harmony with the Seleucid era, which dated from October (see Benfey, Monats-nam. p. 217; and comp. 1Ma 4:52; 1Ma 10:21; 2Ma 15:37). Yet this has little countenance from the enactment of the festival of the seventh new moon (Lev 23:24; Num 29:1-6), which has in the Mosaic legislation certainly a different import from the Rabbinical ordinance (see Vriemoet, Observ. Misc. p. 284 sq.; Gerdes, De Festo Clangoris [Duisb. 1700; also in his Exercit. Acad.]). SEE NEW MOON. Nor does the expression “in the end of the year” (בְּצֵאֹת הִשָּׁנָה), with reference to the Feast of Tabernacles (Exo 23:16), favor this assumption (see Ideler, p. 493). Other passages adduced (Job 29:4; Joe 2:25), as well as the custom of many other nations (Credner, ut sup. p. 209 sq.), are a very precarious argument. Nevertheless, it is clear that even in the pre-exilian period of the theocracy, the autumn, as being the close of the year's labor, was often regarded among the agrarian population as a. terminal date (Ideler, Chronol. 1, 493 sq.; see Dresde, Annus Jud. ex Antiq. Illust. [Lips. 1766; merely Rabbinic]; Selden, De Anno Civili Vett. Hebr. [Lond. 1644; also in Ugolino, Thesaur. 17] Nagel, De Calendario Vett. Ebr... [Altdorf, 1746]). Seyffarth maintains that even prior to the destruction of Jerusalem the Israelites reckoned by lunar months (Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch. 2, 344 sq.). The prevailing belief, however, that they had from the first such a year has been of late combated by Bottcher (Prob. alttest. Schrifterkldr. p. 283; De Inferis, 1, 125) and Credner (Joel, p. 210 sq.), and most stoutly by Seyffarth (Chronol. Sacra, p. 26 sq.). Credner holds that the Israelites originally had a solar year of thirty-day months, and that this was exchanged for the lunar year when the three great festivals were accurately determined, i.e. about the time of king Hezekiah and Josiah (on the contrary, see Von Bohlen, Genes. p. 105 sq.; Benfey and Stern, Ueber  die Monatsnamen, p. 5 sq.). Seyffarth, however, ascribes the solar year to the Jews down to about 200 B.C.

A well-defined and universal era was unknown among the ancient Hebrews. National events are sometimes dated from the departure out of Egypt (Exo 19:1; Num 33:38; 1Ki 6:1), usually from the accession of the kings (as in Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah), later from the beginning of the exile (Eze 33:21; Eze 40:1). Jeremiah reckons the Captivity according to the years of Nebuchadnezzar (Eze 25:1 sq.), but Ezekiel (Eze 1:1) otherwise. The post-exilian books date according to the regal years of the Persian masters of Palestine (Ezra 1Ma 4:26; 1Ma 6:15; 1Ma 7:7 sq.; Neh 2:1; Neh 5:4; Neh 13:6; Hag 1:1; Hag 2:11; Zec 7:1). But as Syrian vassals the Jews adopted the Greek (1Ma 1:10) or Seleucid era ( מַנַיִן שְׁטָרוֹת, cera contractum, since it was used in contracts generally, Arab. karyakh ahu-ikerfin), which dated from the overthrow of Babylon by Seleucus Nicator I (Olymp. 117, 1), and began with the autumn of B.C. 312 (see Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. 1, 448). This reckoning is employed in the books of the Maccabees, which, however, singularly differ by one year between themselves, the second book being about one year behind the first in its dates (comp. 1Ma 6:16 with 2Ma 11:21; 1Ma 6:20 with 2Ma 13:1); from which it would seem that the author of 2 Macc. had a different epoch for the ser. Seleuc. from the author of 1 Macc., with the latter of whom Josephus agrees in his chronology. Inasmuch as 1 Macc. always counts by Jewish months in the Seleucid sera (1Ma 1:57; 1Ma 4:52; 1Ma 4:59; 1Ma 7:43; 1Ma 14:27; 1Ma 16:14), and these are computed from Nisan (1Ma 10:21; 1Ma 16:14)-the second book likewise counts by Jewish months (1Ma 1:18; 1Ma 10:5; 1Ma 15:37 : on the contrary 1Ma 11:21)we might suppose that the former begins the Seleucid sera with the spring of B.C. 312, while the latter begins it with the autumn of the same year (Petav. Raionar. 10:45; Prideaux, 2, 267, etc.), a conclusion to which other circumstances likewise point (Ideler, ut sup. p. 531 sq.; Wieseler, Chronol. Synopsis, p. 451 sq.). What Wernsdorf objects'(De Fide Maccab. p. 19 sq.) is not of much importance; but we cannot thence infer that the Babylonians began the Seleucid sera with the autumn of 3) 1 (Seyffarth, Chronol. Sacra, p. 20). See Hosmann, De AEra Seleucid. et Regum Syriae Successione (Kil. 1752). Still another national reckoning is given in 1Ma 13:41 sq., namely, from the year of the deliverance of-the Jews from the Syrian yoke, i.e. seventeen era Seleuc., or from the autumn of B.C. 143 (Josephus, Ant. 13:6, 6), and this era appears upon Samaritan coins  (Eckhel, Doctrina Numor. Vett. I, 3, 463 sq.). On other Jewish eras see the Mishna (Götting, 8:5). SEE YEAR.

2. — Month (חֹדַשׁ, lit. new, sc. moon; seldom and more Aramaic יָרֵחִ, the moon). The months of the Hebrews, as stated above, were lunar (as appears from the foregoing names), and began from the new moon as ocularly observed (the [synodic] lunar month has 26 d. 12 h. 44 min. 3 [strictly 2.82] sec. [Ideler, Chronol. 1, 43]). This is certain from the post- exilian period (Mishna, Rosh Hash-shanah, 1, 5 sq.), but for pre-exilian times various conjectures have been hazarded (see above). The length of the lunar month in the later period depended upon the day when the appearance of the new moon was announced by the Sanhedrim (see a similar reckoning in Macrob. Sat. 1, 15, p. 273 ed. Bip.), which thus made the month either twenty-nine days (חֹדֵשׂ חָסֵר, i.e. short) or thirty days (חֹדֶשׁ מָלֵא, i.e. full), according as the day was included in the following or the preceding month. The general rule was that in one year not less than four nor more than eight full months could occur (Mishna, Arach. 2, 2). The final adjustment of the lunar to the solar year was by intercalation (עיבור), so that whenever in the last month, Adar, it became evident that the Passover, which must be held in the following month, Nisan, would occur before harvest, i.e. not at the time when the sun would be in Aries (Josephus, Ant. 3, 10, 5), an entire month (Vadar) was interjected between Adar and Nisan, constituting an intercalary year (שׁנה מעוברת, which, however, according to the Gemara, did not take place in a sabbatic year, but always in that which preceded it; nor in two successive years, nor yet more than three years apart). See Anger, De Teps. in Act. Ap. Ratione, p.30 sq.

Prior to the exile the individual months were usually designated by numbers (the twelfth month occurs in 2Ki 25:27, Jer 52:31; Eze 29:1; comp. 1Ki 4:7); yet we find also the following names: Earn-month (חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבַיב, Exo 13:4; Exo 23:15; Deu 16:1, etc.), corresponding to the later Nisan; Bloom- month ( זַו [or זַיו] חֹדֶשׁ, 1Ki 6:1; 1Ki 6:37), the second month; Rain- month (יֶרִח בּוּל, 1Ki 6:38), the eighth (connected by Benfey, p. 182, with the word בִּעִל בֵּל; see the Talmudic interpretation cited by him, p. 16); Freshet-month ( יֶרִח הָאֲתָנַים, 8:2), the seventh; all of which seem to be mere appellatives (see. Benfey and Stern, Ueber die Monatsnamen einiger  alten Vilker [Berl. 1836], p. 2). After the exile the months received the following names (Gemara, Pesach. 94:2; Targ. Sheni on Esther 3, 7 sq.; comp. Mishna, Shekal. 3, 1): 1. Nisan (נַיסָן, Nehemiah 2, 1; Esther 3, 7), the first month, in which the Passover (q.v.) was held (and in which the vernal equinox fell, Joseph us, Ant. 3, 10, 5), corresponding, in general, to our April (Ideler, Chronol. 1. 491), and answering (Josephus, Ant. 3, 10, 5; War, 5, 3, 1) to the Macedonico-Syrian Xanthicus, also (Ant. 2, 14, 6) to the Egyptian month Pharmuthi, which last, however, was March 27-April 25 of the Julian calendar (Ideler, ut sup. 1, 143); 2. lydr (אַיָּי, Targ. on 2Ch 30:2); 3. Sivan ( סיון Est, Est 8:9; Σειουάλ, Bar. 1, 8); 4. Tammuz תּמּוּז); 5. Ab.( אָב); 6. Elul (אלֵוּל, Neh 6:15; Ε᾿λούλ, 1Ma 14:27), the last month of the civil year in the post-exilian age (Mishna, Shebiith, 10:2; Erubin, 3, 7); 7. Tishri (תְּשְׁרַי.), in which the festivals of Atonement and Tabernacles fell (also the autumnal equinox); 8. Marcheshvdn (מִרְחֶשְׁוָן, Μασουάν or Μαρσουάνη, Josephus, Ant. 1, 3, 3); 9, Kislev (כַּסְלֵו, Neh 1:1; Zec 7:1; Χασλεῦ, 1Ma 1:54); 10.Tebeth (טֵבֵת, Est 2:16); 11. Shebat (שְׁבָט, Zec 1:7; Σαβάτ , 1Ma 16:14); 12. Addr (אֲדֶר, Est 3:7; Est 8:12; Α᾿δάρ, 2Ma 15:37); 13. Ve-A ddr (וַאָדָר; strictly Va-Adar, וִאֲדָר), or second Adar (שֵׁנַי אָדָר. or בִּתְרָאָה). Occasionally, however, the months were newly numbered in the post-exilian period likewise (Hag 1:1; Hag 2:1 sq.; Zec 1:1; Zec 8:19;: Neh 7:73; Neh 8:3; Neh 8:14; Dan 10:4; 1Ma 9:3; 1Ma 9:54; 1Ma 10:21; 1Ma 13:51).'On the origin and signification of those names, see Benfey, op. cit. p. 24 sq.; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 702, 947. From the fact that the second book of Maccabees and Josephus reckon according to the Syro-Macedonian months (Dioscurus, Xanthicus, etc.) it does not follow that the Jews adopted this calendar in the Seleuciderm. In 2 Macc. the Egyptian months (Epiphi, Pachon) are named. See Pott, in the Hall. Lit. —Zeit. 1839, No. 4650; Carpzov, Appar. p. 356 sq.; Michaelis, Comment. 1763-68, Oblat. p. 16 sq.; Langhausen, De Maense Vett. Hebr. Lunari (Jen. 1713; also in Ugolino, Thesaur. 17); Ideler, Chronol. 1, 448 sq. 509 sq. SEE MONTH.

3. Week (שָׁבוּעִ, lit. sevened). This division of the synodal lunar month into seven days (whence the Heb. name) early prevailed among the Israelites, as among other Shemitic people and the Egyptians (Ideler, Chronol. 1, 178; 2, 473); but only among the Israelites was this arrangement associated with  cosmogony, with law, and with religion itself, so as to enter into real civil life and form the basis of the whole cycle of festivals. SEE SABBATH. But ordinarily, days rather than weeks (as also among the Greeks and Romans) constituted the conventional mode of computing time (but see Lev 12:5; Dan 10:2 sq.). In the post-exilian period the reckoning by weeks became more customary, and at length special names for particular week-days came into use, enumerated after the formula ἐν μιᾶ'/, or πρώτῳ σαβ βάτων, or σαββάτου, etc. (Mar 16:2; Mar 16:9; Luk 24:1; Act 20:7; 1Co 16:2; see Epiphan. Hcer. 70, 12; so also in Chald. with שִׁבְּתָאor שִׁבִּתָּא; see Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 273. The word ἑβδομάς does not occur in the New Test.; see also Ideler, Chronol. 1, 481). The astronomical derivation of the week naturally grows out of the obvious fact (Chronol. 1, 60) that the moon changes about every seven (properly seven and three eighths) days, so that the lunar month divides itself into four quarters. Hence nations which have no historical relation in this respect nevertheless agree in the observance (Chronol. 1, 88). The days of the week were named long before the Christian era on regular astrological principles from the seven planets (Lobeck, Aglaopham. p. 933 sq.), which (according to Dion Gass. 37:18) was an Egyptian invention. They began with Saturn's day (Saturday), inasmuch as Saturn was the outermost planet; but among the Jews this day (the Sabbath) was the last of the week, and so the Jewish (and Christian) week commences with Sunday. But these heathenish names were never in general use among the Jews (see Bahr, Symbol. 2, 585 sq.). Weeks or heptads of years belong, among the Jews, to prophetical poetry; but in one instance they occur in a literal sense in prose (Dan 7:24-27), as also among the Romans such annorum hebdomnades were known (Gell. 3, 10; Censorin. De Die Nat. 14). SEE WEEK.

4. Day (יוֹם, so called from its heat; ἡμέρα). The civil day (νυχθήμερον, 2Co 11:25) was reckoned by the Hebrews from sundown to sundown (Lev 23:32); most other ancient nations computed time according to the moon's course (Pliny, 2, 79; Tacit. Germ. c. 11; Caesar, Bell. Gall. 6:18; Isidore, Orig. 5, 30; Censorin. De Die Nat. 23); but before the exile they seem not to have divided the day into special or well- defined portions beyond the natural divisions of morning (בֹּקֶר; see the definition for the Temple-service in the Mishna, Tamid, 3, 2), noon ( צָהַרִיַם, Gen 43:16; Deu 28:29; comp. חום הִיּוֹם,  Gen 18:11 Samuel 11:11; and נְכוֹן הִיּוֹם, Pro 4:18), and evening (עֶרֶב. comp. also נֶשֶׁ, the morning and evening breeze), which were in general use, as among the modern Arabs (Niebuhr, Bedouin, p. 108 sq.). During the exile theJews appear to have adopted the division into regular hours (Chald. שָׁעָה) (Dan 4:16; Dan 5:5; 2Es 6:24), as (according to Herod. 2, 109) the twelve hours of the day originated among the Babylonians; and in the New Test. the hours are frequently enumerated. As, however, every natural day of the year was divided into twelve hours (Joh 11:9; see Ideler, Chronol. 1, 84 sq.), they must have been unequal at different seasons of the year, since in the latitude of Palestine the longest summer day lasts from about four A.M. to eight P.M. (Mayr, Reis. 3, 15), being about four hours longer than the shortest. The hours of the day (for those of the night, SEE NIGHT-WATCH ) were naturally counted from sunrise (cock-crowing, קריאת הגבר, was a designation of time observed in the Temple, Mishna, Tamid, 1, 2); whence the third hour (Mat 20:3; Act 2:15) corresponds about to our nine o'clock A.M. (the time when the market-place was full of men, πλήθουσα ἀγορά; see Kype, Observat. 1, 101 sq.; also the first hour of prayer, Act 2:15); the end of the sixth hour (Mat 20:5; Joh 19:14) to midday; with the eleventh hour (Mat 20:6; Mar 15:34) the day inclined to a close and labor ceased (see also Joh 1:40; Joh 4:52; Acts 3, 1; Act 10:3). There were three daily hours of prayer morning, noon, and night; besides, there is occasionally mention of prayer four times a day (Neh 9:3); but a quarterly division of the day (as inferred by Lücke, Joh. 2, 756) is not certain in the New Test. Yet it is somewhat doubtful whether the evangelists, John at least, always reckon according to the Jewish hours (Clericus, Ad Joan. 19:14; Michaelis, in the Hamb. verm. Bibliothek, 3, 338 sq.; Rettigin the Stud. u. Krit. 1830, 1, 101 sq.; Hug, in the Freiburge Zeitschr. 5, 90 sq.). SEE DAY.

5. Hour (Chald. שָׁעָה Gr. éρα). The Oriental Asiatics, especially the Babylonians (Herod. 2, 109, Vitruv. 9:9), had from early times sundials (horologiasolaria) or shadow-measures (Pliny, 36:15); and hence, from the intercourse with Babylon, this useful contrivance may have been introduced into Palestine even before the exile. At all events, something of the kind seems to be meant by the “degrees of Ahaz'” (מִעֲלוֹת אָחָז, Isa 38:8; comp. 2Ki 20:9), either an obelisk which cast its shade upon the steps of the palace, or perhaps a regular gnomon with  degrees marked on it (Targ. Jonath. אבן שעיאIt; Symmachus, ὡρολόγιον; Jerome, horoloqium ; see Salmas. Ad Solin. p. 447 sq.; Martini, Abhandl. v. d. Sonnenuhren der Alten [Leips. 1777]; alsoDe Haeroloogiis Vett. Sciothericis [Amst. 1797]). The Romans after U. C. 595 used water-clocks (clepsydrae, Vitruv. 9:9, Pliny, 7:60) for the watch room of post-courses (Veget. Mil. 3, 8) and for regulating the continuance of speaking (Philo, Opp. 2, 597; Becker, Gallus, 1, 187). Whether this practice prevailed among the Jews in the time of Christ, we know not (Zeltner, De Horologio Caiaphae [Altdorf. 1721], does not: touch the point); but they could not have been ignorant of some means of measuring time, whether dials or water-clocks, since the latter are in frequent use in the modern East (Niebuhr, Reis. 2, 74). For a peculiar device for dividing the hours mentioned by the Talmudists, see Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 282; see also Ideler, Chronol. 1, 230 sq. SEE HOUR.

See, generally, Ulmer, De Calendario Vett. Hebreor. (Altdorf. 1846); Walch, C(lendarium Palcestince (Economicum (Gött. 1786); Hincks, Ancient Egyptian Years and Months (Lond. 1865); id. Assyro Babyloniain Measures of Time (ibid. eod.). SEE CALENDAR.

## Times, Regarder of[[@Headword:Times, Regarder of]]

             SEE OBSERVER OF TIMES.

## Timna[[@Headword:Timna]]

             (Heb. Timna, תַּמַנָע, restraint), the name of a woman and also of a man.

1. (Sept. θαμνά) A concubine of Eliphaz, son of Esau, and by him mother of Amalek (Gen 36:12; named [apparently only] in 1 Chronicles 1, 36 [by an ellipsis] as a son of Eliphaz); probably the same as the sister of Lotan, and daughter of Seir the Horite (Gen 36:22; 1 Chronicles 1, 39). B.C. considerably post 1963.

2. (Sept. θαμανά v.r. θαιμάν; “Timnah.” ) The first named of the Esauite “dukes” or sheiks in Mount Seir (Gen 36:40; 1 Chronicles 1, 51). B.C. long post 1963.

## Timnah[[@Headword:Timnah]]

             (Heb. Timnah', תַּמְנָה, portion), the name of several places in Palestine, which appears in the original, either simple or compounded, in several  forms, not always accurately represented in the A. V. We treat under this head only the simple name, reserving the compounds for a separate article. SEE TIMNA.

1. The place near which Tamar entrapped Judah into intercourse with her (Gen 38:12-14; Heb. with ה directive, Timnathah, תַּמְנ תָה; Sept. θαμνά; Vulg. Thamnatha; A.V. “to Timnath” ). It had a road leading to it (Gen 38:14), and as it lay on high ground (Gen 38:12), it probably was the same with the Timnah in the mountain district of the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:57; Sept. θαμνά v.r. θαμναθά; Vulg. Thamna). As it lay in the same group with Maon, Ziph, and Carmel, south-east of Hebron (Keil, Comment. ad loc.), it may perhaps be identical with a ruined site upon a low hill on the west of the road between Ziph and Carmel, “called Um el- Amod (‘mother of the pillar'). Foundations and heaps of stones, with some cisterns, cover a small tract of ground, while two or three coarse columns mark the site probably of a village church, and give occasion for the name” (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 192; comp. p. 629).

2. A town near the north-west border of Judah, between Beth-shemesh and Ekron (Jos 15:10; Sept. Λίψ v.r. Νότς; Vulg. Thamna). It is doubtless the same with the place of the same name in Dan (Jos 19:43, Heb. with הparagogic, Timnathah, תַּמְנ תָה; Sept. θαμνά; Vulg. Themna; A. V. “Thimnathah” ), which lay in the vicinity of Ekron; and likewise with the residence of Samson's first wife (Jdg 14:1-2; Jdg 14:5; Heb. likewise with הappended; Sept. θαμναθά; Vulg. Thanmnatha; A.V. “Timnath ;” Josephus, θαμνά, Ant. 5, 8,5), which lay on the Philistine edge of the Shephelah (Jdg 14:1); and both are therefore the same place that was invaded by the Philistines in the time of Ahaz (2Ch 28:18; Sept. θαμνά ; Vulg. Thamnan). At this last date it had suburbs adjoining (“villages” ); and in Samson's day it contained vineyards, haunted, however, by such savage animals as indicate that the population was but sparse. It was on higher ground than Ashkelon (Jdg 14:19), but lower than Zorah, which we may presume was Samson's ‘starting- point (Jdg 13:25). After the Danites had deserted their original allotment for the north, their towns would naturally fall into the hands of Judah, or of the Philistines, as the continual struggle between them might happen to fluctuate. In the later history of the Jews, Timnah must have been a, conspicuous place. It was fortified by Bacchides as one of the most important military posts of Judaea (θαμνάθα, 1Ma 9:50), and it  became the head of a district or toparchy, which was called after its name, and was reckoned the fourth in order of importance among the fourteen into which the whole country was divided at the time of Vespasian's invasion (θαμνά, Josephus, War, 3, 3, 5; see Pliny, 5, 14). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. θαμνά, Thamna” ) confound it with the Timnah of Judah's adventure with Tamar, but say that it still existed as a large village near Diospolis on the road to Jerusalem. According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 106), it is likewise mentioned in the Talmud (Sotah, fol. 10 b). The modern representative of all these various forms of the same name is probably Tibneh, a deserted village about two miles west of Ain Shems (Beth- shemesh), among the broken undulating country by which the central mountains of this part of Palestine descend to the maritime plain (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 342; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 361).

## Timnah (or Timnath)[[@Headword:Timnah (or Timnath)]]

             There seem to be three localities thus designated.

1. In the mountains of Judah (Genesis 38:12-14; Jos 15:57). For ihis no modern representative of a corresponding name (Tibneh) has been discovered in the region required, for the ruined site, Tibna, two and a half miles east of Beit Nettif, and nine miles west of Bethlehem, suggested by Cosider (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:53), and containing only  "foundations" (ibid. page 161), is entirely out of the neighborhood of the associated localities (in Joshua).

2. In the plain of Judah (Jos 15:10; Jdg 14:1-2; Jdg 14:5; 2Ch 28:18). The present representative; Tibnah, lies five and a half miles north-east of Tell es-Safieh (Gath), and eight miles south of Abu Shusheh (Gezer). It is merely described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:441) as "ruined walls, caves, and wine-presses, with rock-cut cisterns. The water supply is from a spring on the north side."

3. In Mount Ephraim (Jos 19:50; Jos 24:30; Jdg 2:9). The modern ruin, Tibneh, which lies ten miles north-west of Beittn (Bethel), and ten and a half miles north-east of Jimzu, is described at length in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:374 sq. Lieut. Conder remarks (Tent Work, 2:229):

"It seems to me very doubtful how far we can rely on the identity of the site with that of Timnath-Heres. It is certain that this is the place called Timnatha by Jerome, a town of importance, capital of a district in the hills, and on the road from Lydda to Jerusalem, the position of which is fixed by references to surrounding towns. But the Jewish tradition, and also that of the modern Samaritans, points to Kefr Haris as the burialplace of Joshua. It is remarkable, however, that a village called Kefr Ishw'a, or ‘Joshua's hamlet,' exists in the immediate neighborhood of the ruin of Tibneh."

## Timnath-heres[[@Headword:Timnath-heres]]

             (Heb. Timndth Cheres, חֶרֶס תַּמַנִת, Timnah of Heres; Sept. θαμναθαρές v.r. θαμναθάρ ἕως ; Vulg. Thamnatsare; Judges 2, 9), or Tim'nath-se'rah (Heb. Timndth-Serach, תַּמְנִתאּסֶרִח, Timnah of Serah; Sept. θαμναθσαρά and θαμναθσαχάς, v.r. θαμνασαράχ and θαμμαχαρής or θαμναθασαχάρα;Vulg. Thamnath Sara and Thanmnath Sare; Jos 19:5; Jos 24:30; Josephus, θαμνά, Ant. 5, 1, 29), the name (varied only by the transposition of the last two consonants of the latter part) by which the city and burial-place of Joshua was known. The Jews adopt Heres as the real name; interpret it to mean “the sun;” and see in it a reference to the act of making the sun stand still, which is to them the greatest exploit of Joshua's life, as they state that the figure of the sun (temunath ha-cheres) was carved upon the sepulcher (Rashi, Comment. ad loc.). Others (as Fürst, 1, 442), while accepting Heres as the original form, interprets that word as “clay,” and as originating in the character of the soil. Others, again, like Ewald (Gesch. 2, 347, 8) and Bertheau (On Judges), take Serah to be the original form, and Heres an ancient but unintentional error. It was the spot which at his own request was presented to Joshua after the partition of the country was completed (Jos 19:50), and in “the border” of which he was buried (24, 30). It is specified as “in Mount Ephraim on the north side of Mount Gaash.” Timnathserah and the tomb of its illustrious owner were shown in the time of Jerome, who mentions them in the Epitaphium Paulae (§ 13).

Beyond its being south of Shechem, he gives no indication of its position, but he dismisses it  with the following characteristic remark, a fitting tribute to the simple self- denial of the great soldier of Israel: “Satisque mirata est, quod distributor possessionum sibi montana et aspera delegisset. Hebrew tradition, in accordance with the above Rabbinical interpretation, identifies the place with Kefar Cheres, which is said by rabbi Jacob (Carmoly, Itineraires, etc. p. 186), Hap-Parchi (Asher, Benj. of Tudela, p. 434), and other Jewish travelers down to Schwarz in our own day (Palest. p. 151), to be about five miles south of Shechem (Nablus) this is doubtless the present Kefr- Harit, or Kefr-Haris, which, however, is more nearly double that distance S.S.W. of Nablus. The modern village has three sacred places-one of Nebi Nan, i.e. the tomb of Nun; the second, Nebi Lusha, i.e. the tomb of Joshua; and the third, Nebi Kifl, i.e. the tomb of the “division by lot” (Conder, Tent-Work in Palest. 1, 78). Another and more promising identification has, however, been suggested in our own day by Dr. Smith (Bibl. Sacra [1843], p. 478 sq.). In his journey from, Jifna to Mejdel-Yaba, about six miles from the former, he discovered the ruins of a considerable town by the name of Tibneh on a gentle hill on the left (south) of the road. . Opposite the town (apparently to the south) was a much higher hill, in the north side of which are several excavated sepulchers, which in size and in the richness and character of their decorations resemble the so-called “Tombs of the Kings” at Jerusalem. The mound or tell stands on the south bank of a deep valley, surrounded by desolate mountains; by it a clear spring issues from a cave; to the south-west is a beautiful arid immense oak-tree, called by the natives Sheik et-Teim, “the chief, the servant of God.” South of the tell the hillside is hollowed out with many tombs, most of which are choked up. One of these has a porch with two rude pilasters, and along the façade are over two hundred niches ‘for lamps; the trailing boughs of the bushes above hang down picturesquely, and half cover the entrance. Within are three kokim, or cells, and through the central one it is possible to creep into a second chamber with only a single grave. Other tombs exist farther east, one having a sculptured facade; but the tomb described is the one popularly supposed to be that of Joshua (Conder, ut sup. p. 228). SEE JOSHUA.

## Timnite[[@Headword:Timnite]]

             (Heb. Timni', תַּמְנַי; Sept. θαμναθαῖος v.r. θαμνί), a designation of Samson's son's father-inlaw, from his residence in Timnah (Jdg 15:6).

## Timon[[@Headword:Timon]]

             (Τίμων, a common Greek name), the fourth named of the seven, commonly called “deacons”, SEE DEACON, who were appointed to act as almoners on the occasion of complaints of partiality being raised by the Hellenistic Jews at Jerusalem (Act 6:5). A.D. 29. Like his colleagues, Timon bears a Greek name, from which, taken together with the occasion of their appointment, it has been: inferred with much probability that the seven were themselves Hellenists. Nothing further is known of him with certainty; but in the Synopsis de Vita et Morte Prophetaruom, Apostoloruai, et Discipulorum Domini, ascribed to Dorotheus of Tyre (Bibl. Max. Patrum, 3, 149), we are informed that he was one of the “seventy-two” disciples (the catalogue of whom is a mere congeries of New-Test. names), and that he afterwards became bishop of Bostra (? “Bostra Arabum “), where he suffered martyrdom by fire.

## Timotheans[[@Headword:Timotheans]]

             a section of the Alexandrian Monophysites (q.v.), so named from Timotheus Elurus, a bitter opponent of the canons of Chalcedon. During the patriarchate of Proterius, Timotheus established schismatical assemblies in Alexandria, having persuaded a few bishops and monks to join him in his secession from the communion of the patriarch. On the death of the emperor Marcian, he succeeded in obtaining consecration from two heretical and exiled bishops, and Proterius was murdered by the partisans of the usurping patriarch on Good-Friday, A.D. 457. After maintaining his position for three years, he was banished to the ancient Cherson, near Sebastopol, but was recalled by the emperor Basiliscus, and took possession of the patriarchal throne of Alexandria in 470. The opinions of Timotheus and his party went the full length of extreme Eutychianism. In some fragments of a work of his which still exist (Mai, Nova Collect. 7:35, 277, 304,305), he is found saying that the nature of Christ is one only-that is, divine; that in the first starting-point of conception by his mother he had one substance with human nature, but that he was not born of the Blessed Virgin in the ordinary way of birth, or her virginity could not have been preserved. This form of Eutychianism thus repudiated the reality of Christ's human nature, and was practically identical with the opinion of the Docetse.

## Timotheus[[@Headword:Timotheus]]

             (Τιμόθεος, honoring God, a frequent name in Greek and Roman history; see Athen. 10:419; 14:626; Livy, 42:67; Pliny, 7:57; 34:19, 34; 36:4, 9), the name of three Jews'(such, at least, by association).

1. A “captain of the Ammonites” (1Ma 5:6), who was defeated on several occasions by Judas Maccabaeus (1Ma 5:6; 1Ma 5:11; 1Ma 5:34-44). B.C. 164. He was probably a Greek adventurer (comp. Josephus, Ant. 12:8, 1) who had gained the leadership of the tribe. Thus Josephus (ibid. 13:8, 1, quoted by Grimm, On 1 Maccabees 5, 6) mentions one “Zeno, surnamed Cotylas, who was despot of Rabbah” in the time of Johannes Hyrcanus.

2. In 2 Macc. a leader named Timotheus is mentioned as having taken part in the invasion of Nicanor (2Ma 8:30; 2Ma 9:3). B.C. 166. At a later time he made great preparations for a second attack on Judas, but was driven to a stronghold, Gazara, which was stormed by Judas, and there Timotheus was taken-and slain (2Ma 10:24-37). It has been supposed that the events recorded in this latter narrative are identical with those in 1Ma 5:6-8, an idea rendered more plausible by the similarity of the names Jazer and Gazara (in Lat. Gazer, Jazare, Gazara). But the name Timotheus was very common, and it is evident that Timotheus the Ammonitish leader was not slain at Jazer (1Ma 5:34); and Jazer was on the east side of Jordan, while Gazara was almost certainly the same as Gezer. SEE GAZARA; SEE JAAZER.

It may be urged further, in support of the substantial accuracy of 2 Macc., that the second campaign of Judas against the first-named Timotheus (1Ma 5:27-44) is given in 2Ma 12:2-24 after the account of the capture of Gazara and the death of the second-named Timotheus there. Wernsdorf assumes that all the differences in the narratives are blunders in 2 Macc. (De Fide Libr. Macc. § 70), and in this he is followed by Grimm (On 2 Maccabees 10,'24, 32). But, if any reliance is to be placed on 2 Macc., the differences of place and circumstances are rightly taken by Patricius to mark different events (De Libr. Macc § 32, p. 259).

3. The Greek form of the name of TIMOTHY SEE TIMOTHY (q.v.), the special follower of Paul (Act 16:1; Act 17:14, etc.). He is called by this name in the A. V. in every case except 2Co 1:1; Philenm, 1; Heb 13:23, and the epistles addressed to him (1Ti 1:2; 1Ti 1:18; 1Ti 6:20; 2Ti 1:2).

## Timothy[[@Headword:Timothy]]

             (Τιμόθεος, i.e. Timotheus [q.v.], as the name is given in the A. V. Act 16:1; Act 17:14-15; Act 18:5; Act 19:22; Act 20:4; Rom 16:21; 1Co 4:17; 1Co 16:10; 2Co 1:19; Php 1:1; Php 2:19; Col 1:1; 1Th 1:1; 1Th 3:2; 1Th 3:6; 2Th 1:1), one of the most interesting of Paul's converts of whom we have an account in the New Test. Fortunately we have tolerably copious details of his history and relations in the frequent references to him in that apostle's letters to the various churches, as well as in those addressed to him personally.

1. His Early Life. —The disciple thus named was the son of one of those mixed marriages which, though condemned by stricter Jewish opinion, and placing their offspring on all but the lowest step in the Jewish scale of precedence, were yet not uncommon in the later periods of Jewish history. The children of these marriages were known as manmerim (“bastards”), and stood just above the Nethinim. This was, however, caeteris paribus. ‘A bastard who was a wise student of the law was, in theory, above an ignorant high-priest (Gem. Hieros. Horayoth, fol. 84, in Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Mat 23:14); and the education of Timothy (2Ti 3:15) may therefore have helped to overcome the prejudice, which the Jews would naturally have against: him on this ground. The mother was a Jewess, but the father's name is unknown; he was a Greek, i.e. a. Gentile, by descent (Act 16:1; Act 16:3). If in any sense a. proselyte, the fact that the issue of the marriage did not receive the sign of the covenant would render it. probable that he belonged to the class of half-converts, the so-called Proselytes of the Gate, not those of Righteousness, if such a class as the former existed. SEE PROSELYTE.

The absence of any personal allusion to the father in the Acts or Epistles suggests the inference that he must have died or disappeared during his son's infancy. The care of the boy thus devolved upon his mother, Eunice, and her mother, Lois, who are both mentioned as sincere believers (2Ti 1:5). Under their training his education was emphatically Jewish. “From a child” he learned (probably in the Sept. version) to “know the Holy Scriptures” daily. The language of the Acts leaves it uncertain whether Lystra or Derbe was the residence of the devout family. The latter has been inferred, but without much likelihood, from a possible construction of Act 20:4, the former from Act 16:1-2 (see Neander, Pflanz. und Leit. 1, 288; Alford and Huther, ad loc.). In either case the absence of any indication of the existence of a synagogue  makes this devout consistency more noticeable. We may think here, as at Philippi, of the few devout women going forth to their daily worship at some river-side; oratory (Conybeare, and Howson, 1, 211). The reading παρὰ τίνων in 2Ti 3:14, adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, indicates that it was from them as well as from the apostle that the young disciple received his first impression of Christian truth. It would be, natural that a character thus fashioned should retain throughout something of a feminine piety. A constitution far from robust (1Ti 5:23), a morbid shrinking from opposition and responsibility (1Ti 4:12-16; 1Ti 5:20-21; 1Ti 6:11-14; 2Ti 2:1-7), a sensitiveness even to tears (2Ti 1:4), a tendency to an ascetic rigor which he had not strength to bear (1Ti 5:23), united, as it often is, with a temperament exposed to some risk (see the elaborate dissertation De Νεωτερικαῖς Ε᾿πιθυμίαις , by Bosius, in Hase, Thesaurus, vol. 2) from “youthful lusts” (2Ti 2:22) and the softer emotions (1Ti 5:2) these we may well think of as characterizing the youth as they afterwards characterized the man.

2. His Conversion and Ordination. — The arrival of Paul and Barnabas in Lycaonia (Act 14:6) brought the message of glad tidings to Timothy and his mother, and they received it with “unfeigned faith” (2Ti 1:5). A.D. 44. If at Lystra, as seems probable from 2Ti 3:11, he may have witnessed the half-completed sacrifice, the half-finished martyrdom of Paul (Act 14:19). The preaching of the apostle on his return from his short circuit prepared him for a life of suffering (Act 14:22). From that time his life and education must have been under the direct superintendence of the body of elders (Act 14:23). During the interval of three years between the apostle's first and second journeys, the youth had greatly matured. His zeal, probably his asceticism, became known both at Lystra and Iconium. The mention of the two churches as united in testifying to his character (Act 16:2) leads us to believe that the early work was prophetic, of the later, that he had already been employed in what was afterwards to be the great labor-of his life, as “the messenger of the churches,” and that it was his tried fitness for that office which determined Paul's choice. Those who had the deepest insight into character and spoke with a prophetic utterance pointed to him (1Ti 1:18; 1Ti 4:14), as others had pointed before to Paul and Barnabas (Act 13:2), as specially fit for the missionary work in which the apostle was engaged. Personal feeling led Paul to the same conclusion (16, 3), and he was solemnly set apart (the  whole assembly of the elders laying their hands on him, as did the apostle himself) to do the work, and possibly to bear the title, of evangelist (1Ti 4:14; 2Ti 1:6; 2Ti 4:5). Iconium has been suggested by Conybeare and Howson (1, 289) as the probable scene of the ordination.

A great obstacle, however, presented itself. Timothy, though inheriting, as it were, from the nobler side (Wettstein, ad loc.), and therefore reckoned as one jf the seed of Abraham, had been allowed to grow up to the age of manhood without the sign of circumcision, and in this point he might seem to be disclaiming the Jewish blood that was in him and choosing to take up his position as a heathen. Had that been his real position, it would have been utterly inconsistent with Paul's principle of action to urge on him the necessity of circumcision (1Co 7:18; Gal 2:3; Gal 5:2). As it was, his condition was that of a negligent, almost of an apostate, Israelite; and, though circumcision was nothing, and uncircumcision was nothing, it was a serious question whether the scandal of such a position should be allowed to frustrate all his efforts as an evangelist. The fact that no offence seems to have been felt hitherto is explained by the predominance of the Gentile element in the churches of Lycaonia (Act 14:27). But his wider work would bring him into contact with the Jews, who had already shown themselves so ready to attack, and then the scandal would come out. They might tolerate a heathen, as such, in the synagogue or the church, but an uncircumcised Israelite would be to them a horror and a portent. With a special view to their feelings, making no sacrifice of principle, the apostle, who had refused to permit the circumcision of Titus, “took and circumcised” Timothy (16:3); and then, as conscious of no inconsistency, went on his was distributing the decrees of the council of Jerusalem, the great charter of the freedom of the Gentiles (Act 14:4),

Henceforth Timothy was one of his most constant: companions. Not since he parted from Barnabas had he found one whose heart so answered to his own. If Barnabas had been as the brother and friend of early days, he had now found one whom he could claim as his own by a spiritual parentage (2Ti 1:2). He calls him “son Timothy” (1Ti 1:18); “my own son in the faith” (1Ti 1:2); “my beloved son” (1Co 4:17); “my workfellow” (Rom 16:21); “my brother” (which is probably the sense of Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός in 2Co 1:1).

3. His Evangelistic Labors and Journeys. —Continuing his second missionary tour, Paul now took Timothy with him, and, accompanied by  Silvanus, and probably Luke also, journeyed at length to Philippi (Act 16:12), where the young evangelist became conspicuous at once for his filial devotion and his zeal (Php 2:22). His name does not appear in the account of Paul's work at Thessalonica, and it is possible that he remained some time at Philippi, and then acted as the messenger by whom the members of that Church sent what they were able to give for the apostle's wants (Act 4:15). He appears, however, at Beroea, and remains there when Paul and Silas are obliged to leave (Act 17:14), going on afterwards to join his master in Greece (1Th 3:2). Meanwhile he is sent back to Thessalonica (ibid.) an having special gifts for comforting and teaching. ‘He returns from Thessalonica, not to Athens, but to Corinth, and his name appears united with Paul's in the opening words of both the letters written from that city to the Thessalonians (1Th 1:1; 2Th 1:1). ‘Dr. Wordsworth infers from 2Co 9:11 and Act 18:5 that; Timothy brought contributions to the support of the-apostle from the Macedonian churches, and thus released him from his continuous labor as a tent-maker. Here, also, he was apparently active as an evangelist (2Co 1:19), and on him, probably, with some exceptions, devolved the duty of baptizing the new converts. (1Co 1:14).

Of the next four or five years of his life we have no record, and can infer nothing beyond a continuance of his active service as Paul's companion. When we again meet with him, it is as being sent on in. advance while the apostle was contemplating the long journey which was to include Macedonia, Achaia, Jerusalem, and Rome (Act 19:22). A.D. 54. He was sent to “bring” the churches “into remembrance of the ways” of the apostle (1Co 4:17). We trace in the words of the “father” an anxious desire to guard the son from the perils which, to his eager but sensitive temperament, would be most trying (1Co 16:10). His route would take him through the churches which he had been instrumental in founding, and this would give him scope for exercising the gifts which were afterwards to be displayed in a still more responsible office. It is probable, from the, passages already referred to, that, after accomplishing the special work assigned to him, he returned by the same route and met Paul according to a previous arrangement (1Co 16:11), and was thus with him when the second epistle was written to the Church of Corinth (2Co 1:1). He returns with the apostle to that city, and joins in messages of greeting to the disciples whom he had known personally at Corinth and who had since found their way to Rome (Rom 16:21).

He forms one of the company of friends who go with  Paul to Philippi and then sail by themselves, waiting for his arrival by a different ship (Act 20:3-6). Whether he continued his journey to, Jerusalem, and what became of him during Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea, are points on which we must remain uncertain. The language of Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus (Act 20:17-35) renders it unlikely that he was then left there with authority. The absence of his name from ch. 27 in like manner leads to the conclusion that he did not share in the perilous voyage to Italy. He must have joined him, however, apparently, soon after his arrival in Rome, and was with him when the epistles to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon were written (Php 1:1; Php 2:19; Col 1:1; Phm 1:1). All the indications of this period point to incessant missionary activity. As before, so now, he is to precede the personal coming of the apostle, inspecting, advising, reporting (Php 2:19-23), caring especially for the Macedonian churches as no one else could care. The special messages of greeting sent to him at a later date (2Ti 4:21) show that at Rome also, as elsewhere, he had gained the warm affection of those among whom he ministered. Among those most eager to be thus remembered to him we find, according to a fairly supported hypothesis, the names of a Roman noble, Pudens (q.v.), of a future bishop of Rome, Linus (q.v.), and of the daughter of a British king, Claudia (Williams, Claudia and Pudens; Conybeare and Howson, 2, 501; Alford, Excursus” ‘in Greek Test. 3, 104). It is interesting to think of the young evangelist as having been the instrument by which one who was surrounded by the fathomless impurity of the Roman world was called to a higher life, and the names which would otherwise have appeared only in the foul epigrams of Martial (1, 32; 4:13; 5, 48; 11:53)-raised to a perpetual honor in the salutations of an apostolic epistle. An article (They of Caesar's Household) in Journ. of Class. and Sacred Philology, No. 10 questions this hypothesis, on the ground that the epigrams are later than the epistles, and that they connect the name of Pudens with heathen customs and vices. On the other hand, it may be urged that-the bantering tone of the epigrams forbids us to take them as evidences of character. Pudens tells Martial that he does not “like his poems.” “Oh, that is because you read too many at a time” (29). He begs him to correct their blemishes. “You want an autograph copy, then, do you?” (7, 11). The slave En or Eucolpos (the name is possibly a willful distortion of Eubulus) does what might be the fulfillment of a Christian vow (Act 18:18), and this is the occasion of the suggestion which seems most damnatory (Martial, 5, 48). With this there mingles, however,  as in 4:13; 6:58, the language of a more real esteem than is common in Martial (comp. some good remarks in Galloway, A Clergyman's Holidays, p. 35-49).

To the close of this period of Timothy's life we may probably refer the imprisonment of Heb 13:23, and the trial at which he “witnessed the good confession” not unworthy to be likened to that of the Great Confessor before Pilate (1Ti 6:13). Assuming the genuineness and the later date of the two epistles addressed to him (see below), we are able to put together a few notices as to his later life. It follows from 1Ti 1:3 that he and his master, after the release of the latter from his imprisonment, revisited the proconsular Asia; that the apostle then continued his journey to Macedonia, while the disciple remained, half reluctantly, even weeping at the separation (2Ti 1:4), at Ephesus, to check, if possible, the outgrowth of heresy and licentiousness which had sprung up there. The time during which he was thus to exercise authority as the delegate of an apostle — a vicar apostolic rather than a bishop — was of uncertain duration (1Ti 3:14). The position in which he found himself might well make him anxious. He had to rule presbyters, most of whom were older than himself (1Ti 4:12), to assign to each a stipend in proportion to his work (1Ti 5:17), to receive and decide on charges that might be brought against them (1Ti 1:19-20), to regulate the almsgiving and the sisterhoods of, the Church (1Ti 1:3-10), to ordain presbyters and deacons (1Ti 3:1-13). There was the risk of being entangled in the disputes, prejudices, covetousness, sensuality, of a great city. There was the risk of injuring health and strength by an overstrained asceticism (1Ti 4:4; 1Ti 5:23). Leaders of rival sects were there Hymenaeus, Philetus, Alexander-to oppose and thwart him (1Ti 1:20; 2Ti 2:17; 2Ti 4:14-15). The name of his beloved teacher was no longer honored as it had been; the strong affection of former days had vanished and “Paul the aged” had become unpopular, the object of suspicion and dislike (comp. Act 20:37; 2Ti 1:15). Only in the narrowed circle of the faithful few-Aquila, Priscilla, Mark, and others-who were still with him was he likely to find sympathy or support (1 Timothy 4:19). We cannot wonder that the apostle, knowing these trials, and, with his marvelous power of bearing another's burdens, making them his own, should be full of anxiety and fear for his disciple's steadfastness; that admonitions, appeals, warnings, should follow each other in rapid and vehement succession (1Ti 1:18; 1Ti 3:15; 1Ti 4:14; 1Ti 5:21; 1Ti 6:11). In the second epistle to him this deep personal feeling utters itself yet more fully. The friendship of twenty years was drawing to a close, and all memories connected with it throng upon the mind of the old man, now ready to be offered: the blameless youth (2Ti 3:15), the holy household (2Ti 1:5), the solemn ordination (2Ti 1:6), the tears at parting (2Ti 1:4). The last recorded words of the apostle express the earnest hope, repeated yet more earnestly, that he might see him once again (1Ti 4:9). Timothy is to come before winter, to bring with him the cloak for which in that winter there would be need (1Ti 4:13). We may hazard the conjecture that he reached him in time, and that the last hours of the teacher were soothed by the presence of the disciple whom he loved so truly. Some writers have even seen in Heb 13:23 an indication that he shared Paul's imprisonment, and was released from it by the death of Nero (Conybeare and Howson, 2, 502; Neander, Pfanz. und Leit. 1, 552). Beyond this all is apocryphal and uncertain.

4. Legendary Notices. —Timothy continued, according to the old traditions, to act as bishop of Ephesus (Euseb. Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 4, 2; Const. Apost. 7:46; see Lange, De Timothy Episcopo Ephes. [Lips. 1755]), and died a martyr's death under Domitian or Nerva (Niceph. Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 11; Photius, Cod. 254). The great festival of Artemis (the καταγώγιον of that goddess) led him to protest against the license and frenzy which accompanied it. The mob were roused to fury, and put him to deathwith clubs (comp. Polycrates and Simeon Metaphr. in Henschen's Acta Sanctorum, Jan. 24). Some later critics-Schleiermacher, Mayerhoff-have seen in him the author of the whole or part of the Acts (Olshausen, Commentary 2, 612).

A somewhat startling theory as to the intervening period of his life has found favor with Calmet (s.v. “Timothee”), Tillemont (2, 147), and others. If he continued, according to the received tradition, to be bishop of Ephesus, then he, and no other, must have been the “angel” of that Church to whom the message of Rev 2:1-7 was addressed. It may be urged, as in some degree confirming this view, that both the praise and the blame of that message are such as harmonize with the impressions as to the character of Timothy derived from the Acts and the Epistles. The refusal to acknowledge the self-styled apostles, the abhorrence of the deeds of the Nicolaitans, the unwearied labor, all this belongs to “the man of God” of the Pastoral Epistles. Nor is the fault less characteristic. The strong language of Paul's entreaty would lead us to expect that the temptation of  such a man would be to fall away from the glow of his “first love,” the zeal of his first faith. The promise of the Lord of the churches is in substance the same as that implied in the language of the apostle (2 Timothy 2, 4-6). This conjecture, it should be added, has been passed over unnoticed by most of the recent commentators on the Apocalypse (comp. Alford and Wordsworth, ad loc.). Trench (Seven Churches of Asia, p. 64) contrasts the “angel” of Revelation 2 with Timothy as an “earlier angel” who, with the generation to which he be longed, had passed away when the Apocalypse was written. It must be remembered, however, that, at the time of Paul's death, Timothy was still” young,” probably not more than thirty-five; that he might, therefore, well be living, even on the assumption of the later date of the Apocalypse, and that the traditions (valeant quantum) place his death after that date. Bengel admits this, but urges the ‘objection that he was not the bishop of any single diocese, but the superintendent of many churches. This, however, may in its turn be traversed by the answer that the death of Paul may have made a great difference in the work of one who had hitherto been employed in traveling as his representative. The special charge committed to him in the Pastoral Epistles might not unnaturally give fixity to a life which had previously been wandering.

An additional fact connected with the name of Timothy is that two of the treatises of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite are addressed to him (De Hierarch. Cael. 1, 1; comp. Le Norry, Dissert. c. 9 and Halloix, Quaest. 4 in Migne's edition).

5. Literature. —In addition to the works above cited, see Klaufing, De Timothy Μαρτυρ. (Vitemb. 1713); Seelen, De Tint. Confessore (Lubec. 1733); Hausdorf, De Ordinatione Timothy (Vitemb. 1754); Witsius, Miscell. Sacr. 2, 438; also his Exercit. Acad. p. 316 sq.; Mosheim, Einleit. in den 1. Br. an Tims. (Hamb. 1754), p. 4 sq.; Bertholdt, Einleit. 6:349 sq.; Heydenreich, Lebenl d. Timotheus, in Tzschirner's Memorab. VIII, 2, 19-76; Evans, Script. Biog. vol. 1; Lewin, St. Paul (see Index); Plumptre, Bible Educator (see Index); and especially Howson, Companions of St. Paul (Lond. 1871), ch. 12. SEE PAUL.

## Timothy, First Epistle To[[@Headword:Timothy, First Epistle To]]

             This is the first of the so-called Pastoral Epistles of Paul, and therefore in treating it we shall adduce many points, especially those relating to its  authenticity, etc., which are applicable to two, and indeed to all three, of them. SEE PAUL.

I. Authorship. —The question whether these epistles were written by Paul was one to which, till within the last half-century, hardly any answer but an affirmative one was thought possible. They are found ascribed to Paul in the Peshito version (2nd century), in the Muratorian fragment, and in the catalogue of Eusebius, who places them among the ὁμολογούμενα. The catalogues of Athanasius, of the Laodicean Council (364), of Cyril, of Epiphanius, and of Jerome contain them, and ascribe them to the apostle. Reminiscences of 1 Timothy occur in Clem. Romans (Epist. 1 Corinthians 29): “Let us draw nigh to him; lifting up pure and undefiled hands” (comp. 1Ti 2:8); in Polycarp (Ad Philippen. c. 4) “The root of all evils is covetousness. Knowing that we brought nothing into this world, and can carry nothing out let us put on the armor of righteousness” (comp. 1Ti 6:7; 1Ti 6:10); and in the letter: of the Church at Vienna and Lyons: “But the fury of the enemy chiefly fell on Attalus, a pillar and ground of our Church” (Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 5, 1; comp. 1 Timothy 3, 15). To 2 Timothy Ignatius seems to allude when he writes to Polycarp (c. 6), “Please him whose soldiers ye are, and from whom you receive pay” (comp. 2Ti 2:4); and Polycarp (Ad Philippen. c. 5) “He has promised us that if we walk worthily of him, we shall reign with him” (comp. 2Ti 2:11-12). To the epistle to Titus Ignatius-alludes (Ad Trall. c. 3): “Whose behavior is itself a great lesson of instruction.” (The word for “behavior,” κατάστημα, occurs in the New Test. only in Tit 2:3). Likewise Clem. Romans (Eph 1:2): “Ye were ready for every good work” (comp. Tit 3:1). To, 1 Timothy we have direct testimony in Irenueus (Adv. Hier. 1, 1, 1): “They introduce vain genealogies, which, as the apostle says, ‘minister' questions, rather than godly edifying, which is ill faith” (comp. 1Ti 1:4); in Clem. Alex. (Strom. 2, 383): “Concerning which the apostle writing says, ‘O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thee' (comp. 1Ti 6:20-21); and in Tertull. (De Prcescrip. ficeret. c. 25): “And this word Paul has used to Timothy, O Timothy, keep the deposit'” (comp. ibid.). To 2 Timothy in Irenaeus (Adv. Hcer. 3, 3,3): “The apostles delivered the episcopate to Linus; of which Linus Paul makes mention in those epistles which he wrote to Timothy” (comp. 2Ti 4:21); and in Tertull. (Scop. c. 13): “Exulting (i.e. Paul) in the prospect of it, he writes to Timothy, ‘I am poured out as a drinkoffering; and the time of my departure is at hand'” (comp. 2  Timothy 4:6). To the epistle to Titus in Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 3, 3, 4): “The apostles would not even in word communicate with those who adulterated the truth, as Paul says, ‘A heretic after the first admonition reject, knowing that such a one is perverse'” etc. (comp. Tit 3:10-11); in Clem. Alex. (Admon. ad Gent. p. 6) “For as that divine apostle of the Lord says, ‘The saving grace of God hath appeared unto all men,'” etc. (comp. Titus 2, 11- 13); and in Tertulk (De Prces. c. 6): “Paul, who suggests that a heretic after the first admonition is to be rejected as perverse'” (comp. Titus 3, 10). See also Tertull. (Ad Uxorem, 1, 7), Irenseus (Adv. Haer. 4:16, 3; 2, 14, 8). Parallelisms, implying quotation, in some cases with close verbal agreement, are found likewise in Ignatius, Ad Mgtn. c. 8 (1Ti 1:4); Polycarp, c. 4 (comp. 1Ti 6:7-8); Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autol. 3, 126 (comp. 1Ti 2:1-2). Later testimony is so abundant that it is needless to adduce it. Thus the external testimony, indirect and direct, to the three epistles is, so far as the Church is concerned; as strong as to any portion of Scripture. It must not be concealed that they were rejected by some of the Gnostic heretics, as Marcion and Basilides (see Tertull. Adv. Mar. 5, 21; Jerome, Prolog. ad Titus). Tatian accepted the Epistle to Titus, but rejected those to Timothy. The contents of the epistles sufficiently account for the repugnance of the Gnostic teachers to admit their genuineness. Origen mentions (Comment. in Matthew p. 117) some who rejected 2 Timothy on account of the allusion to the apocryphal story of Jannes and Jambres (3, 8), which they considered unworthy of an apostle.

The Pastoral Epistles have, however, been subjected to a more elaborate scrutiny by the criticism of Germany. The first doubts were uttered by J. C. Schmidt. These were followed by the Sendschreiben of Schleiermacher, who, assuming the genuineness of 2 Timothy and Titus, undertook, on that hypothesis, to prove the spuriousness of 1 Timothy Bolder critics saw that the position thus taken was untenable, that the three epistles must stand or fall together. Eichhorn (Eileitf. 3) and De Wette (Einleit.) denied the Pauline authorship of all three. There: was still, however, an attempt to maintain their authority as embodying the substance of the apostle's teaching, or of letters written by him, on the hypothesis that they had been sent forth after his death by some over-zealous disciple, who wished, under the shadow of his name, to attack the prevailing errors of the time (Eichhorn, ibid.). One writer (Schott, isagoge Hist. —crit. p. 324) ventures on the hypothesis that Luke was the writer. Baur (Die sogenannten  Pastoral-Bsriefe), here as elsewhere more daring than others, assigns them to no earlier period than the latter half of the 2nd century, after the death of Polycarp in A.D. 167 (p. 138). On this hypothesis 2 Timothy was the earliest, 1 Timothy the latest of the three, each probably by a different writer (p. 72-76)., They grew out of the state of parties in the Church of Rome, and, like the Gospel of Luke and the Acts were intended to mediate between the extreme Pauline and the extreme Petrine sections of the Church (p. 58). Starting from the data supplied by the Epistle to the Philippians, the writers, first of 2 Timothy, then of Titus, and lastly of 1 Timothy, aimed, by the insertion of personal incidents, messages, and the like, at giving to their compilations an air of verisimilitude (p. 70). It will be seen from the above statement that the question of authorship is here more than usually important. There can be no solution as regards these epistles like that of an obviously dramatic and therefore legitimate personation of character, such as is possible in relation to the authorship of Ecclesiastes. If the Pastoral Epistles are not Pauline, the writer clearly meant them to pass as such, and the animus decipiendi would be there in its most flagrant form. They would have to take their place with the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, or the Pseudo-Ignatian Epistles. Where we now see the traces, full of life and interest, of the character of “Paul the aged,” firm, tender, zealous, loving, we should have to recognize only the tricks, sometimes skilful, sometimes clumsy, of some unknown and dishonest controversialist. Consequences such as these ought not, it is true, to lead us to suppress or distort one iota of evidence. They may well make us cautious, however, in examining the evidence, not to admit conclusions that are wider than the premises, nor to take the premises themselves for granted. The task of examining is rendered in some measure easier by the fact that, in the judgment of most critics, hostile as well as friendly, the three Pastoral Epistles stand on the same ground. The intermediate hypotheses of Schleiermacher (supra) and Credser (Einleit. ins N.T.), who looks on Titus as genuine, 2 Timothy as made up out of two genuine letters, and 1 Timothy as altogether spurious, may be dismissed as individual eccentricities, hardly requiring a separate notice. In dealing with objections which take a wider range we are meeting those also which are confined to one or two out of the three epistles.

(I.) Objections to these Epistles in General. —The chief elements of the alleged evidence of spuriousness in the three Pastoral Epistles may be arranged as follows:

1. Language. —The style, it is urged, is different from that of the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. There is less logical continuity, a want of order and plan, subjects brought up, one after the other, abruptly (Schleiermacher). Not less than fifty words, most of them striking and characteristic, are found in these epistles which are not found in Paul's writings (see the list in Conybeare and Howson, App. I, and Huther, Einleit.). The formula of salutation (χάρις ἔλεος, εἰρήνη), half-technical words and phrases like εὐσέβεια and its cognates (1Ti 2:2; 1Ti 3:16; 1Ti 6:6 et al.), παρακαταθήκη (1Ti 1:18; 1Ti 6:20; 2Ti 1:12; 2Ti 1:14; 2Ti 2:2), the frequently recurring πιστὸς ὁ λόγος (1Ti 1:15; 1Ti 3:1; 1Ti 4:9; 2Ti 2:11), the use of ὑγιαίνουσα as the distinctive epithet of a true teaching-these and others like them appear here for the first time (Schleiermacher and Baur). Some of these words, it is urged, φανεροῦν, ἐπιφάνεια, σωτήρ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον, belong to the Gnostic terminology of the 2nd century.

On the other side it may be said

(1.) that there is no test so uncertain as that of language and style thus applied; how uncertain we may judge from the fact that Schleiermacher and Neander find no stumbling-blocks in 2 Timothy and Titus, while they detect an un-Pauline character in 1 Timothy A difference like that which marks the speech of men divided from each other by a century may be conclusive against the identity of authorship; but, short of that, there is hardly any conceivable divergency which may not coexist with it. The style of one man is stereotyped, formed early, and enduring long. The sentences move after an unvarying rhythm; the same words recur. That of -another changes, more or less, from year to year. As liis thoughts expand, they call for a new vocabulary. The last works of such a writer, as those of Bacon and of Burke, may be florid, redundant, figurative, while the earlier were almost meager in their simplicity. In proportion as the man is a solitary thinker, or a strong assertor of his own will, will he tend to the former state. In proportion to his power of receiving impressions from without, of sympathizing with others, will be his tendency to the latter. Apart from all knowledge of Paul's character, the alleged peculiarities are but of little weight in the adverse scale. With that knowledge we may see in them the natural result of the intercourse with men in many lands, of that readiness to become all things to all men, which could hardly fail to show itself in  speech as well as in action. Each group of his epistles has, in like manner, its characteristic words and phrases.

(2.) If this is true generally, it is so yet more emphatically when the circumstances of authorship are different. The language of a bishop's charge is not that of his letters to his private friends. The epistles which Paul wrote to the churches as societies might well differ from those which he wrote, in the full freedom of open speech, to a familiar friend, to his own “true son.” It is not strange that we should find in the latter a Luther- like vehemence of expression (e.g. κεκαυστηριασμένων, 1Ti 4:2; διαπαρατριβαὶ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν, 1Ti 6:5; σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις, 2Ti 3:6), mixed sometimes with words that imply that which few great men have been without, a keen sense of humor, and the capacity, at least, for. satire (e.g. γραώδεις μύθους, 1Ti 4:7; φλύαροι καὶ περίεργοι, 1Ti 5:13; τετύφωται, 1Ti 6:4; γαστέρες ἀργαί, Tit 1:12).

(3.) Other letters, again, were dictated to an amanuensis. These have every appearance of having been written with his own hand, and this call hardly have been without its influence on their style, rendering it less diffuse, the transitions more abrupt, the treatment of each subject more concise. In this respect it may be compared with the other two autograph epistles, those to the Galatians and Philemon. A list of words given by Alford (vol. 3, Prole. ch. 7) shows a considerable resemblance between the first of these two and the Pastoral Epistles.

(4.) It may be added that to whatever extent a forger of spurious epistles would be likely to form his style after the pattern of the recognized ones, so that men might not be able to distinguish the counterfeit from the true, to that extent the diversity which has been dwelt on is, within the limits that have been above stated, not against, but for, the genuineness of these epistles.

(5.) Lastly, there is the positive argument that there is a large. common element, both of thoughts and words, shared by these epistles and the others. The grounds of faith, the law of life, the tendency to digress and go off at a word, the personal, individualizing affection, the free reference to his own sufferings for the truth, all these are in both, and by them we recognize the identity of the writer. The evidence can hardly be given within the limits of this article, but its weight will be felt by any careful  student. The coincidences are precisely those in most instances, which the forger of a document would have been unlikely to think of, and give but scanty support to the perverse ingenuity which sees in these resemblances a proof of compilation, and therefore of spuriousness.

2. Anachronism. —It has been urged (chiefly by Eichhorn, Einleit. p. 315) against the reception of the Pastoral Epistles that they cannot be fitted into the records of Paul's life in the Acts: — This there is a threefold answer.

(1.) The difficulty has been enormously exaggerated. If the dates assigned to them must, to some extent, be conjectural, there are; at least, two hypotheses in each case (infira) which rest on reasonably good grounds.

(2.) If the difficulty were as great as it is said to be, the mere fact that we cannot fix the precise date of three letters in the life of one of whose ceaseless labors and journeyings we have, after all, but fragmentary records; ought not to be a stumbling-block. The hypothesis of a release from the imprisonment with which the history of the Acts ends removes all difficulties; and if this be rejected (Baur, p. 67), as itself not resting on sufficient evidence, there is, in any case, a wide gap of which we know nothing. It may at least claim to be a theory, which explains phenomena.

(3.) Here, as before, the reply is obvious, that a man composing counterfeit epistles would have been likely to make them square with the acknowledged records of the life.

3. Ecclesiasticism. —The three epistles present, it is said, a more developed state of Church organization and doctrine than that belonging to the lifetime of Paul.

(1.) The rule that the bishop is to be “the husband of one wife” (1Ti 3:2; Tit 1:6) indicates the strong Opposition to second marriages which characterized the 2nd century (Baur, p. 113-120).

(2.) The “younger widows” of 1Ti 5:11 cannot possibly be literally widows. If they were, Paul, in advising them to marry, would be excluding them, according to the rule of 1Ti 5:9, from all chance of sharing in the Church's bounty. It follows, therefore, that the word χῆραι is used, as it was in the 2nd century, in a wider sense, as denoting a consecrated life (Baur, p. 42-49).

(3.) The rules affecting the relation of the bishops and elders indicate a hierarchic development characteristic of the Petrine element, which became dominant in the Church of Rome in the postapostolic period, but foreign altogether to the genuine epistles of Paul (Baur, p. 80-89).

(4.) The term αἱρετικός is used in. its later sense, and a formal procedure against the heretic is recognized, which belongs to the 2nd century rather than the first.

(5.) The upward progress from the office of deacon to that of presbyter, implied in 1 Timothy 3, 13, belongs to a-later period (Baur, loc. cit.).

(6.) On 2Ti 1:6; 2Ti 2:2, see below.

It is not difficult to meet objections which contain so large an element of mere arbitrary assumption.

(1.) Admitting Baur's interpretation of 1Ti 3:2 to be the right one, the rule which makes monogamy a condition of the episcopal office is very far removed from the harsh, sweeping censures of all second marriages which we find in Athenagoras and Tertullian.

(2.) There is not a shadow of proof that the younger widows” were not literally such. The χῆραι of the Pastoral Epistles are, like those of Act 6:1; Act 9:39, women dependent on the alms of the Church, not necessarily deaconesses, or engaged in active labors. The rule fixing the age of sixty for admission is all but conclusive against Baur's hypothesis.

(3.) The use of ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι in the Pastoral Epistles as equivalent (Tit 1:5; Tit 1:7), and the absence of any intermediate order between the bishops and deacons (1Ti 3:1-8), are quite unlike what we find in the Ignatian Epistles and other writings of the 2nd century. They are in entire agreement with the language of Paul (Act 20:17; Act 20:28; Philippians 1, 1). Few features of these epistles are more striking than the absence of any high hierarchic system.

(4.) The word αἱρετικός; has its counterpart in the αἱρέσεις of 1Co 11:19. The sentence upon Hymenaeus and Alexander (1Ti 1:20) has a precedent in that of 1Co 5:5.

(5.) The best interpreters ‘do not see in 1Ti 3:13 the transition from one office to another (comp. Ellicott, adloc., and SEE DEACON ). If it is  there, the assumption that such a change is foreign to the apostolic age is entirely an arbitrary one.

4. Heresiology. —Still greater stress is laid on the indications of a later date in the descriptions of the false teachers noticed in the Pastoral Epistles. These point, it is said, unmistakably to Marcion and his followers. In the ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως (1Ti 6:20) there is a direct reference to the treatise which he wrote under the title of'Α᾿ντιθέσεις setting forth the contradiction between the Old and New Test. (Baur, p. 26). The “genealogies” of 1Ti 1:4; Tit 3:9 in like manner point to the eons of the Valentinians and Ophites (ibid. p. 12). The “forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats,” fits in to-Varcion's system, not to that of the Judaizing teachers of Paul's time (ibid. p. 24). The assertion that “the law is good” (1Ti 1:8) implies a denial, like that of Marcion, of its divine authority. The doctrine that the “resurrection was past already” (2 Timothy 2, 18) was thoroughly Gnostic in its character. In his eagerness to find tokens of a later date everywhere, Baur sees in the writer of these epistles not merely an opponent of Gnosticism, but one ill part infected with their teaching, and appeals to the doxologies of 1Ti 1:17; 1Ti 6:15, and their Christology throughout, as having a Gnostic stamp on them (p. 28-33).

Carefully elaborated as this part of Baur's attack has been, it is, perhaps, the weakest and most capricious of all. The false teachers of the Pastoral Epistles are predominantly Jewish, νομοδιδάσκαλοι (1Ti 1:7), belonging altogether to a different school from that of Marcion, giving heed to “Jewish fables” (Tit 1:4) and” disputes connected with the law” (Tit 3:9). Of all monstrosities of exegesis few are more willful and fantastic than that which finds in νομοδιδάσκαλοι Antinomian teachers, and in μαχαὶ νομικαί Antinomian doctrine (Baur, p. 17). The natural suggestion that in Act 20:30-31 Paul contemplates the rise and progress of a like perverse teaching; that in Colossians 2, 8-23 we have the same combination of Judaism and a self-styled γνῶσις (1Ti 6:20) or φιλοσοφία (Col 2:8), leading to a like false asceticism, is set aside summarily by the rejection both of the speech and the epistle as spurious. Even the denial of the resurrection, we may remark, belongs as naturally to the mingling of a Sadducaean element with an Eastern mysticism as to the teaching of Marcion. The self-contradictory hypothesis that the writer of 1 Timothy is at once the strongest opponent of the  Gnostics, and that he adopts their language, need hardly be refuted. The whole line of argument, indeed; first misrepresents the language of Paul in these epistles and elsewhere, and then assumes the entire absence from the 1st century of even the germs of the teaching which characterized the 2nd (comp. Neander, P. flaz. und Leit. 1, 401; Heydenreich, p. 64).

(II.) Special Objections to the First Epistle. —The most prominent of these are the following:

1. That it presents Timothy in alight in which it is inconsistent with other notices of him in Paul's epistles to regard him. Here he appears as little better than a novice, needing instruction as to the simplest affairs of ecclesiastical order; whereas in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, written earlier than this, we find him (1Co 4:17) described by Paul as “My beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every Church;” and in 1Th 1:1-3 we are told that the apostle had sent him to Thessalonica to establish the believers there, and to comfort them concerning their faith. If Timothy was so well able to regulate the churches at Corinth and Thessalonica, how, it is asked, can it be supposed that a short while afterwards he should require such minute instructions for his conduct as this epistle contains? To this it may be replied,

(1) that in visiting Corinth and Thessalonica Timothy acted as the apostle's delegate, and had, doubtless, received from him minute instructions as to how he should proceed among those to whom he was sent; so that the alleged difference in the circumstances of Timothy when sent to Corinth and when left in Ephesus disappears;

(2) that it does not necessarily follow from the injunctions given to Timothy in this epistle that the writer regarded him as a novice, for they rather respect the application of general principles to peculiar local circumstances than set forth instructions such as a novice would require; and

(3) it is not to be forgotten that the apostle designed through Timothy to present to the Church at large a body of instruction which should be useful to it in all ages of its existence.

2. It is objected that after the Church at Ephesus had enjoyed the apostle's instructions and presidency for three years it could not have been, at the time this epistle is supposed to have been written by Paul, in such ignorance of ecclesiastical arrangements as the injunctions here given would lead us to suppose. — But what is there in the epistle that necessitates such a supposition ? It contains many directions to Timothy how lie should conduct himself in a church, some of which are certainly of an elementary character, but there is nothing that leads to the conclusion that they were all intended for the benefit of the Church at Ephesus, or that the state of that Church was such as to require that injunctions of this kind should be given for its sake alone. Timothy's sphere of evangelistic effort extended greatly beyond Ephesus; and this epistle was designed at once to guide him as to what he was to do in the churches which he might be called to regulate, and to supply his authority for so doing. Besides, does it not naturally occur that such minute injunctions are just such as a person forging this epistle at a later period in Paul's name would be most likely to avoid?

3. The absence of allusions to events in Timothy's history has been allege against the Pauline origin of this epistle. A strange objection and as untenable as strange! This may be seen by a reference to the following passages: 1Ti 1:18; 1Ti 4:14; 1Ti 5:23; 1Ti 6:12.

4. It is alleged that the writer of this epistle has made such a mistake as Paul could not have made when he classes Alexander with Hymenueus (1Ti 1:20) as a false Christian, whereas we know from 2Ti 4:14 that he was not a Christian at all. But where is the shadow of evidence that the Alexander mentioned in 1Ti 1:20 is the same person with the Alexander mentioned in 2Ti 4:14? Was this name so uncommon in Ephesus that we must needs suppose a blunder where a writer speaks of one so called as a heretic simply because, in other passages, mention is made of one so called who was not a heretic? Nothing can be more obvious than that there were two Alexanders, just as there might have been twenty, known to the apostle and Timothy; and that of these two one was a heretic and troubler of the Church at Ephesus, and the other probably a heathen and an enemy of the apostle.

5. In 1Ti 1:20 mention is made of Hymenaeus as a heretic whom the writer makes Paul say he had excommunicated; but this is a mistake, for in 2Ti 2:17 we find Hymenaeus still a member of the Church  at Ephesus, and such a mistake could not have been made by Paul. Here, however, it is assumed without proof (1) that the Hymenaeus of the one epistle is the same as the Hymenaeus of the other; (2) that, being the same, he was still a member of the same Church; and (3) that it was impossible for him, though excommunicated, to have returned as a penitent to the Church and again to have become a plague to it. Here are three hypotheses on which we may account for the fact referred to, and, until they be all excluded, it will not follow that any blunder is chargeable upon the writer of this epistle.

6. In 1Ti 6:13 the writer refers to our Lord's good confession before Pontius Pilate. Now of this we have a record in John's Gospel; but, as this was not written in Paul's time, it is urged that this epistle must be ascribed to a later writer. It is easy to obviate any force that may appear to be in this remark by the consideration that all the prominent facts of our Lord's life, and especially the circumstances of his death, were familiarly known by oral communication to all the Christians before the gospels were written. Though, then, John's gospel was not extant in Paul's time, the facts recorded by John Were well known, and might therefore be very naturally referred to in an epistle from one Christian to another. Of our Lord's confession before Pilate we may readily suppose that Paul, the great advocate of the spirituality of the Messiah's kingdom, was especially fond of making use.

7. The writer of this epistle, it is affirmed, utters sentiments in favor of the law, which are not Pauline, and teaches the efficacy of good works in such a way as to be incompatible with Paul's doctrine of salvation by grace. This assertion we may safely meet with a pointed denial. The doctrine of this epistle concerning the law is that it is good if it be used νομίμως, as a law, for the purposes which a moral law is designed to serve; and what is this but the doctrine of the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, where the apostle maintains that in itself and for its own ends the divine law is holy, just, and good, and becomes evil only when put out of its proper place and used for purposes it was never designed to serve (Rom 7:7-12; Gal 3:21. etc.). What the writer here teaches concerning good works is also in full harmony with the apostle Paul's teaching in his acknowledged epistles (comp. Romans 12; Ephesians , 6 etc.); and if in this epistle there is no formal exposition of the Gospel scheme, but rather a dwelling upon practical duties, the reason may easily be found in the  peculiar character of this as a pastoral epistle an epistle of official councils and exhortations to a minister of Christianity.

8. De Wette asserts that 1 Timothy 3, 16 bears marks of being a quotation from a confession or symbol of the Church, of which there were none in Paul's day. But what marks of this does the passage present? The answer is, the use of the word ὁμολογουμένως, a technical word, and the word used by the ecclesiastical writers to designate something in accordance with orthodox doctrine. This is true; but, as technical words are first used in their proper sense, and as the proper sense of ὁμολογουμένως perfectly suits the passage in question, there is no reason for supposing any such later usage as De. Wette suggests. Besides, his argument tells both ways, for one may as well assert that the ecclesiastical usage arose from the terms of this passage as affirm that the terms of this passage were borrowed from ecclesiastical usage.

9. The writer of this epistle quotes as a part of Scripture a passage which occurs only in Luk 10:7; but as Luke had not written his gospel at the time Paul is supposed to have written this epistle, and as it is not the habit of the New-Test. writers to quote from each other in the way they quote from the Old Test., we are bound to suppose that this epistle is the production of a later writer. But does this writer quote Luk 10:7 in the manner alleged? The passage referred to is in Luk 5:18, where we have first a citation from Deu 25:4, introduced by the usual formula, “The Scripture saith;” and then the writer adds, as further confirmatory of his position, the saying of our Lord which is supposed to be quoted from Luke's gospel. Now we are not bound to conclude that this latter-was adduced by the writer as a part of Scripture. It may be regarded as a, remark of his own, or as some proverbial expression, or as a well-known. saying of Christ's, by which he confirms the doctrine he is establishing. We are under no necessity to extend the formula with which the verse is commenced so as to include in it all that the verse contains. The καί by itself will not justify this; indeed, we may go further, and affirm that the use of καί alone rather leads to an opposite conclusion, for had the writer intended the latter clause to be regarded as a quotation from Scripture as well as the former, he would probably have used some such formula as καὶ πάλιν. (comp. Heb 2:13).

10. De Wette maintains that the injunction in 1Ti 5:23 is so much beneath the dignity of an apostle that we cannot suppose it to have proceeded from  such a writer as Paul. But what is there in such an injunction less dignified than in many injunctions of an equally familiar nature scattered through Paul's epistles? And in what is it incompatible with the apostolic character that one sustaining it ‘should enjoin upon a young, zealous, and active preacher, whom he esteemed as his own son, a careful regard to his health; the more especially when, by acting as is here enjoined, he would vindicate Christian liberty from those ascetic restraints by which the false teachers sought to bind it?

(III.) Special Objections to the Second Epistle. —Of these the most weighty are founded on the assumption that this epistle must be viewed as written during the apostle's first imprisonment at Rome; and as, for reasons to be subsequently stated, we do not regard this assumption as tenable, it will not be necessary to occupy space with any remarks upon them. We may leave unnoticed also those objections to this epistle which are mere repetitions of those urged against the first, and which admit of similar replies.

1. In 1Ti 3:11, the writer enumerates a series of persecutions and afflictions which befell 1lim at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, of which he says Timothy knew. Would Paul, it is asked, in making such an enumeration, have committed the mistake of referring to persecutions which he had endured before his connection with Timothy, and have said nothing of those which he endured subsequently, and. of which Timothy must have known, while of the former he might be ignorant? But there is no mistake in the matter. Paul has occasion to refer to the knowledge Timothy had of his sufferings for the Gospel. Of these some had occurred before Timothy's connection with him, while others had occurred while Timothy was his companion and fellow sufferer. Of the latter, therefore, Paul makes no specific mention, feeling that to be unnecessary; but of the former, of which Timothy could know only by hearsay, but of which he no doubt did know. for we cannot conceive that any interesting point in Paul's previous history would be unknown to his “dear son in the faith,” he makes specific enumeration. This fully accounts for his stopping short at the point where Timothy's personal experience could amply supply the remainder.

2. The declaration in 1Ti 4:7, etc., is incompatible with what Paul says of himself in Php 3:12, etc. But respect must be had to the very different circumstances in which the apostle was when he wrote these two passages. In the one case he viewed himself as still engaged in active work,  and having the prospect of service before him; in the other he regards himself as very near to death, and shortly about to enter into the presence of his master. Surely the same individual might in the former of these cases speak of work yet to do, and in the latter of his work as done, without any contradiction.

3. In 1:6 and 2:2 there are pointed allusions to ecclesiastical ceremonies which betray a later age than that of Paul. This is said without reason; the laying-on of hands in the conferring of a χάρισμα was altogether an apostolic usage; and the hearing of Paul's doctrines was what Timothy, as his companion in travel, could easily enjoy, without our needing to suppose that the apostle is here represented as acting the part of professor in a school of theology.

Full particulars on this discussion will be found in the introductions of Alford, Wordsworth, Huther, Davidson, Wiesinger, and Hug. Conybeare and Howson (App. I) give a good tabular summary both of the objections to the genuineness of the epistles and of the answers to them, and a clear statement in favor of the later date. The most elaborate argument in favor of the earlier is to be found in Lardner, History of Apost. and Evang. (Works, 6:315-375). See also the introductions of Hainlein, Michaelis, Eichhorn, De Wette, Bertholdt, Guericke, Schott, etc.; Schleiermacher, Ueber den sogenaunnten erstenz Brief des Paulus an den Timotheos, ein kritisches Sendschreiben an J. C. Gass (Berl. 1807, 12mo); Planck, Bemerkungen iiber d. ersten Paulin. Brief an d. Timothy (Gött. 1808, 8vo); Beckhaus, Specimen Obss. Crit. —exeget. de Vocabulis ἃπαχ λεγομένοις in Lad Timothy Ep. Paulina obviis, Authentia ejus nihil det- ahentibus (Lingae, 1810, 8vo); Curtius, De Tempore quo prior Pauli ad Timothy Epist. exarata sit (Berol. 1828, 8vo); Otto, Die geschichtl. Veroialtnisse der Past. —Briefe (Leips. 1860, 8vo).

II. Date. —The direct evidence on this point is very slight.

(a.) 1Ti 1:3 implies a journey of Paul from Ephesus to Macedonia, Timothy remaining behind.

(b.) The age of Timothy is described as νεότης (1Ti 4:12).

(c.) The general resemblance between the two epistles indicates that they were written at or about the same time. Three hypotheses have been maintained as fulfilling these conditions.

1. The journey in question has been looked-upon as an unrecorded episode in the two years work at Ephesus (Act 19:10). This conjecture has the merit of bringing the epistle within the limit of the authentic records of Paul's life, but it has scarcely any other. Against it we may urge that a journey to Macedonia would hardly have been passed over in silence either by Luke in the Acts, or by Paul himself in writing to the Corinthians. Indeed, the theory of unrecorded travels of this kind is altogether gratuitous. There is no period after the formal appointment of Paul as a missionary during which it was possible, so fully have we the itinerary of the apostle; unless, indeed, it be the long residence in Ephesus, that favorite resort of theorists as to imaginary journeys; and so entirely was Paul occupied with local labors there that it is wholly excluded even at that time.

2. This journey has been identified with the journey after the tumult at Ephesus (Act 20:1). Against this conjecture is the palpable fact that Timothy, instead of remaining at Ephesus when the apostle left, had gone on into Macedonia before him (Act 19:22). The hypothesis of a possible return is traversed by the fact that he was with Paul in Macedonia at the time when 2 Corinthians was written and sent off. To obviate this objection, it has been suggested that Paul might have written this epistle immediately after leaving Ephesus, and the second to the Corinthians not before the concluding period of his stay in Macedonia; so that Timothy might have visited him in the interval. This appears to remove the difficulty, but it does so by suggesting a new one; for how, on this supposition, are we to account for the apostle's delaying so long to write to the Corinthians after the arrival of Titus, by whose intelligence, concerning the state of the Corinthian Church, Paul was led to address them? It may be asked, also, if it be likely that Timothy, after receiving such a charge as Paul gives him in this epistle, would so soon have left Ephesus and followed the apostle.

An attempt has been made by Otto (Die geschichtl. Verhalt. p. 23 sq.) to avoid the difficulty in 1 Timothy 1 by translating it thus, “As I in Ephesus exhorted thee to stand fast, so do thou, as thou goest to Macedonia, enjoin on some not to adhere to strange doctrines,” etc. The passage is thus made to refer to Timothy's going to Macedonia, not to the apostle's, and the occasion of his going is referred to the journey mentioned (Act 19:21-22), with which the visit to Corinth mentioned (1Co 4:17; 1Co 16:10), is made to synchronize. The date of 1 Timothy is thus placed before that of 1 Corinthians. All this, however, rests on a rendering of 1  Timothy 1, 3 which, in spite of much learned disquisition, its author has failed to vindicate.

3. The journey in question has been placed in the interval between Paul's first and second imprisonments at Rome. In favor of this conjecture as compared with the preceding is the internal evidence of the contents of the epistle. The errors against which Timothy is warned are present, dangerous, and portentous. At the time of Paul's visit to Miletus in Act 20:1.e., according to those hypotheses, subsequent to the epistle, they are still only looming in the distance (Act 20:30). All the circumstances referred to, moreover, imply the prolonged absence of the apostle. Discipline had become lax, heresies rife, the economy of the Church disordered. It was necessary to check the chief offenders by the sharp sentence of excommunication (1Ti 1:20). Other churches called for his counsel and directions, or a sharp necessity took him away, and he hastens on, leaving behind him, with full delegated authority, the disciple in whom he most confided. The language of the epistle-also has a bearing on the date. According to the two preceding hypotheses, it belongs to the same periods as 1 and 2 Corinthians and the Epistle to the Romans, or, at the latest, to the same group as Philippians and Ephesians; and in this case the differences of style and language are somewhat difficult to explain. Assume a later date, and then there is room for the changes in thought and expression which, in a character like Paul's, were to be expected as the years went by.

The objections to the position thus assigned are the following:

(1.) The second imprisonment itself is not a matter of history. We have elsewhere, however, adduced the evidence as being entirely satisfactory. SEE PAUL.

(2.) As the evidence that the apostle took such a journey between his first and second imprisonment is purely hypothetical and inferential, it must be admitted that the hypothesis built upon it as to the date of this epistle rests at the best on somewhat precarious grounds. On the other hand, we know that the apostle did purpose extended tours on his contemplated release from tile first imprisonment (Rom 15:23-24), and that these embraced Asia Minor (Php 2:2), as well as Crete (Tit 1:5).

(3.) This hypothesis is directly opposed to the solemn declaration of Paul to the elders of the Church at Ephesus when he met them at Miletum, “I  know that ye all shall see my face no more” (Act 20:25), for it assumes that he did see them again and preached to them. But Paul was not infallible in his anticipations, and we have positive evidence that he did revisit Ephesus (2Ti 4:12 ; comp. Act 13:20).

(4.) It is opposed by what Paul says (2Ti 4:12), from which we learn that at the time this epistle was written Timothy was in danger of being despised as a youth; but this could hardly. be said of him after Paul's first imprisonment, when he must, on the lowest computation, have been thirty years of age. In reply to this, it is sufficient to say that this was young enough for one who was to exercise authority over a whole body of bishop-presbyters, many of them older than himself (1Ti 5:1).

(5.) This hypothesis seems, to assume the possibility of churches remaining in and around Ephesus in a state of defective arrangement and order for a greater length of time than we can believe to have been the case. But arguments of this kind are highly insecure, and cannot weigh against historical statements and inferences. On the whole, therefore, we decidedly incline to this position for the journey in question.

The precise date of the first epistle we have, nevertheless, no means of fixing. In Php 2:24 the apostle expresses a hope of visiting that Church shortly. Carrying out this intention, he would, after his liberation, proceed, to Macedonia, whence we -must suppose him passing into Asia, and visiting Ephesus (A.D. 60). Thence he may have taken his proposed journey to Spain (Rom 15:24; Rom 15:28), unless he took advantage of his proximity to the West to do so direct from Rome. After, this, and not long before his martyrdom (A.D. 64), this epistle seems to have been written.

III. Place. —In this respect, as in regard to time, 1 Timothy leaves much to conjecture. The absence of any local reference but that in 1:3 suggests Macedonia or some neighboring district. In A and other MSS. in the Peshito, Ethiopic, and other versions, Laodicea is named in the inscription as the place whence it was sent; but this appears to have grown out of a traditional belief resting on very insufficient grounds (and incompatible with the conclusion which has been adopted above) that this is the epistle referred to in Col 4:16 as that from Laodicea (Theophyl. ad loc.). The Coptic version, with as little likelihood, states that it was written from Athens (Huther, Einleit.).

IV. Object and Contents. —The design of the first epistle is partly to instruct Timothy in the duties of that office with which he had been entrusted, partly to supply him with credentials to the churches which he might visit, and partly to furnish through him guidance to the churches themselves.

It may be divided into three parts, exclusive of the introduction (1Ti 1:1-2) and the conclusion (1Ti 6:20-21). In the first of these parts (1Ti 1:3-20) the apostle reminds Timothy generally of his functions, and especially of the duties he had to discharge in reference to certain false teachers, who were anxious to bring the believers un der the yoke of the law. In the second (2-4:2) he gives Timothy particular instructions concerning the orderly conducting of divine worship, the qualifications of bishops and deacons, and the proper mode of behaving himself in a church. In the third (1Ti 6:3-19) the apostle discourses against some vices to which the Christians at Ephesus seem to have been prone.

V. Structure and Characteristics. —The peculiarities of language, so far as they affect the question of authorship, have already been noticed. Assuming the genuineness of the epistles, some characteristic features common to them both remain to be noticed.

1. The ever-deepening sense in Paul's heart of the Divine Mercy, of which he was the object, as shown in the insertion of ἔλεος in the salutations of both epistles, and in the ἠλεήθην of 1Ti 1:13.

2. The greater abruptness of the second epistle. From first to last there is no plan, no treatment of subjects carefully thought out. All speaks of strong overflowing emotion, memories of the past, anxieties about the future.

3. The absence, as compared with Paul's other epistles, of Old-Test. references. This may connect itself with the fact just noticed, that these epistles are not argumentative, possibly also with the request for the “books and parchments” which had been left behind (2Ti 4:13). He may have been separated for a time from the ἱερὰ γράμματα, which were ‘commonly his companions.

4. The conspicuous position of the “faithful sayings” as taking the place occupied in other epistles by the Old-Test. Scriptures. The way in which  these are cited as authoritative, the variety of subjects which. they cover, suggest the thought that in them we have specimens of the prophecies of the Apostolic Church which had most impressed themselves on the mind of the apostle, and of the disciples generally. 1 Corinthians 14 shows how deep a reverence he was likely to feel for such spiritual utterances. In 1Ti 4:1 we have a distinct reference to them.

5. The tendency of the apostle's mind to dwell more on the universality of the redemptive work of Christ (1Ti 2:3-6; 1Ti 4:10); his strong desire that all the teaching of his disciples should be “sound” (ὑγιαίνουσα), commending itself to minds in a healthy state; his feat of the corruption of that teaching by morbid subtleties.

6. The importance attached by him to the practical details of administration. The gathered experience of a long life had taught him that the life and well-being of the Church required these for its safeguards.

7. The recurrence of doxologies (1Ti 1:17; 1Ti 6:15-16; 2Ti 4:18), as from one living perpetually in the presence of God, to whom the language of adoration was as his natural speech.

VI. Commentaries. —The following are the exegetical helps on both epistles to Timothy exclusively; to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Megander, Expositio [includ. Titus] (Basil. 1536, 8vo); Wittich, Expositio (Argent. 1542, 8vo); Artopoeus, Scholia (Stuttg. 1545; Basil. 1546, 8vo); Calvin, Commentarius (Genev. 1548, 4to; in French, ibid. 1563, fol.; in English by Tomson, Lond. 1579, 4to; by Pringle, Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Alesius, Disputatio (Lips. 1550-51, 2 vols. 8vo); D'Espence [Romans Cath.], Commentarii (1st Ep. Lutet. 1561, fol.; 1568, 8vo ; 2nd Ep. Par. 1564, fol.); Major, Enarrationes (Vitemb. 1563- 64, 2 vols. 8vo); Hyper, Commentarius [includ. Titus and Philem.] (Tigur. 1582, fol.); Magalian [R. C.], Commentarii [includ. Titus] (Lugd. 1609, 4to); Sotto [R. C.], Commentarius (includ. Titus] (Par. 1610, fol.); Stewart [R. C.], Commentarius (Ingolst. 1610-11,2 vols. 4to); Weinrich, Commentarius (Lips. 1618, 4to); Scultetus, Observationes [includ. Titus and Philem.] (Francof. 1624; Vitemb. 1630, 4to); Gerhard, Adnotationes (Jen. 1643, 1666; Lips. 1712, 4to); Nethen, Disputatio (Ultraj. 1655, 4to); Habert ER. C.], Expositio [includ. Titus and Philem.] (Par. 1656, 8vo); Daille, Expositiona [French] (Genev. 1659-61, 3 vols. 8vo); Cocceius, Commentarius (L. B. 1667, 4to); Gargon, Oopeninge (Leyd. 1706, 1719,  4to); Hulse, Oopeninge (Rotterd. 1727, 4to); \*Mosheim, Erklarung (Hamb. 1755, 4to); Zacharili, Erkllr. (Leips. 1755, 8vo); Hesse, Ellu.f. (Gott. 1796, 8vo); \*Heydenreich, Erläut. [includ. Titus] (Hadam. 1826-28, 2 vols. 8vo]; Flatt, Vorles. [includ. Titus] (Tub. 1831, 8vo); Baumgarten, Aechtheit, etc. (Berl. 1837, 8vo); Leo, Commentarius (Lips. 1837-49, 2 vols. 8vo); Matthies, Erklar. [includ. Titus] (Greifsw. 1840, 8vo); Mack [R. C.], Commentar [includ. Titus] (Tüb. 1841, 8vo); \*Scharling, Untersuch. etc. (from the Danish, Jen. 1846, 8vo); Paterson, Commentary [includ. Titus] (Lond. 1848,18mo); Rudow, De Origine, etc. (Gotting. 1852, 8vo); \*Ellicott, Commentary [includ. Titus] (Lond. 1856; Bost. 1866, 8vo); Mangold, Die Irrlehrer, etc. (Marb. 1856, 8vo); Vinke, Aanmerkingen (Utr. 1859, 8vo); \*Otto, Die Verhiltnisse, etc. (Leips. 1860, 8vo); Beck, Erklar. (Leips. 1879, 8vo).

On the first epistle alone there are the following: Cruciger, Commentarius (Argent. 1540, 8vo); Phygio, Explanatio [includ. Levit.] (Basil. 1543, 4to; 1596, 8vo); Venator, Distributiones (ibid. 1553; Lips. 1618, 8vo); Melancthon, Enarratio [includ. 2 Timothy 1, 2] (Vitemb. 1561, 8vo); Hessels [R. C.], Commentarius (Lovan. 1568, 8vo); Chytraeus, Enarratio (Francof. 1569, 8vo); Danaeus, Commentarius (Genev. 1578, 8vo); Dibuad, Commentarius (Hanov. 1598, 8vo); Meeltihrer, Commentarius [includ. Ephesians and Philippians] (Norib. 1628, 4to); Schmid, Paraphrasis (Hamb. 1691, 1694, 4to); Fleischmann, Commentarius (Tiib. 1795, 8vo); Paulus, De Tempore, etc. (Jen. 1799, 4to); Schleiermacher, Sendschr. etc. (Berl. 1807, 8vo); Planck, Denmerk. etc. (Gött. 1808, 8vo); Beckhaus,De ἃπαξ λεγομ. etc. (Ling. 1810, 8vo); Wegscheider, Erklr. (Gött. 1810, 8vo); Curtius, De Tempore, etc. (Berol. 1828, 8vo). SEE EPISTLE.

## Timothy, Second Epistle To[[@Headword:Timothy, Second Epistle To]]

             This follows immediately the first in the New Test. The questions of genuineness and style have already been considered there. As in the case of the first epistle, the chronological questions are the most difficult to answer satisfactorily.

I. Date. —It is certain that the second epistle was written while the author was a prisoner (2Ti 1:8; 2Ti 1:16-17; 2Ti 2:9; 2Ti 4:21), at Rome, we may (for the present) assume; but the question arises, was it during his first or his second imprisonment that this took place?

1. In favor of the first, the most weighty consideration arises out of the fact that the apostle appears to have had the same individuals as his companions when he wrote this epistle as he had when he wrote the epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, and that to Philemon which we know were written during his first imprisonment at Rome. “At the beginning of the imprisonment,” says Hug, who has very forcibly stated this argument in favor of the earlier hypothesis, “when the Epistle to the Ephesians was written, Timothy, who was not one of Paul's companions on the voyage to Italy (Act 27:2), was not with him at Rome; for-Paul does not add his name in the address with which the epistle commences, as he always did when Timothy was at his side. Timothy afterwards arrived; and, accordingly, at the outset of the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, his name appears with the apostle's (Col 1:1; Phm 1:1); secondly, Luke was in Paul's company (Col 4:14; Phm 1:24); thirdly, Mark was likewise with him (Col 4:10; Phm 1:24); fourthly, Tychicus was then Paul's διάκονος and letter-bearer, and, in particular, was sent to Asia (Eph 4:21 ; Colossians 1, 7, 8). All these circumstances are presented to view in the Second Epistle to Timothy.

(1) Timothy was not with Paul at first, but was summoned to his side (2Ti 4:9; 2Ti 4:21);

(2) Luke was with him (2Ti 4:11);

(3) he wishes Mark to come with Timothy, so that he must have been with him in the course of his imprisonment (2Ti 4:11);

(4) Tychicus was with him in the capacity of letter-bearer, and, in particular, was sent to Asia (2Ti 4:12). Now, in order to suppose that Paul wrote this epistle to Timothy during a second imprisonment at Rome, we must assume that the circumstances of both were exactly the same, etc. ‘We must also assume that Paul at both times, even if the latter part of Nero's reign, was permitted to receive friends during his confinement, to write letters, dispatch messengers, and, in general, to have free intercourse with everybody” (Introduction [Fosdick's transl.], p. 556, etc.).

2. On the other hand, the difficulties lying in the way of this seem insuperable. Hug's reasoning assumes that the epistle must have been written in the early part of the apostle's imprisonment, else Timothy could  not have been absent at the time of its composition. But that this is utterly inadmissible the following considerations show:

(1.) When Paul wrote to the Colossians, the Philippians, and Philemon, Demas was with him; when he wrote this epistle to Timothy, Demas had forsaken him, having loved this present world and gone to Thessalonica (4:10).

(2.) When Paul wrote to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, he was in good hopes of a speedy liberation, from his imprisonment; when he wrote this epistle to Timothy he had lost all these, hopes, and was anticipating death as near at hand (2Ti 4:6-8).

(3.) At the time this epistle was written Paul had been, if not oftener, at least once, before the bar of the emperor, when he had offered-his apology (2Ti 4:16).

(4.) Tychicus, the bearer of the letters to the Colossians, had been dispatched from Rome before this epistle to Timothy was written (2Ti 4:12).

(5.) At the time the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon were written, Aristarchus was with Paul; by the time this was written, Aristarchus had left Paul (2Ti 4:11). All these circumstances forbid our supposing that this Second Epistle to Timothy was written before the epistles above named; that is, in the early part of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome.

Shall we then, assign the epistle to a later period of that same imprisonment? Against this also lie difficulties. Before we can admit it, we must suppose that Timothy and Mark, who did not accompany Paul to Rome bad shortly after followed him thither, and, after remaining awhile, left Paul, and were again requested by him in this epistle to return; that during the interval of their absence from Rome, Paul's first trial had occurred; and that, yet even before he had so much as appeared before his judges, he had written to his friends in terms intimating his fill confidence of a speedy release (Php 1:25; Php 2:24; Phm 1:22). These circumstances may perhaps admit of explanation; but there are others which seem to present insuperable difficulties in the way of the supposition that this epistle was written at any period of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome.

(1.) Paul's imprisonment, of which we have an account in the Acts, was of a much milder kind than that in which he was at the time he wrote this  epistle. In the former case, he was permitted to lodge in his own hired house, and to receive all who came to him, being guarded only by a single soldier; in the latter, he was in such close confinement that Onesiphorus had no small difficulty in finding him; he was chained, he suffered evil even unto bonds as a malefactor, his friends had mostly deserted him, and he had narrowly escaped destruction from the Roman tyrant (Act 1:16-18; Act 2:9; Act 4:6-8; Act 4:18).

(2.) In 2Ti 4:13 he requests Timothy to bring with him from Troas some books, parchments, etc. which he had left at that place. If we suppose the visit here referred to the same as that mentioned in Act 20:5-7, we must conclude that these documents had been allowed by the apostle to lie at Troas for a space of at least years, as that length of time elapsed between the visit to Troas, mentioned by Luke, and Paul's first imprisonment at Rome. This is surely very unlikely, as the documents were plainly of value to the apostle; and if by φαιλόνης, in this passage, he meant a cloak or mantle, the leaving of it for so long a time unused then it might have been of service, and the sending so anxiously for it when it could be of little or none, as the apostle's time of departure was at hand, must be allowed to be not a little improbable.

(3.) In 2Ti 4:20 Paul speaks of having left Trophimus sick at Miletus. Now this could not have been on the occasion referred to in Act 20:15, for subsequent to that Trophimus was with Paul at Jerusalem (Act 21:29). It follows that Paul must have visited Miletus at a subsequent period; but he did not visit it on his way from Jerusalem to Rome on the occasion of his first imprisonment, and this, therefore, strongly favors the hypothesis of a journey subsequent to that event, and immediately antecedent to the writing of this epistle. The attempt to ‘enfeeble the force of this by translating ἀπέλιπον, “they left,” etc., and understanding it of messengers from Ephesus coming to visit Paul, is ingenious, but, can hardly be admitted, as no sound interpreter would forcibly supply a subject to a verb where the context itself naturally supplies one. (4.) In 4:20, the apostle says “Erastus abode in Corinth.” Such language implies that shortly before writing this epistle the apostle had been at Corinth, where he left Erastus. But before his first imprisonment Paul had not been at Corinth for several years, and during the interval Timothy had been with him, so that he did not need to write to him at a later period about that visit (Act 20:4). Hug contends that ἔμεινε simply expresses the fact that Erastus was then residing at Corinth,  without necessarily implying that Paul had left him there; but would the apostle in this case have used the aorist?

3. It thus appears that the number of special names and incidents in the second epistle make the chronological data more numerous. We propose here, by way of summary, and in part recapitulation, to bring them, as far as possible, together, noticing briefly with what other facts each connects itself, and to what conclusion it leads as to the conflicting theories of an earlier and later date, (A) during the imprisonment of Act 28:30, and (B) during the second imprisonment already spoken of.

(1.) A parting apparently recent, under circumstances of special sorrow (2Ti 1:4)-not decisive. The scene at Miletus (Act 20:37) suggests itself, if we assume A. The parting referred to in 1Ti 1:3 might meet B.

(2.) A general desertion of the apostle even by the disciples of Asia (2Ti 1:15). Nothing in the Acts indicates anything like this before the imprisonment of Act 28:30. Everything in Acts 19, 20 :and not less the language of the Epistle to the Ephesians, speaks of general and strong affection. This, therefore, so far as it goes, must be placed on the side of B.

(3.) The position of Paul as suffering (2Ti 1:12), in bonds (2Ti 2:9), expecting “the time of his departure” (2Ti 4:6), forsaken by almost all (2Ti 4:16)-not quite decisive, but tending to B rather than A. The language of the epistles belonging to the first imprisonment imply, it is true, bonds (Php 1:13; Php 1:16; Eph 3:1; Eph 6:20), and in all of them the apostle is surrounded by many friends, and is hopeful and confident of release (Php 1:25; Phm 1:22).

(4.) The mention of Onesiphorns, and of services rendered by him both at Rome and Ephesus (2Ti 1:16-18) — not decisive again, but the tone is rather that of a man looking back on a past period of his life, and tile order of the names suggests the thought of the ministrations at Ephesus being subsequent to those at Rome. Possibly, too, the mention of “the household,” instead of Oinesiphorns himself, may imply his death in the interval. This, therefore, tends to B rather than A.

(5.) The abandonment of Paul by Demas (2Ti 4:10)-strongly in favor of B. Demas was with the apostle when the epistles to the Colossians (Col 4:14) and Philemon (24) were written. 2 Timothy must  therefore, in all probability, have been written after them; but if we place it anywhere in the first imprisonment, we are all but compelled, by the mention of Mark, for whose coming the apostle asks in 2Ti 4:11, and who is with him in Col 4:10, to place it at an earlier age. The above qualifying words (“all but” ) might have been omitted but for the fact that it has been suggested that Demas, having forsaken Paul, repented and returned (Larduer, 6:368).

(6.) The presence of Luke (Luk 4:11) agrees well enough with A (Col 4:14), but is perfectly compatible with B.

(7.) The request that Timothy would bring Mark (Mar 4:11) seems at first, compared as above with Col 4:14, to support A, but, in connection with the mention of Demas, tends decidedly to B.

(8.) Mention of Tychicus as sent to Ephesus (4:12) appears, as connected with Eph 6:21-22; Col 4:7, in favor of A, yet, as Tychicus was continually employed on special missions of this kind, may just as well fit in with B.

(9.) The request that Timothy would bring the cloak and books left at Troais (2Ti 4:13). On the assumption of A, the last visit of Paul to Troas would have been at least four or five years before, during which there would probably have been opportunities enough for his regaining what he had left. In that case, too, the circumstances of the journey present no trace of the haste and suddenness which the request more than half implies. On the whole, then, this must be reckoned as in favor of B.

(10.) “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil,” “greatly withstood our words” (2Ti 4:14-15). The part taken by a Jew of this name in the uproar of Acts 19, and the natural connection of the χαλκεύς with the artisans represented by Demnetrius, suggest a reference to that event as something recent, and so far support A., On the other hand, the name Alexander was too common to make us certain as to the identity and if it were the same, the hypothesis of a later date only requires us to assume what was probable enough, a renewed hostility.

(11.) The abandonment of the apostle in his first defense (ἀπολογία), and his deliverance “from the mouth of the lion” (2Ti 4:16-17) fits in as a possible contingency with cither hypothesis, but, like the mention of  Demas in (5), must belong, at any rate, to a time much later than any of the other epistles written from Rome.

(12.) “Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick” (2Ti 4:20) language, as in (9), implying a comparatively recent visit to both places. If, however, the letter were written during the first imprisonment, then Trophimus had not been left; at Miletus, but had gone on with Paul to Jerusalem (Act 21:29), and the mention of Erastus as remaining at Corinth would have been superfluous to one who had left that city at the same time as the apostle (Act 20:4). The conjecture that the “leaving” referred to took place during the voyage of Acts 27 is purely arbitrary, and at variance with Act 27:5-6 of that chapter.

(13.) “Hasten to come before winter” Assuming A, the presence of Timothy in Php 1:1; Col 1:1; Phm 1:1 might be regarded as the consequence of this; but then, as shown in (5) and (6), there are almost insuperable difficulties in supposing this epistle to have been written before those three.

(14.) The salutations from Eubulus, Pudens, Lin's, and Claudia. Without laying much stress on this, it may be said that the absence of these names from all the epistles, which, according to A, belong to the same period, would be difficult to explain. B leaves it open to conjecture that they were converts of more recent date. They are mentioned, too, as knowing Timothy, and this implies, is at least probable, that lie had already been at Rome, and that this letter to him was consequently later than those to the Philippians and Colossians.

On the whole, it is believed that the evidence preponderates strongly in favor of the later date, and that the epistle if we admit its genuineness, is therefore a strong argument for believing that the imprisonment of Acts 28 was followed by a period, first of renewed activity, and then of suffering.

II. Place. —On this point the second epistle is free from the conflict of conjectures. With the solitary exception of Böttger, who suggests Caesarea, there is a consensus in favor of Rome, and everything in the circumstances and names of the epistle leads to the same conclusion. We may suppose that Paul was apprehended at Nicopolis (1Ti 3:12), and thence conveyed to Rome, where this epistle was written, shortly before his death. Where Timothy was at the time it is impossible to say; most probably at Ephesus.

III. Object and Contents. —The design of the second epistle is partly to inform Timothy of the apostle's trying circumstances at Rome, and partly to utter a last warning voice against the errors and delusions, which were corrupting and disturbing the churches.

It consists of an inscription (1Ti 1:1-5); of a series of exhortations to Timothy, to be faithful in his zeal for sound doctrine, patient under affliction: and persecution, careful to maintain a deportment becoming his office, and diligent in his endeavors to counteract the unhallowed efforts of the false teachers (1Ti 1:6; 1Ti 4:8); and. a conclusion in which Paul requests Timothy to visit him, and sends the salutations of certain Christians at Rome to Timothy, and those of the apostle himself to some believers in Asia Minor.

IV. Commentaries. —The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole of the second epistle exclusively: Barlow, Exposition (Lond. 1624, 4to; 1632, fol.); Hall, Commentary [on ch. 3 and 4] (ibid. 1658, fol.); Feufking, Illusiratio [includ. 2 and 3 John] (Vitemb. 1705, fol.); Brockner, Commentarius (Hafn. 1829, 8vo). SEE EPISTLE.

## Tin[[@Headword:Tin]]

             (בְּדַיל, bedil, from בָּדִל, to divide; so called apparently from its separation as an alloy [Isaiah 1, 25]; Seplt κασσίτερος; Vlg. stannum), Among the various metals found among the spoils of the Midianites, tin is enumerated (Num 31:22); It. was known to the Hebrew metal- workers as an alloy of other metals (Isa 1:25; Eze 22:18; Eze 22:20). The markets of Tyre were supplied with it by the ships of Tarshish (Eze 27:12). It was used for plummets (Zec 4:10, marg. “stone of tin,” as the Heb. is), and was so plentiful as to furnish the writer of Ecclesiasticus (47:18) with a figure by which to express the wealth of Solomon, whom he apostrophizes thus: “Thou didst gather gold as tin, and didst multiply silver as lead.”

In the Homeric times the Greeks were familiar with it. Twenty lavers of tin were in Agamemnon's cuirass given him by Cinyres (Homer, II. 11:25), and twenty bosses of tin were upon his shield (ibid. 11:34). Copper, tin, and gold were used by Hephtestus in welding the famous shield of Achilles (ibid. 18:474). The fence ‘round the vineyard in the device upon it was of tin (ibid. 564), and the oxen were wrought of tin and gold (ibid. 574). -The  greaves of Achilles, made by Hephbestus, were of tin beaten fine, close fitting to the limb (ibid. 612; 21:592). His shield had two folds, or layers, of tin between two outer layers of bronze and inner layer of gold (ibid. 20:271). Tin was used in ornamenting chariots (ibid. 23:503), and a cuirass f bronze overlaid with tin is mentioned (ibid. 561). No allusion to it is found in the Odyssey. The melting of tin in a smelting-pot is mentioned by Hesiod (Theol. 862).

Tin is not found in Palestine (Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. ch. 3, p. 73). Whence, then, did the ancient Hebrews obtain their supply ? “Only three countries are known to contain any considerable quantity of it: Spain and Portugal, Cornwall and the adjacent parts of Devonshire, and the islands of Junk, Ceylon, and Banca, in the Straits of Malacca” (Kenrick, Phoenicia, p. 212). According to Diodorus Siculus (5, 46), there were tin mines in the island of Panchaia, off the east coast of Arabia, but the metal was not exported. There can be little doubt that the mines of Britain were the chief source of supply to the ancient world. Mr. Cooley, indeed, writes very positively (Maritime and Inland Discovery, 1, 131), “There can be no difficulty in determining the country from which tin first arrived in Egypt. That metal has been in all ages a principal export of India; it is enumerated as such by Arrian, who found it abundant in the ports of Arabia at a time when the supplies of Rome flowed chiefly through that channel. The tin- mines of Banca are probably the richest in the world; but tin was unquestionably brought from the West at a later period.” But it has been shown conclusively by Dr. George Smith (The Cassiferides, Lond. 1863) that, so far from such a statement being justified by tile authority of Arrian, the facts are all the other way. After examining the commerce of the ports of Abyssinia, Arabia, and India, it is abundantly evident that, “instead of its coming, from the East to Egypt; it has invariably been exported from Egypt to the East” (p. 23). With regard to the tin obtained from Spain, although the metal was found there, it does not appear to have been produced in sufficient quantities to supply the Phoenician markets. Posidonius (in Strabo, 3, 147) relates that in the country of the Artabri, in the extreme north-west of the peninsula, the ground was bright with silver, tin, and white gold (mixed with silver), which were brought down by the rivers; but the quantity thus obtained could not have been adequate to the demand. At the present day the whole surface bored for mining in Spain is little more than a square mile (Smith, Cassiterides, p. 46). We are therefore driven to conclude that it was from the Cassiterides, or tin districts of Britain, that  the Phoenicians obtained the great bulk of this commodity (Lewis, Hist. Survey of the Astr. of the Anc. p. 451), and that this was done by the direct voyage from Gades. It is true that at a later period (Strabo, 3. 147) tin was conveyed overland to Marseilles by a thirty days journey (Diod. Sic. 5, 2); but Strabo (3, 175) tells us that the Phoenicians alone carried on this traffic in former times from Gades concealing the passage from every one; and that on one occasion, when the Romans followed one of their vessels in order to discover the source of supply, the master of the ship ran upon a shoal, leading those who followed him to destruction. In course of time, however, the Romans discovered the passage. In Ezekiel,” the trade in tin is attributed to Tarshish, as ‘the merchant' for the commodity, without any mention of the place whence it was procured” (Cassiterides, p. 74); and it is after the time of Julius Caesar that we first hear of the overland traffic by Marseilles.

Pliny (6, 36) identifies the cassiteros of the Greeks with the plumbum album or candidum of the Romans, which is our tin. Stamnum, he says, is obtained from an ore containing lead and silver, and is the first to become melted in the furnace. The etymology of cassiteros is uncertain; but it is doubtless the same as the Arabic term kasdir. From the fact that in Sanskrit kasti-ra signifies “tin,” ‘an argument has been derived in favor of India being the source of the ancient supply of this metal, but too much'stress must not be laid upon it. SEE LEAD. The name of some metal has been read in the Egyptian sculptures as khasit, which may refer to “tin.” The Hebrew word refers to its principal use. in making bronze, which was the case at a very remote period of Egyptian history. A bronze, apparently cast, has been found bearing the name of Pharaoh Pepi of the sixth dynasty, who reigned certainly five centuries before the Exode. In Egypt and Assyria bronze was generally made of ten or twenty parts of tin to eighty or ninety of copper, and there appear to have been the same proportions in Grecian and Roman manufactures of a later age. Wilkinson supposes that the beautiful articles of workmanship frequently found in England, which have neither a Greek nor a Roman type, were probably first introduced by this trade. One specimen of manufactured tin, now in the Truro Muscum, has been discovered in England, which, as it differs from those made by the Romans, is supposed to be of Phoenician origin. It is nearly three feet long by one broad, and three inches high (Anc. Egyptimans, 2, 134 sq.). SEE METAL.

## Tinction[[@Headword:Tinction]]

             a name applied, in the early Church. to the rite of baptism.

## Tindal (l), Matthew[[@Headword:Tindal (l), Matthew]]

             one of the successors of Toland and Shaftsbury in the school of English deists or freethinkers, was born at Beer-Ferrers, in Devonshire, about 1657. He was educated at Lincoln and Exeter colleges, Oxford; took his A.B. in 1676 shortly after was elected fellow of All-Souls, and was admitted doctor of laws at Oxford in 1685. He retained his fellowship during the reign of James II by professing the Roman Catholic faith; he afterwards recanted, however, and, adopting revolutionary principles, went to the other extreme, and wrote against the nonjurors. He now became an advocate and sat as judge in the court of delegates, with a pension from the crown of £200 per annum. Some time afterwards, considerable attention was drawn to him by his work entitled The Rights of the Christian Church (1706-7, 8vo), and the ensuing controversy; but the production which has rendered his name a memorable one was his Christianity as Old as the Creation (1730), which provoked replies from Dr. Warburton, Leland, Foster, and Conybeare. Dr. Middleton endeavored to take a middle course in this controversy, as may be seen in that article, but the most effective answer, though its very existence seems to have been forgotten, was that embodied in the Appeal of William Law, published in 1740. Tindal's line of argument was mainly coincident with Shaftsbury's, that the immutable principles of faith and duty must be found within the breast, and that -no external revelation can have any authority equal to the internal this he supported by much learning and show of argument, to which Warburton thought he.had replied by the mass of learned evidence contained in his Legation. William Law, making no account of literary evidence, replied by his masterly development of the philosophy of the fall and final recovery of mankind; a book remarkable for close argument, and for its many fine illustrations, but now obsolete in certain fundamental principles. Tindal died in London, Aug. 16, 1733, and was interred in Clerkenwell Church. Mr. Tindal also wrote, An Essay concerning the Power of the Magistrate and the Rights of Mankind in Matters (Religion (Lond. 1697, 8vo): —A Defense of the Rights of the Christian Church (ibid. 1709, 2 pts. 8N.o): — The Nation Vindicated (ibid. 1711; pt. 2, 1712): —War with Priestcraft, or the Freethinker's Iliad (ibid. 1732, 8vo), a burlesque poem.

## Tindal (l), Nicholas[[@Headword:Tindal (l), Nicholas]]

             nephew of the preceding, was born in Devonshire in 1687; graduated A.M. from Exeter College in 1713, and was chosen fellow of Trinity College. He entered holy orders and became vicar of Great Waltham, Essex, and rector of Alverstoke, Hampshire. In 1740 he obtained the living of Colbourne, Isle of Wight, and soon after became chaplain of Greenwich Hospital. He died 3 1744. Among his works are, A Guide to Classical Learning (Lond. 1765, 12mo): a translation of Rapin's History of England, with a Continuation from 1688 to the Accession of George II (1744-47, in weekly Nos.): —Antiquities, Sacred and Profane (Lond. 1727, 4to; in Nos., never completed), vol. 1. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Tindale, William[[@Headword:Tindale, William]]

             SEE TYNDALE, WILLIAM.

## Tingstad, Johan Adolph[[@Headword:Tingstad, Johan Adolph]]

             a Protestant divine, doctor of theology, and bishop of Strengnias, in Sweden, where he died Dec. 10, 1827, is the author of De Ortu et Cognitione Linguarmmu Orientalium (Greifswalde, 1768): Animadversiones Philologicae et Criticae ad Vaticiniumm Jabacuci (Upsala, 1795): —Supplementoruma ad Lexica Hebr. Specimina Academica (ibid. 1803): —De oolfsmarre Skriftero af gamla Testaments Propheter (Strengnas, 1813): —Klagsnger of Prophet Jeremia (ibid. 1820): Psaltaren Profifversattn. (3rd ed. ibid. 1813): —Philol. Amarkninge of er stradda Stallen gamla Test. Grundsprak (ibid. 1824). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 123, 229; 2, 804; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 432; Steinschneider, Bibliograph. Handbuch, No. 2011 (Leips. 1859). (B. P.)

## Tinker, Reuben[[@Headword:Tinker, Reuben]]

             a missionary of the Presbyterian Church; was born at Chester, Mass., Aug. 6, 1799. He received a good preparatory education; graduated at Amherst College in 1827, and at the Auburn Theological Seminary in 1830; and in November of the same ear was ordained by the Mountain Association, with a view to his becoming a missionary of the American Board at the Sandwich Islands. He reached the islands at a somewhat critical period,  but, in spite of all existing difficulties, the cause of the Gospel was rapidly advancing. In 1834 it was resolved to publish; in the native language, a semi-monthly newspaper devoted to the interests of religion, and he was appointed to conduct it. In 1838 he dissolved his relations with the board, and established himself, with the approval of his brethren, at Koloa, on the island of Kani, where he labored until he departed for his own country in 1840. In September, 1845, hue was installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Westfield, Chautauqua Co., N.Y., where he continued to labor till near the close of his life. He died Oct. 26, 1854. Mr. Tinker was an eloquent preacher, a self-sacrificing missionary, and a fast and firm friend. After his death appeared Sermones by Rev. Reuben Tinker, Missionary at the Sandwich Islands; with a Biographical Sketch by M. L. P. Thompson, D.D. (Buffalo,1856,12mo). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:770; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J.L.S.)

## Tinne (or Chippewayan) Version[[@Headword:Tinne (or Chippewayan) Version]]

             This-language is quite different from that which is called Chippeway or Ojibbeway; it is spoken in the Hudson's Bay Territory, near Fort Simpson, and over a vast tract of country eastward of the Rocky Mountains. T he Rev. W. W. Kirkby, of the Church Missionary Society, has translated the gospels according to Mark and John, which have been printed in the syllabic character, and circulated among those for whom they were designed since 1870. (B. P.)

## Tinshemeth[[@Headword:Tinshemeth]]

             SEE MOLE; SEE SWAN.

## Tintoretto, II, Or Giacomo Robusti[[@Headword:Tintoretto, II, Or Giacomo Robusti]]

             a distinguished Italian painter, was born at Venice, according to Ridolfi, in 1512. After being instructed in the rudiments of design, he became a pupil of Titian, with whom he studied for a short time only; it being generally stated that Titian dismissed him, being jealous of his talents and progress. He was not discouraged, but resolved to become the head of a new school. Over his door he wrote, “Michael Angelo's design, and the coloring of Titian.” He made a special study of light and shade, and of the human form both by living models and by anatomy. Though he possessed many excellences, his sovereign merit consisted in the animation of his figures.  He flourished for a long period, and retained his powers to a great age, dying at Venice in 1594. His three greatest pictures, according to his own estimate and that of others, are, The Crucifixion, in the College of San Rocco; The Last Supper, now in the Church of Santa Maria della Salute; and 11 Servo, or the Venetian Slave, condemned to martyrdom by the Turks, invoking the protection of St. Mark. Some of his works are of enormous size, the Crucifixion being forty feet long, the Israelites worshipping the Golden Calf and the Last Judgment each about sixty feet high. One of his last productions was his Paradiso, in the hall of the great council chamber of San Marco. Tintoretto wrought so fast, and at so low a price, that few of the other painters in Venice could secure employment. The churches and halls of the different communities are overloaded with his productions. See Spooner, Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Tipelskirch, Friedrich[[@Headword:Tipelskirch, Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian; was born at Konigsberg, March 5,1802. For a number of years he acted as chaplain to the Prussian ambassador in -Rome, was in 1837 called to Giebichenstein, near Halle, and died in the year 1866. He published sermons and other writings, for which see Zuchold, Biblioth. Theol. 2, 1341; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 106, 804; Hauck, Theolog. Jahresberichf, 3, 602. (B. P.)

## Tiphsah[[@Headword:Tiphsah]]

             (Heb. Tiphscch', תַּפְסִח, from פָּסִח, to ford, this being the usual crossing- place of the ELuphrates [Strabo, 16:1, 21]; Sept. θαψσά v.r. θερσά; Vulg. Thaphsa, Thapsa) is mentioned in 1Ki 4:24 as the limit. of Solomon's empire towards the Euphrates, and in 2Ki 15:16 it is said to have been attacked by Menahem, king of Israel, who “smote Tiphsah and all that were therein, and all the coasts thereof.” It is generally admitted that the town intended, at any rate in the former passage, is that which the Greeks and Romans knew under the name of Thapsacus (θάψακος), situated in Northern Syria, on the western bank of the Euphrates, not far above Carchemish. Thapsacus was a town of considerable importance in the ancient world. Xenophon, who saw it in the time of Cyrus the younger, calls it “great and prosperous” (μεγάλη καὶ εὐδαίμων, Anab. 1; 4, 11). It must have been a place of considerable trade, the land traffic between East and West passing through it, first on account of its ford-way (which was the lowest upon the Euphrates), and then on account of its bridge (Strabo, 16:1, 23); while it was likewise the point where goods were both embarked for transport down the stream (Q. Curt. 10:1), and also disembarked from boats which had come up it, to be conveyed on to their final destination by land (Strabo, 16:3, 4). It is a fair conjecture that Solomon's occupation of the place was connected with his efforts to establish a line of trade with Central Asia directly across the continent, and that Tadmor was intended as a resting-place on the journey to Thapsacus. Thapsacus was the place at which armies marching east or  west usually crossed the “Great River.” It was there that the Ten Thousand first learned the real intentions of Cyrus, and, consenting to aid him in his enterprise, passed the stream (Xenoph. Anab. 1, 4, 11). ‘There, too, Darius Codomannus crossed on his flight from Issus (Arrian, Exp. A l. 2, 13); and Alexander, following at his leisure, made his passage at the same point (ibid. 3 7). A bridge of boats was usually maintained at the place by the Persian kings, which of course was broken up when danger threatened. Even then, however, the stream could in general be forded, unless in the flood season. This is clear from the very name of the place, and is confirmed by modern researches. When the natives told Cyrus that the stream had acknowledged him as its king, having never been forded until his army waded through it, they calculated on his ignorance, or thought he would not examine too strictly into the groundwork of a compliment (see Xenoph. Anab. 1, 4, 11). When Greek ascendancy and enterprise succeeded to Persian rule, Thapsacus rose into still greater importance, and embraced both sides of the river-whence it received the name of Amphipolis (Pliny, 5, 21).

It has generally been supposed that the site of Thapsacus was the modern Deir (D'Anville, Rennell, Vaux, etc.). But the Euphrates expedition proved that there is no ford at Deir, and, indeed, showed that the only ford in this part of the course of the Euphrates is at Suriyeh, 45 miles below Balls, and 165 above Deir (Ainsworth, Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand, p. 70). This, then, must have been the position of Thapsacus. Here the river is exactly of the width mentioned by Xenophon (four stades, or eight hundred yards), and here for four months in the winter of 1841-42 the river had but twenty inches of water (ibid. p. 72). “The Euphrates is at this spot full of beauty and majesty. Its stream is wide and its waters generally clear and blue. Its banks are low and level to the left, but undulate gently to the right. Previous to arriving at this point, the course of the river is southerly, but here it turns to the east, expanding more like an inland lake than a river, and quitting (as Pliny has described it) the Palmyrean solitudes for the fertile Mygdonia” (ibid.). A paved causeway is visible on either side of the Euphrates at Suriyeh, and a long line of mounds may be traced, disposed, something like those of Nineveh, in the form of an irregular parallelogram. These mounds probably mark the site of the ancient city.

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

             (2Ki 15:16) is thought by Lieut. Conder'( (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:169) to be (different from that of 1Ki 4:24) the present Khurbet Tafsulh, six miles south-west of Shechem (Nablus), and described (ibid. p. 198) as "a small ruined village in gardens, appears to be modern."

## Tippet[[@Headword:Tippet]]

             (Lat. Liripipium), a narrow garment or covering for the neck and shoulders; a kind of hood worn over the shoulders, which was fastened round the neck by a long pendent appendage called the liripoop. This latter portion was generally dropped during the 16th century, and only the hood was worn. The liripoop lingers in the hat-band, and is used at funerals. The tippet of the almuce had rounded ends, to distinguish it from the squared terminations of the stole; they were worn hanging down in front by canons, but by monks behind, by way of distinction. The tippets disappeared from the hood in the time of Henry VII. The manner of wearing the modern hood or the literate's tippet over the back, depending from the neck by a ribbon, is a corruption, and a practice eminently unmeaning. See Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.; Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.

## Tipstaff[[@Headword:Tipstaff]]

             an officer of the Court of Queen's Bench, attending the judges, with a wand or staff of office tipped with silver, to take prisoners into custody. A similar officer was attached to the ancient Star-chamber Court.

## Tira[[@Headword:Tira]]

             is the name for a Buddhist temple in Japan. It is usually built on rising ground, constructed of the best cedars and firs, and adorned within with many carved images. In the middle of the temple stands an altar with one or more gilt idols upon it, and a beautiful candlestick with perfumed candles burning before it. Kimpfer says, “The whole empire is full of these temples, and their priests are without number. In and about Miako alone there are 3893 temples, and 37,093 siukku, or priests.”

## Tiras[[@Headword:Tiras]]

             (Heb. Tiras', תַּיֹרָס, Sept. θείρας;Vulg. Thisras), the youngest son of Japheth (Genesis 10, 2). B.C. 2514. As the name occurs only in the ethnological table, we have no clue, so far as the Bible is concerned, to guide us as to the identification of it with any particular people. Ancient authorities generally fixed on the Thracians, as presenting the closest verbal approximation to the name (Josephus, Ant. 1, 6, 1; Jerome, in Gen 10:2; Targums Pseudo-Jon. and Jerus on Genesis loc. cit.; Targ. on 1Ch 1:5); the occasional rendering Persia probably originated in a corruption of the original text. The correspondence between Thrace and Tiras is not so complete as to be convincing; the gentile form θρᾶξ, however, brings them nearer together. No objection arises on ethnological grounds to placing the Thracians among the Japhetic races (Bochart, Phaleg, 3, 2; Michaelis, Spicileg. 1, 55 sq.). Their precise ethnic position is, indeed, involved in great uncertainty; but all authorities agree in their general Indo European character. The evidence of this is circumstantial rather than direct. The language has disappeared, with the exception of the ancient names and the single word bria, which forms the termination of Mesembria, Selymbria, etc., and is said to signify “town” (Strabo, 7:319).

The Thracian stock was represented in later times by the Getae, and these, again, still later, by the Daci, each of whom inherited the old Thracian tongue (ibid. 303). But this circumstance throws little light on the subject; for the Dacian language has also disappeared, though fragments of its vocabulary may possibly exist either in Wallachian dialects or perhaps in the Albanian language (Diefenbach, Or. Eur. p. 68). If Grimm's identification of the Getae with the Goths were established, the Teutonic affinities of the Thracians would be placed beyond question (Gesch. d. deutsch. Spr. 1, 178); but this view does hot meet with general acceptance. The Thracians are associated in ancient history with the Pelasgians (Strabo, 9:401), and the Trojans, with whom they had many names in common (ibid. 13:590); in Asia Minor they were represented by the Bithnians (Herod. 1, 28; 7:75). These circumstances lead to the conclusion that they belonged to the Indo-European family, but do not warrant us in assigning them to any particular branch of it. Other explanations have been offered of the name Tiras, of which we may notice the Agathyyrsi, the first part of the name (Aga) being treated as a prefix (Knobel, Völkertafel, p. 129); Taurus and the various tribes occupying that range (Kalisch, Comm. p. 246); the river. Tyras (Dniester), with its  cogominous inhabitants the Tyritf (Havernick, Einleit. 2, 231; Schulthess, Prad. p. 194); and, lastly, the maritime Tyrrheni (Tuch, in Genesis loc. cit.). SEE ETHNOGRAPHY.

## Tirathite[[@Headword:Tirathite]]

             (Heb. Tirati', תָּרְעְתְּי, patrial from some unknown תַּרָעָה, Tirandh [a gate (Gesenius) or fissure (Fürst)]; Sept. Α᾿ργαθιείμ v.r. θαργαθιίμ and Ταθείμ ; Vulg. canentes), the designation of one of the three families of Scribes residing at Jabez (1 Chronicles 2, 55), the others being the Shimeathites and Suchathites. The passage is hopelessly obscure, and it is perhaps impossible to discover whence these three families derived their names. The Jewish commentators, playing with the names in true Shemitic fashion, interpret them thus, “They called them Tirathim, because their voices when they sang resounded loud (תְּרִע); and Shimeathites because they made themselves heard (שָׁמִע) in reading the law.”

## Tire[[@Headword:Tire]]

             (an old English word for dressing the head, see Plumptre, Bible Educator, 4:211) is used (both as a verb and a noun) to translate, in the A. V., three Hebrew words and one Greek: יָטִב(in Hiph.), to make good, i.e. ornament, sc. the head (2Ki 9:30); פְּאֵר, peer (Eze 24:23), a turban (“bonnet,” etc.); שִׂהֲרון, saharon (Isa 3:18), crescents (“ornament,” Judges 7:21, 26); , μτίρα (Jdg 10:3; Jdg 16:8), a miter or head-band. SEE HEAD-DRESS. The third of these terms probably represents a pendent disk, worn by women on the head, and similar articles are still hung on camels necks among the Arabs. “The kamarah (moon) is an ornament formed of a thin plate of gold, embossed with fanciful work or Arabic words, and having about seven little flat pieces of gold called bark attached to the lower part; or it is composed of gold with diamonds, rubies,” etc. (Lane, Mod. Egypt. 2, 401). Lieut. Conder thinks that the “round tires like the moon” of Isaiah were like the strings of coin, which form part of the head-dress of the modern Samaritan women (Tent-Work in Palest. 2, 244). SEE ORNAMENT.

## Tirhakah[[@Headword:Tirhakah]]

             [many Tirshakah] (Heb. Tirha'kah, תּרְהָקָה, of Ethiopic derivation; Sept. θαρακά v.r. θαραθά and θαρά ; Vulg. Tharaca), a king of Cush (Sept. βασιλεὺς Αἰθιόπων, A.V. “king of Ethiopia” ), the opponent of Sennacherib (2Ki 19:9; Isa 37:9). While the king of Assyria was “warring against Libnah,” in the south of Palestine, he heard of Tirhakah's advance to fight him, and sent a second time to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. This was near the close of B.C. 713, unless we suppose that the expedition took place in the twenty-fourth instead of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, which would bring it to B.C. 703. If it were an expedition later than that of which the date is mentioned, it must have been before B.C. 697, Hezekiah's last year. But, if the reign of Manasseh is reduced to thirty-five years, these dates would be respectively B.C. cir. 693, 683, and 678, and these numbers might have to be slightly modified if the fixed date of the capture of Samaria, B.C. 720, be abandoned. SEE HEZEKIAH.

Wilkinson supposes (1, 138) that Tirh'kah occupied the throne of Egypt from B.C. 710 to 689. Rawlinson gives the date B.C. 690 (Hersod. 1, 392). Dr. Hincks, in an elaborate article, argues for this latter date, and: supposes Tirh'kah, after a reign over Egypt of twenty-six years, to have retired to Ethiopia B.C. 664 (Journ. of Sac. Lit. Jan. 1864). SEE CIHRONOLOGY.

According to Manetho's epitomists, Tarakos (Ταρακός), or Tarkos (Ταρκός), was the third and last king of the XXVth dynasty, which was of Ethiopians, and reigned eighteen (Afr.) or twenty (Eus.) years. From one of the Apis-Tablets we learn that a bull Apis was born in his twenty-sixth year and died at the end of the twentieth of Psammetichus I of the XXVIth dynasty. Its life exceeded twenty years, and no Apis is stated to have lived longer than twenty-six. Taking that sum as the most probable, we should date Tirh'kah's accession B.C. cir. 695, and assign him a reign of twenty-six years. In this case we should be obliged to take the later reckoning of the Biblical events, were it not for the possibility that Tirh'kah ruled over Ethiopia before becoming king of Egypt. In connection with this theory it must be observed that an earlier Ethiopian of the same dynasty is called in the Bible “So, king of Egypt,” while this ruler is called Tirh'kah, king of Ethiopia,” and that a Pharaoh is spoken of in Scripture at the period of the latter, and also that Herodotus (3, 141) represents the Egyptian opponent of Sennacherib as Sethos, a native king,  who may, however, have been a vassal under the Ethiopian. See So. It is deserving of remark, and strongly favors the view of those writers who maintain that during considerable periods Ethiopian dynasties ruled in Egypt, that from the time of Shishak to that of Tirh'kah it is of Ethiopians that we read in Scripture as having mainly furnished the hosts which marched to battle out of Egypt. While Shishak is called king of Egypt, his army is declared to have been composed, not of Egyptians, but of Lubims and Sukkims and Ethiopians (2Ch 12:3). We subsequently read of Zerah the Ethiopian leading an army of Ethiopians and Lubims against Asa (2Ch 16:8).

We now find that while Pharaoh of Egypt may have made great promises, it is the Ethiopian king Tirh'kah who alone brings an army into the field. In the reign of Pharaoh-necho, the Egyptian army seems to have been mainly composed of Ethiopians and Libyans (Jer 46:9). The natural inference is that, during this long period, the military power of Egypt was at a low ebb. At the time we are now speaking of, Rawlinson supposes Egypt to have been subject to Ethiopia (Hierod. 1, 391). In this he is not quite correct, however. Egypt may have been inferior to it in strength and spirit, but it was, at least, nominally independent at this time, though it may have fallen soon after under the power of the Ethiopian king. That Tirh'kah was actually king of Egypt at some time is strongly maintained. There is nothing in Scripture to prevent our supposing that he became so subsequent to the period when it speaks of him. Indeed, in the position in which it places him, at the head of a large army in Egypt, with no Assyrian enemy to dread, it pictures a situation which would tempt an ambitious soldier to extend his power by dethroning an effeminate or irresolute monarch, such as the Pharaoh of his time would seem to have been. Wilkinson (1, 138-142) supposes that he at first ruled over Upper Egypt, while Sethos held the sovereignty of the lower country; that he came to the Egyptian throne rather by legal succession than by usurpation; and that he did actually fight against the army of Sennacherib, and overthrow it in battle. Scripture, however, expressly ascribes the overthrow of the Assyrian to the supernatural interposition of God (2Ki 19:35). Herodotus (2, 141) does not mention Tirh'kah at all, but only speaks of the king of Egypt, and mentions the overthrow of the Assyrian army very much in the way that crafty, priests might pervert tie actual occurrence as recorded in Scripture. It is quite possible that Tirh'kah may have led his army in pursuit of the Assyrians after their mysterious midnight overthrow; may have captured prisoners and treasure; and this would be quite sufficient ground for any successes ascribed to him on the  Theban sculptures. If, as is probable, he became king of all Egypt, there seems strong reason for agreeing with much, at least; of Strabo's account of him (lib. 15) as having extended his conquests into Europe.

The Assyrian power was effectually checked by the ruin of its army and the divisions of its reigning family. At the head of a great army which had come forth to fight the Assyrians, and now found itself without a foe, there is every reason why Tirh'kah may have extended the Egyptian power as far as any Egyptian king before him. If Tirh'kah did come into actual collision with the Assyrians at or near Pelusium in Egypt, as many writers maintain, it must have been upon another occasion than that mentioned in Scripture (see Josephus, Ant. 10:1, 4). It is, however, more probable that Scripture has sketched in a few words the entire matter, and that the variations from it are the effect of ignorance or design. The invasion of Assyria had probably Egypt and Ethiopia as its ultimate object, but in the account of. Scripture the Assyrian host plainly was only on its way to the accomplishment of its purpose. SEE SENNACHERIB.

The name of Tirh'kah is written in hieroglyphics Teharka (or Coptic Tarkha). His successful opposition to the power of Assyria is recorded on the walls of a Theban temple, for at Medinet Habu are the figure and the name of this king and the captives he took (Trevor, Egypt, p. 71). At Jebel Berkel, or Napata, he constructed one temple and part of another. Of the events of his reign little else is known, and the account of Megasthenes (ap. Strabo, 15:686, where he is called “Tearkon the Ethiopian,'Τεάρκων οΑ῾ἰθίοψ), that he rivaled Sesostris as a warrior and reached the Pillars of Hercules, is not supported by other evidence. It is probable that at the close of his reign he found the Assyrians too powerful, and retired to his Ethiopian dominions. See Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 1, 140 sq.; Brugsch, Hist. of Egypt, 2, 256 sq. SEE ETHIOPIA.

## Tirhanah[[@Headword:Tirhanah]]

             [many Tir'hanah] (Heb. Tirchanah', תַּרְחֲנָה, favor; Sept. θαρχανά v.r. θαράμ ; Vulg. Tharina), second named of the four sons of Caleb the Hezronite by his concubine Maachah (1Ch 2:48). B.C. apparently cir. 1618.

## Tiria[[@Headword:Tiria]]

             (Heb. Tireya. תַּירְיָא.,fear; Sept. Τιριά v.r. Τιριά ; Vulg. Thiria), third named of the four sons of Jehaleleel of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:16). BC. apparently cir. 1618.

## Tirinus, Jacob[[@Headword:Tirinus, Jacob]]

             a Jesuit, was born at Antwerp in the year 1580. In 1600 he entered the Order of the Jesuits, Was appointed professor of exegesis, superior of the Dutch Mission, and died July 14, 1636. He published, Biblia Mo-agna, cunr Commentarius Gaogneri, Estii, Menochii, et Tirini (Paris, 1643, 5 vols. fol.): —Commentarius in Sacram Scripturami, cum Chronico Sacro ac Prolegomenis de Antiquis Ponderibus et Afonetis acc de Alensuris deque Chorographia Tesrce Sanctae (Antw. 1632, 3 vols. fol.; 1645, fol.; Lyons, 1664; Venice, 1688; Augsburg, 1704). See Winer, Handb. der theol. Literatur, 1, 186, 188; 2, 804; F1irst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 432; Theol. Universal-Lex. 5. (B. P.)

## Tirones[[@Headword:Tirones]]

             (newly levied recruits), a name sometimndes given to catechumens (q.v.).

## Tironesians, or Congregation of Tiron[[@Headword:Tironesians, or Congregation of Tiron]]

             This order of monks was founded at Tiron, near Poitiers, in 1109, by Bernard d'Abbeville. SEE BERNARD OF TIRON. The first monastery was abandoned in 1114, and another built on the river Tiron. It was soon filled with monks, and before long the order had under its control sixty-five abbeys and priories and eleven parishes. Bernard required the strictest observance of the Benedictine rule; and so great was the self-denial of the monks that at times they were hardly supplied with the necessaries of life, one loaf of bread being deemed sufficient for the daily portion of four men. Notwithstanding these austerities, the number increased in three years to five hundred, and the fame of Bernard's sanctity had spread to foreign countries. Henry I of England sent the monastery an annuity of fifteen marks of silver in perpetuity, besides 560 marks yearly during his life, and built a magnificent dormitory. Tile king of France gave to it all the territory of Savigny. Thibaud de Blois presented it with two priories, and built for it an infirmary. Money and other valuable gifts were offered at its shrine. and: at the death of its founder, in: 1116, it was in a most flourishing condition.  At the time of its greatest prosperity there were under its control eleven abbeys, forty-four priories, and twenty-nine parishes, scattered over France, England, and Scotland. In 1629 the Abbey of Tiron was added to the possessions of the Congregation of St. Maur, and from that time the Tironesians ceased to exist as a separate organization. See Helyot, Ordres Religieix, 3, 674.

## Tirosh[[@Headword:Tirosh]]

             SEE WINE.

## Tirsch, Leopold[[@Headword:Tirsch, Leopold]]

             a German scholar, apparently of Jewish extraction, who lived in the 18th century, is the author of Dissertatio de Characterum Antiquacruni apud Hebrceos ante Esdram Usu (Prague, 1759): —Fundamenta Linguae Sanctae (ibid. 1766): Hand-Lexikon der jüdisch teutschen Sprache, etc. (ibid. 173): —Dissertatio de Tabernaculorum Feriis, prout olim a Judaeis gestce sunt, hodieque aguntur (ibid. 1773): —Dissertatio an Lingua Hebraica Omnium Antiuissina Primaque Habenda, etc. (ibid. 1773): — Grammatica Hebr.; accedit Syllabues Vocum Irregul. S.S. Odine Alphab. (ibid. 1784). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 432; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handb s.v. (B. P.)

## Tirshatha[[@Headword:Tirshatha]]

             [most Tir'shatha] (Heb. always with the article, hat-Tirshatha', הִתַּרַשָׁתָא; hence the Sept. gives the word Α᾿θερσασθά [4.r. Α᾿θερσαθά]. Ezr 2:63; Neh 7:65, and ‘ Α᾿ρταρσασθά, Neh 10:1; Vulg. Athersatha), the title of the governor of Judaea under the Persians, derived by Gesenius from the Persian root torsh, signifying “stern,” “severe.” He compares the title Gestrenger Herr, formerly given to the magistrates of the free and imperial cities of Germany (comp. also our expression, “most dread sovereign”). It is added as a title after the name of Nehemiah (Neh 8:9; Neh 10:1 [Hebrews 2]); and occurs also. in three other places (Ezr 2:63, and the repetition of that account in Neh 7:65-70), where probably it is intended to denote Zerubbabel, who had held the, office before Nehemiah. In the margin of the A. V. (Ezr 2:63; Neh 7:65; Neh 10:1) it is rendered “governor;” an explanation justified by Neh 12:26, where “Nehemiah the governor הִפֶּחָה(Pechah, probably from the  same root as the word we write pacha, or pasha), occurs instead of the more usual expression” Nehemiah the Tirshatha.” This word, פֶּהָה, is twice applied by Nehemiah to himself (Neh 5:14; Neh 5:18), and by the prophet Haggai (Hag 1:1; Hag 2:2; Hag 2:21) to Zerubbabel. According to Gesenius, it denotes the prefect or governor of a province of less extent than a satrapy. The word is used of officers and governors under the Assyrian (2Ki 18:24; Isa 36:9), Babylonian (Jer 51:57; Eze 23:6; Eze 23:23; see also Ezr 5:3; Ezr 5:14; Ezr 6:7; Dan 3:2-3; Dan 3:27; Dan 6:7 [Hebrews 8]), Median (Jer 51:28), and Persian (Est 8:9; Est 9:3) monarchies. Under this last we find it applied to the rulers of the provinces bordered by the Euphrates (Ezr 8:36; Neh 2:7; Neh 2:9; Neh 3:7), and to the governors of Judaea, Zerubbabel and Nehemiah (comp. Mal 1:8). It is found also at an earlier period in the times of Solomon (1Ki 10:15; 2Ch 9:14) and Benhadad king of Syria (1Ki 20:24), from which last place, compared with others (2Ki 18:24; Isa 36:9),we find that military commands were often held by these governors; the word, indeed, is often rendered by the A. V., either in the text or the margin, “captain.” By thus briefly examining the sense of Pechdh, which (though of course a much more general and less distinctive word) ‘is given as an equivalent to Tirshath'. we have no difficulty in forming an opinion as to the general notion implied in it. We have, however, no sufficient information to enable us to explain in detail in what consisted the special peculiarities in honor or functions that distinguished the Tirshatha from others of the same class, governors, captains, princes, rulers of provinces. SEE GOVERNOR.

## Tirzah[[@Headword:Tirzah]]

             (Heb. Tirtsah', תַּרְצָה, delight; Sept. θερσά v.r. [in the case of No. 2] θερσιλά and θερμα ; Vulg. Thersa), the name of a woman and also of a place. SEE CYPRESS; SEE TIZITE.

1. The last named of the five daughters of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh, whose case originated the law that in the event of a man dying without male issue his property should pass to his daughters (Num 26:33; Num 27:1; Num 36:11 [where she is named second]; Jos 17:3). SEE ZELOPHEHAI ).

2. An ancient Canaanitish city, whose king is enumerated among the twenty-one overthrown in the conquest of the country (Jos 12:24).  From that time nothing is heard of it till after the disruption of Israel and Judah. It then reappears as a royal city, the residence of Jeroboam (1Ki 14:17; Sept. Σαριφά, i.e.? Zaieda), and of his successors, Baasha (1Ki 15:21; 1Ki 15:33), Elah (1Ki 16:8-9), and Zimri (1Ki 16:15). It contained the royal sepulchers of one (1Ki 16:6), and probably all the first four kings of the northern kingdom. Zimri was besieged there by Omri, and perished in the flames of his palace (1Ki 16:18). The new king continued to reside there at first, but after six years he left it to his son Ahab (q.v.), at that time raised to the viceroyship; and removed to a new city which he built and named Shomr6n (Samaria), and which ‘continued to be the capital of the northern kingdom till its fall. Once, and once only, does Tirzah reappear, as the seat of the conspiracy of Menahem ben-Gaddi against the wretched Shallum (2Ki 15:14; 2Ki 15:16); but as soon as his revolt had proved successful, Menahem removed the seat of his government to Samaria, and Tirzah was again left inobscurity. Its reputation for beauty throughout the country must have been wide-spread. It is in this sense that it is mentioned in the Song of Solomon, where the juxtaposition of Jerusalem is sufficient proof of the estimation in which it was held — “Beautiful as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem” (Son 6:4). The Sept. (εὐδοκία) and. Vulg. (suavis ) do not, however, take tirtsah as a proper name in this passage. Its occurrence here on a level with Jerusalem has been held to indicate that the Song of Songs was the work of a writer belonging to the northern kingdom. But surely a poet, and so ardent a poet as the author of the, Song of Songs, may have been sufficiently independent of political considerations to go out of his own country if Tirzah can be said to be out of the country of a native of Judah- for a metaphor. SEE CANTICLES.

Eusebius (Onomuasf.. sv. θαρσιλά) mentions it in connection with Menahem, and identifies it with a “village of Samaritans in Batansea.” There is, however, nothing in the Bible to lead to the inference that the Tirzah of the Israelitish monarchs was on the east of Jordan. Josephus merely mentions it (θαρσή, Ant. 8:12, 5). It is nowhere stated to what tribe this town belonged; but Adrichomius (Theaf. T. S. p. 74) and others place it in Manasseh. Lightfoot (Choreograph. Cent. c. 88) seems to suspect that Tirzah and Shechem were the same; for he says that “if Shechem and Tirzah were not one and the same town,” it would appear that Jeroboam had removed when his son died from where he was when he first erected his idols (comp. 1Ki 12:25; 1Ki 14:17). It does not appear  to be mentioned by the Jewish topographers, or any of the Christian travelers of the Middle Ages, except Brocarduls, who places “Thersa on a high mountain, three leagues (leucae) from Samaria to the east” (Descriptio Terrte Sanct. 7:13). This is exactly the direction, and very nearly the distance, of Tellizah, a place in the mountains north of Nablius, which was visited by Robinson (Bibl. Res. 3, 302) and Van de Velde in 1852 (Syr. and Pal. 3, 334). The town is on an eminence, which towards the east is exceedingly lofty, though, being at the edge of the central highlands, it is more approachable from the west. “The place is large and thriving, but without any obvious marks of antiquity (Robinson, Later Res. p. 302). Lieut. Coider, however, suggests the identity of Tirzah with a “mud hamlet” called Teidsir, twelve miles east of Jeba, which he found to have been once a place of importance, judging from the numerous rock-cut sepulchers burrowing under the houses, the fertile lands and fine olives around, and the monument of good masonry, apparently a Roman tomb. The position is beautiful, and the old main road leads to the place from Shechem (Tent Work in Palest. 1, 108).

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

             The present Teiasir, which Tristram assumes (Bible Places, page 196) as the modern representative, lies twelve miles east by north from Sebustieh (Samaria), and is described in the .Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance  Survey (2:228, 245). As to the identity of the name, Lieut. Conder remarks (Tent Work, 2:108):

"It contains the exact letters of the Hebrew word, though the last two radicals are interchanged in position, a kind of change not unusual among the peasantry. The beauty of the position and the richness of the plain on the west, the ancient remains, and the old main road to the place from Shechem, seem to agree well with the idea of its having once been a capital; and if I am right in the suggestion, then the old sepulchres are probably, some of them, those of the early kings of Israel before the royal family began to be buried in Samaria."

## Tischendorf, Lobegott Friedrich Constantin[[@Headword:Tischendorf, Lobegott Friedrich Constantin]]

             the most prominent scholar in the department of New-Test. palaeography, was born Jan. 18,1815, at Lengenfeld, in Saxony. Having been prepared at the gymnasium at Plauen for the university, he entered, at Easter, 1834, aged nineteen, the halls of Leipsic. Here Gottfried Hermann and Georg Benedict Winer were among his teachers. At the close of 1836 he received a prize medal for an essay on Doctrina Pauli Apostoli de Vi Mortis Chisti Satisfactoria, which he published at Leipsic in 1837. A second prize was awarded to him in the year 1838 on Disputatio de Christo, Pane Vite, sive de Loco Ecang. Joann. c. 6:vv. 51-59, Conae Sacae Potissimuml Ratione habita (ibid. 1839). At the same time, he took his degree of doctor of philosophy. In 1840 he published Dissertatio Citica et Exegetica de Ev. Matthew. c. 19:16 sq., and was promoted as licentiate of theology; in the same year he qualified as privat-docent of theology by publishing De Recensionibus quas dicunt Novi Testamenti Ratione Ptissimum habita Scholzii (ibid.; reprinted in the Prolegomena to the Greek Testament published in 1841). In this essay, as Kabhnis rightly remarked, he gave to the world the program of his theological future. In October, 1839, he began to prepare a critical hand-edition of the Greek New Test., which was published in 1841 under the title Novumn Testanetumi Greece: Textum ad  Fidem Antiquorunm Testium Recens. Brevenm Appaatunz Crit. una cuan Variis Lectionib.us Elzev., Knappii. Scholzii, Lachmanni subjunzit, etc. (ibid.). In 1840 Tischendorf went to Paris. The library threre contained a celebrated palimpsest.

A manuscript of the Bible from early in the 5th century had been cleaned off in the 12th century, and used for writings of Ephraem Syrus. What no mortal had been able to do before. Tischendorf did, and with the aid of chemical reagents he completely restored the original text. The University of Breslau acknowledged his merit by bestowing on him the title of doctor of theology. Meanwhile he also collated the Paris manuscripts of Philo for Prof. Grossmann at Leipsic, and the only remaining manuscript of the 60th book of the Basilicas for Dr. Heimbach at Jena. F. Didot, the publisher, bargained with Tischendorf for a reissue of his Leipsic edition, which appeared at Paris in 1842; and then abbé Jager, a professor in the Sorbonne, begged him to edit a Greek text that should conform as nearly as possible to the Vulgate, which was also published in the same year. In 1841 and 1842 he visited the libraries in Holland, London, Cambridge, and Oxford. Early in 1843 he left Paris for Rome, on the way working four weeks on the Codex E of the gospels at Basle. In Italy he staved more than a year, and used his time in the best possible manner. When his Italian researches were completed, he prepared to start for his first Eastern journey in 1844, which he repeated again in 1853 and 1859. On his third journey, in 1859, he discovered the famous Codex Sinaiticus. After his return he was made ordinary professor of the Leipsic University, and a special chair of sacred paleography was made for him. From this time on, he spent the remainder of his life in publishing the results of his amassed materials, collected on his different journeys, of which we shall speak further on. On May 5,1873, he was seized with apoplexy; he recovered somewhat from the attack, but in November, 1874, the malady grew worse, and on Dec. 7, 1874, he passed away. His funeral took place on the 10tl, at which Drs. Ahifeld, Kahnis, Luthardt, and others made addresses.

Probably no theologian ever received so varied and so many signs of distinction, academic and civil. He was made a Russian noble, a Saxon privy-councilor, knight of any orders, doctor of all academic degrees, aid ‘member of an indefinite number of societies. When, in 1855, king Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia (brother of the present emperor of Germany) said to him, “You are predestined to discoveries; wherever they are possible, there you are to make them,” he only proved himself a true  prophet; and only a man of such uncommon quickness, keenness, energy, and ambition as Tischendorf could achieve what he brought about. “What Wettstein and Bengel began,” said his colleague Luthardt, “what Hug and Lachmann carried on he brought nearly to completion in a way which leaves the labors of his predecessors far behind.” And “whoever,” said Kahnis, “in the future outstrips him will do it only on the road which Tischendorf marked out; whoever overcomes him will do so only by the weapons which he himself has furnished.” Complaint has been made of his changes of opinion, a reading not infrequently being confidently adopted in one issue and as confidently rejected in the next, or vice versa. But how could it be otherwise, when the evidences in the case were constantly increasing in number and clearness? As the illustrious scholar said in his last will,” I have sought no other aim than truth; to her I have always unconditionally bowed the knee.” No pride of opinion, no zeal for consistency, was allowed to stand in the way. He was, doubtless, unconsciously biased in favor of the authorities he himself had brought to light; but his purpose was to set forth the exact text of the original without regard to dogmatic, or personal considerations.

As to his publications, they are very numerous. We must here pass over his essays, reviews, etc., and shall confine ourselves to his most important works. Besides those already mentioned, they are, in chronological order, Codex Ephiracemi Syri Rescriptus (Lips. 1843-45, 2 vols.): Monumenta Sacra Inedita sive Reliquice Antiquissimae Textus Novi Testam. Graeci, etc. (ibid. 1846): —De Israelitarumper Mare Rubrunm Transitu (ibid. 1847): —Evangelium Palatinum Ineditum sive Reliquime Textus Evangeliorum Latini ante Hieron. versi ex Cod. Palatino Purpureo 4 vel. v p. Chr. Saeculi (ibid. 1847): —Novum Test. Grac. (ibid. 1850; 2nd ed. 1862, and often): — Vetus Test. Grceceajuxta LXX Intepretes: Textum Vat. Romanum emendatius edidit, etc. (ibid. 1850, 2 vols.; 2nd ed. 1856; 3rd ed. 1860; 4th ed. 1869; 6th ed. 1880): —Codex Amziainus sive N.T. Latine Interprete Hiesronymo (ibid. 1.850; 2nd ed. 1954): —De Evangeliorum Aipocryphorum Originie et Usa, etc. (Hagae, 1851): —Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha (Lips. 1851): —Synopsis Evangelica (ibid. 1851; 2nd ed. 1854; ed. 2 emend. 1864; ed. 3 emend. 1871; transl. into Tamul by H. Schanz, Tranquebar, 1868): —Codex Claromontanus sire Epistulae Pauli Omnnes Gr. et Lat. ex Cod. Paris. Celeberaimo, etc. (ibid. 1852): —Evangelia Apocrypha (ibid. 1853): —N.T. Tsriglottum, Gr. Lat. Germanice, etc. (ibid. 1854; 2nd ed. 1865): —N.T. Greece: Editio Academica (ibid. 1855,  and often): —Monumnenta Sacra Inedita : Nova Collectio (1855-70, 7 vols.): —Pilati circa Christum Judicio quid Lucis Afeiraturu ex Actis Pilati (ibid. 1855): —Anecdota Sacra et Profana exr Oriente et Occidente Allata, etc. (ibid. 1855; 2nd ed. 1861): —Hermae Pastor Graeca. (ibid. 1856): —N.T. Gr. et Lat., ex Triglottis (ibid. 1858): —N.T. Graec.: Editio Septima Critica Major (ibid..1859), and Editio Septina Critica Minor (ibid.): —Notitia Etditionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici Auspiclis Imperatoris. Alexandri II Susceptae (ibid. 1860): —Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petopolitanus, etc. (Petropoli, 1862, 4 vols. fol.): — N.T. Sinaiticum sire N.T. cum Epistula Barnabae et Fragmentis Pastoris (Lips. 1863): — N.T. Greece et Germaniae, ex Triglottis (ibid. 1864): — N.T. Latine: Textum Hieronynmi Notata Clementina Lectione, etc. (ibid. 1864) -N.T. Gr., ex Sinaitico Codiae Omniumn Antiquissinzo Vaticana itengue Elzeviriaena Lectione. Notata (ibid. 1865): —Wann curden unsere Evangelien verfasst? (ibid. 1865, and often). Of this little book there are three French, English, and American translations, two Swedish, and one each of Danish, Dutch. Italian, Russian, and Turkish: —Apocalypses Apocryphce Mosis, Esdrce, Pauli, Johannis, etc. (ibid. 1866): —N.T. Vaticanum, post Angli Mai aliorumque Impefectos Labores ex ipso Codice edidit (ibid. 1867): —Appendix Codicum Celeberrimorum Sinaitici Vaticani Alexandrini (ibid. 1867): —Philonea Inedita Altera, etc. (ibid. 1868): —N.T. Gr., ad Antiquiss. Testes denuo Rec. Apparatum Criticumn Owreni Studio Perfectum (ibid. 1869-72, 2 vols.); the third vol., containing Prolegomena, is now in preparation by Dr. Oscar Gebhardt; The New Testament: the Authorized English Version, with Introductions and Various Readings from the three most Celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text (ibid. 1869); 45,000 copies were sold in the first year: Appendix Novi Testam. Vaticani, etc. (ibid. 1869): — Conlatio Critic Cod. Sin. cum Textu Elzeviriano Vatic. etc. (ibid. 1869): —Responsa ad Calumnias Romanus (ibid. 1870): —Die Sinaibibel, etc. (ibid. 1871): — N.T. Greece, ad Antiquissimos Testes deunuo recensuit: Editio Critica Minor ed. 8 Majore Desumpta (1872), vol. 1: Clementis Romnaai Epistulce (ibid. 1873) . — Biblia Sacra Latina Veteris Testam. Hieroynmo Interpretei etc. Editionem instituit suasore Chr. Car. Jos. de Bunsen, Th. Heyse, ad finem perduxit C. de T. (ibid. 1873) --N.T. Gr., ad Editionem suam 8 Crit. Majorem conformavit, Lectionibusque Sinaiticis et Vaticanis item Elzevirianis instruxit (ibid. 1873): —Liber Psalmorsunz Hebr. atque Let. ab Hieronymo e Hebraeo Conversus. Consociata Opera edd. C. de T., S. Bar, Fr. Delitzsch (ibid. 1874). From the rich material left behind, we  may expect still other works. Besides these works, we must mention his Reise in den Orient (Leips. 1846, 2 vols.; Engl. transl. by W. L. Shuckard, Travels in the East [Lond. 1847]): —Aus dem heiligen Lande (ibid. 1862; transl. into French and Swedish): —Recheonschetft iber meine handschrülichen Studien Studien afeine wissenschatlichen Reise, published in the Jahrbiicher der. Literatur; and papers in the Anzeige- Blatt. The Leipziger Repertorium der deutschen und ausldndischen Literatur, the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, the Serapeurm, and Studien und Kritiken also contain a vast amount of information from his pen, as maybe seen from the list of Tischendorf's writings furnished by Mr. Gregory for the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1876, p. 183 sq.

See Volbeding, Constantin Tischezndorf in seiner 25 jahrigen wissenschatlichen Wirksamkeit: Literar. histor. Skizze (Leips. 1862); Beilage zum allgeneinen evangelisch-lutherischen Kirchenzeitung, 1874, No. 50 (ibid.); Asm Sorge und Grabe des Dr. Theol. Constantint Tischendorf: süf Reden und Ansprachen, nebst einem Rückibck auf das Leben und einem Verzeichniss sämmtlicher Duckwerke des Verstorbenen (ibid. 1875); Abbot, The late Professor Tischendorf (reprinted from the Unitarican Review and Religious Magazine for March, 1875); Gregory, Tischendorf,; in Biblioth. Sacra (Audoer 1876), p. 153 sq.; Theologisches Universal-Lex, s.v.; Literarischer Handwieiser Judas katholische Deutschland, 1875, p. 417 sq.; Zuchold, Biblioth. Theolog. 2, 1341 sq. (B. P.)

## Tischer, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Tischer, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a German Protestant divine, was born at Tautschen, near Torgau, in the year 1767. In 1792 he was called to the pastorate of his native city; in 1794 he was appointed superintendent at Jüterbogk; four years later he was called to Plauen, and in 1823 to Pirna, having in the meantime received the degree of doctor of theology. He died in the latter place in 1842. He published, Scholia in Loc. Galatians 1 1-20 (Wittenb. 1802): — Psychologische Piredigtentwürfe (Leilps. 1.795): — Die Huiuptsücke der christlichen Religion (33rd ed. ibid. 1852): —Das Christesitum in den HaeiptStücken aunserer Kirohie (2nd ed. ibid. 1837): Ueber dics menschliche Hierz und seine Eigenheiten (ibid. 1829-43, 4 ols.), sermons: —Die Plicht der Kirchlichkeit aus den Gsetzen der Seelenlehre bewiesen (ibid. 1836): —and a number of other sermons and essays. See Zuchold,  Bibi. Theolog. 2, 1343; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 262; 2, 161, 197, 228, 314, 321, 334. (B.P)

## Tishbite[[@Headword:Tishbite]]

             (Heb. Tishbi', תַּשְׁבַּי, apparently a gentile adj.; Sept. θεσβίτης ; Vulg. Thesbites), the constant designation of the prophet Elijah (1Ki 17:1; 1Ki 21:17; 1Ki 21:28; 2Ki 1:3; 2Ki 1:8; 2Ki 9:36). The following explanations have been given of this obscure epithet:

1. The name naturally points to a place called Tish-bah, Tishbeh, Tishbi, or rather perhaps Tesheb, as the residence of the prophet. Indeed, the word מתשבי, which follows it in. 1Ki 17:1, and which in the received Hebrew text is so pointed as to mean “from fie residents,” may, without violence or grammatical impropriety, be pointed to read “from Tishbi.” This latter reading” appears to have been followed by the Sept. (Vat. ὁ θεσβείτης ὁ ἐκ θεσβῶν), Josephus (Ant. 8:13, 2, πόλεως θεσβώνης), and the Targ. (דַּמְתּוֹשָׁב, “from out of Toshab” ); and it has the support of Ewald (Gesch. 3, 468, note). It is also supported by the fact, which seems to have escaped notice, that the word does not in this passage contain the וwhich is present in each one of the places where תּוֹשָׁבis used as a mere appellative noun. Had the וbeen present in 1Ki 17:1, the interpretation “from Tishbi” could never have been proposed.

Assuming, however, that a town is alluded to as Elijah's native place, it is not necessary to infer that it was itself in Gilead, as Epiphanius, Adrichomius, Castell, and others have imagined; for the word תּוֹשָׁב, which in the A. V. is rendered by the general term “inhabitant,” has really the special force of “resident” or even “stranger.” This and the fact that a place with a similar name is not elsewhere mentioned have induced the commentators, geographers, and lexicographers, with few exceptions, to adopt the name “Tishbite” as referring to the place THISBE (θισβή) in Naphtali, which is found in the Sept. text of Tobit 1, 2. ‘the difficulty in the way of this is the great uncertainty in which the text of that passage is involved-an uncertainty quite sufficient to destroy any dependence upon it as a topographical record, although it bears the traces of having originally been extremely minute. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, note to 1Ki 17:1) suggests in support of the reading “the Tishbite from Tishbi of Gilead” (which, however, he does not adopt in his text) that the place may have  been purposely so described, in order to distinguish it from the town of the same name in Galilee.

2. But התשביhas not always been read as a proper name, referring to a place. Like מתשבי, though exactly in reverse, it has been pointed so as to make it mean “the stranger.” This is done by Michaelis in the text of his interesting Bibel für Ungelehrten — “Der Fremdling Elia, einer von de Fremden, die in Gilead wohnhaft waren;” and it throws a new and impressive air around the prophet, who was so emphatically the champion of the God of Israel. But this suggestion does not appear to have been adopted by any other interpreter, ancient or modern.

The numerical value of the letters תשבי is 712, on which account, and also doubtless with a view to its correspondence with his own name, Elias Levita entitled his work, in. which 712 words are explained, Sepher Tishbi (Bartolocci, 1, 140 b). SEE ELIJAH.

## Tisio (or Tisi), Benvenuto[[@Headword:Tisio (or Tisi), Benvenuto]]

             called Il Garofalo, an eminent painter of the Ferrarese school, was born in 1481, received his first education under Domenico Panetti, then studied with Niccolb Soriani at Cremona, and next under Boccaccio Bocacino. He went to Rome in 1499, where he remained fifteen months, and then traveled through various Italian cities, intending to settle down at Rome. Persuaded, however, by the solicitations of Panetti and 1by the commissions of duke Alphonso, he remained in his native place, Ferrara. His death took place in 1559. The works of Tisio are extremely valuable, and scarcely to be found outside of Italy. Among them we note, Murder of the Innocents, Resurrection of Lazarus, and Taking of Christ in the Church of St. Francis at Ferrara; St. Peter Martyrs, in the Church of the Dominicans; Visitation of the Virgin, in the Palazzo Doria. See Spooner; Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Tisri, or rather Tismori[[@Headword:Tisri, or rather Tismori]]

             (תַּשְׁרַי, from תשר, to begin), was the Rabbinical name of the first month of the civil and the seventh month of the ecclesiastical year, in which fell the festival of Atonement and that of Tabernacles. In 1Ki 8:2'it is termed the month of Ethanim, that is, the month of streaming rivers, which are filled during this month by the autumnal rains. It corresponds with our  September-October. Tisri is one of the six names of months found in Palmyrene inscriptions, which, with other evidence, renders it very probable that the Jewish names of months form a member in a great series, which were extensively in use in the eastern parts of the world (see Benfey and Stern, Ueber die Monatsnament einiger alten V6lker [Berlin, 1836]). SEE MONTI.

## Titan[[@Headword:Titan]]

             (Τιτάν, usually in the plur. Τιτᾶνες, of uncertain derivation).. These children of Uranus (Heaven) and Gaia (Earth) were, SEE TITANES, according to the earliest Greek legends, the vanquished predecessors of the Olympian gods, condemned by Zeus to dwell in Tartarus, yet not without retaining many relics of their ancient dignity (AEsch. Prom. Vinct. passim). By later (Latin) poets they were confounded with the kindred Gigantes (Horace, Odes, 3, 4, 42, etc.), as the traditions of-the primitive Greek faith died away; and both terms were transferred by the Sept. to the Rephaim of ancient Palestine. SEE GIANT.

The usual Greek rendering of Rephaim is indeed Γίγαντες (Gen 14:5; Jos 12:4, etc.), or, with a yet clearer reference to Greek mythology, γηγενεῖς (Proverbs 2, 18; Pro 9:18) and θεομάχοι (Symmach.; Pro 9:18; Pro 21:16; Job 26:5). But in 2Sa 5:18; 2Sa 5:22 “the valley of Rephaim” is represented by ἡ κοιλὰς τῶν τιτάνων instead of ἡ κοιλὰς τῶν γιγάντων (1Ch 11:15; 1Ch 14:9; 1Ch 14:13); and the same rendering occurs in a Hexapl. text in 2Sa 23:13. Thus Ambrose defends his use of a classical allusion by a reference to the old Latin version of 2 Samuel 5, which preserved the Sept. rendering (De Fide, 3, 1, 4, “Nam et gigantes et vallem Titanum prophetici sermonis series non refugit. Et Esaias Sirenas... dixit”). It can therefore occasion no surprise that in the Greek version of the triumphal hymn of Judith (16, 7) “the sons of the Titans” (υἱοὶ Τιτάνων ; Vulg. filii Titan; old Lat. filii Dathan; f. Tela; f. bellatorum) stands parallel with “high giants,” ὑψηλοὶ Γίγαντες, where the original text probably had רְפָאַיםand גַּבּוֹרַים. The word has yet another interesting point of connection with the Bible; for it may have been from some vague sense of the struggle of the infernal and celestial powers, dimly shadowed forth in the classical myth of the Titans, that several Christian-fathers inclined to the belief that Τειτάν was the mystic name of “the beast” indicated in Rev 13:18 (Ireneus, 5 30, 3, “Divinum putatur' apud multos esse hoc nomen .... et ostentationem quandam continetultionis ... et alias autem et antiquum, et fide dignum, et  regale, magis autem et tyrannicum nomen ... ut ex multis colligamus ne forte Titan vocetur qui veniet” ).

## Titanes[[@Headword:Titanes]]

             in Greek mythology, were the children of Urtanus and Gaia. There were twenty-two of them namely, Oceanus, Ostasus, Adamus, Ophion, Anytus, Coeus, Andes, Hyperion, Crius, Olymbrus, Japetus, Egaon, and Kronus (Saturn); Tethys, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Phoebe, Dione, Thia, Thrace, Euryphaessa. They represented the powers of nature as anciently and still engaged in wild combat. Uranus had thrown his first sons, the Hecatonchires (the fifty-armed), Briareus, Cottus, and Gyas (also Gyges), and the Cyclops Arges, Steropes, and Brontes, into Tartarus. Gaia became angry on this account, and incited the Titans to rebel against their father, and for this purpose gave to Kronus a hook, with which he emasculated him (Uranus). All save Oceanus participated in the rebellion. — Uranus was dethroned, those pining in Tartarus liberated, and Kronus acknowledged as ruler, who, however, subjected again those who had been liberated to the tortures of Tartarus, with the Hecatonchires as their guards. Titanes was also the name of the divine beings descended from the Titanes, sometimes called Titanides, as Prometheus, Hecate, Latona, Pyrrha, Helios, and Selene. The name Titan has become very common to designate the god of the sun. A peculiar saying was that Bacchus was torn asunder by the Titanes. Bacchus is here represented to be the power of vegetation, which is broken by the satanic powers of the infernal region.

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

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1497 at Hasselt, Belgium, and studied at Liege. Having completed his studies, he joined the Capuchins, went to Rome in 1537, and died the same year. He wrote, Commentaria in Omnes Psalmos: — Paraphrastica Elucidatio in Librum Job: — Commentaria in Ecclesiasten Salomonis: — Commentaria in Cantica Canticorum: — Collatio pro Editione Vulgata Sacrae Scripturae: — Elucidatio in Omnes Epistolas Pauli, etc. See Miraeus, Elogia Illustrium Belgii Scriptorum; Andreas, Bibliotheca Belgica; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Titfilus[[@Headword:Titfilus]]

             the Latin name given to early churches, as if in contradistinction to the martyria, or those erected over the graves of martyrs. SEE MARTYR; SEE MENSA. The tituli of the Middle Ages were parish churches under the care of presbyters, who took their titles from them. Why they were called tituli is not exactly agreed among learned men. Baronius says that it is because they had the sign of the cross upon them, by which sign or title they were known to belong to Christ. SEE TITLE.

## Tithe[[@Headword:Tithe]]

             (מִעֲשֵׂר, maaser; Sept. and New Test. δεκάτη, occasionally δέκατον or ἐπιδέκατον; Vulg. decimae; plur. מִעִשְּׂרוֹת; αἱ δέκαται; decimae; from עֵשֵׂר, “ten;” Targum מעשרא, תד מן עסרא), the tenth part both of the produce of the land and of the increase of the flock, enjoined in the Mosaic law to be devoted by every Israelite to the servants of the sanctuary, and to the hospitable meals provided on the festivals for the poor and needy (Lev 27:30-33; Num 18:21-32; Deu 12:5-18; Deu 14:22-29; Deu 26:12-14). (The following treatment of the subject relates to Jewish tithes from Biblical and Rabbinical sources.

I. The Mosaic Law respecting Tithes. —The first enactment respecting tithes ordains that the tenth of all produce and of all animals is to be  devoted to the Lord; that the predial or vegetable tithe may be redeemed if one fifth is added to its value; and that the mixed or animal tithe, which is unredeemable, is to be taken as it comes, without any selection, and without attempting to effect any change, else the original animal and the one substituted for it are both forfeited to the sanctuary (Lev 27:30-33). In the second mention of the tithe it is enacted that it is to be given to the Levites of the respective districts as a remuneration for their services in the sanctuary, since they were excluded from sharing in the division of the land of Canaan; that they are allowed to consume the tithe wherever they please (בְּכָלאּמָקוֹם), and that from the tithe thus received they are to give a tenth to the Aaronites or priests (Num 18:21-32). In the third legislation on this point it is further commanded that the Israelites are to tithe the produce of the soil every year; that this vegetable tithe, together with the firstlings of the flock and herd, is to constitute the social and festive repast in the place of the sanctuary; that in case the sanctuary is too far off, the tithal produce is to be converted into money, which is to be taken to the metropolis, and there laid out in food for this entertainment, and that the Levite is to share with the family in this social meal. It is, moreover, ordained that at the end of every third year this vegetable tithe ( מִעֲשִׂר תַּבוּאָה) is not to be taken to the metropolis, but is to constitute hospitable and charitable meals at home, to which the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow are to be invited (Deu 12:5-7; Deu 12:17; Deu 14:22-29). The triennial conversion of the second or vegetable tithe into entertainments for the poor is again enjoined in Deu 26:12-15, where it is also ordered that every Israelite shall make an exculpatory declaration that he has conscientiously performed the tithal command.

It will be seen that the book, of Deuteronomy only mentions the second or vegetable tithe as well as its triennial conversion into the poor tithe, omitting altogether the first or Levitical tithe; while the books of Leviticus and Numbers, which discuss the Levitical tithe, pass over in silence the second or feast tithe This has given rise to various theories among modern critics. Thus Ewald will have it that the Deuteronomist, writing during the period of the Jewish monarchy, when the Levitical tithe, as enacted in Leviticus and. Numbers, could no longer be continued as a regular rate in consequence of the new taxes imposed b the sovereigns, endeavored to bring the tithe back to its original form of a voluntary offering. (Die Alterthiimer les Volkes Israel, p. 346). Knobel (Comment. on Leviticus p.  419, 590) regards Deu 12:6; Deu 12:11; Deu 14:22-29; Deu 26:12, as proceeding from the later Jehovistic legislator who lived towards the end of the kingdom of Judah, and who substituted for the older Elohistic annual vegetable and animal tithe, which was no longer practicable, the triennial vegetable tithe which was to be devoted to the hospitable meals, whereunto the Levites, together with the stranger, widow, orphans, and poor, were to be invited. Bishop Colenso (The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Exanmmiied, 3, 476), who also regards the enactments in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy as referring to one and the same tithe, finds “the most complete contradiction between the two sets of laws.” Against these theories, however, is to be urged that

a. The tithal enactment in Deuteronomy has nothing whatever to do with the one in Leviticus and Numbers, and is therefore neither intended to contravene nor supersede it.

b. The Deuteronomist presupposes the existence and force of the Levitical tithe as the fixed income of the ministers of the sanctuary, and designs the second tithe to be in force by its side. This is evident from the fact that the book of Deuteronomy (Deu 10:9; Deu 12:19; Deu 14:27; Deu 14:29), like the books of Leviticus and Numbers, legislates upon the basis of Levitical poverty, and frequently refers to the care to be taken of the Levites. Now if, according to the above-named hypothesis, we are to regard the triennial tithe as substituted in the place of the original Levitical tithe, we are shut up to the preposterous conclusion that the only provision made by the Deuteronomist for the Levites is an ample meal once in three years.

c. The mention of the second tithe by the Deuteronomist alone is owing to the fact that it is connected with the fixing of the central sanctuary, the rites and regulations of which he alone discusses.

d. The post-exilian practice of the Jews shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the nation for whom these tithal laws were passed understood the enactment in Deuteronomy to mean a second tithe as in force side by side with the first or Levitical tithe enjoined in Leviticus and Numbers (Tobit 1, 7; Josephus, An. 4:8, 8, 22; Mishna, Maaser Sheni). This also sets aside the objection urged by some that a double tithe would be too heavy and unbearable a tax. For if the Jews did not find it so in later times, when under the rule of foreign sovereigns, and paying heavy rates to them, surely they could not have found the double tithe too grinding an  oppression during the independence of the State, especially when it is remembered that the second tithe was devoted to festive repasts of the respective families at which the Levites, the strangers, the widows, orphans, etc., were simply guests.

From all this we gather:

1. That one tenth of the whole produce of the soil was to be assigned for the maintenance of the Levites.

2. That out of this the Levites were to dedicate a tenth to God for the use of the high-priest.

3. That a tithe, in all probability a second tithe, was to be applied to festival purposes.

4. That in every third year either this festival tithe or a third tenth was to be eaten in company with the poor and the Levites.

The question thus arises, were there three tithes taken in this third year, or is the third tithe only the second under a different description? That there were two yearly tithes seems clear, both from the general tenor of the directions and from the Sept. rendering of Deu 26:12. But it must be allowed that the third tithe is not without support.

a. Josephus distinctly says that one tenth was to be given to the priests and Levites, one tenth was to be applied to feasts in the metropolis, and that a tenth besides these (τρίτην πρὸς αὐταῖς) was every third year to be given to the poor (Ant. 4:8, 8, 22).

b. Tobit says he gave one tenth to the priests, one tenth he sold and spent at Jerusalem, i.e. commuted according to Deu 14:24-25, and another tenth he gave away (Tob 1:7-8).

c. Jerome says one tenth was given to the Levites, out of which they gave one tenth to the priests (δευτεροδεκάτη); a second tithe was applied to festival purposes, and a third was given to the poor (πτωχοδεκάτη) (Corm. on Ezekiel 45:1, 565). Spencer thinks there were three tithes. Jennings, with Mede, thinks there were only two complete tithes, but that in the third year an addition of some sort was made (Spencer, De Leg. Hebr. p. 727; Jennings, Jewish Ant. p. 183).  On the other hand, Maimonides says the third and sixth years second tithe was shared between the poor and the Levites, i.e. that there was no third tithe (De Jur. Paup. 6:4). Selden and Michaelis remark that the burden of three tithes, besides the first-fruits, would be excessive. Selden thinks that the third year's tithe denotes only a different application of the second, or festival, tithe, and Michaelis that it meant a surplus after the consumption of the festival tithe (Selden, On Tithes, 2, 13; Michaelis, Lawus of Moses, § 192, 3, 143, ed. Smith). Against a third tithe may be added Reland, Ant. Hebr. p. 359i Jahn, Ant. § 389; Godwyn, Moses and Aaron, p. 136, and Carpzov, p. 621,622; Keil, Bibl. Arch. § 71, 1, 337; Saalschütz, Hebr. Arch. 1, 70; Winer, Realwörterb. s.v. “Zehnte.”

Of these opinions, that which maintains three separate and complete tithings seems improbable as imposing an excessive burden on the land, and not easily reconcilable with the other directions; yet there seems no reason for rejecting the notion of two yearly tithes when we recollect the especial promise of fertility to the soil conditional on observance of the commands of the law (Deuteronomy 28). There would thus be, (1) a yearly tithe for the Levites; (2) a second tithe for the festivals, which last would, every third year, be shared by the Levites with the poor. It is this poor man's tithe which Michaelis thinks is spoken of as likely to be converted to the king's use under the regal dynasty (1Sa 8:15; 1Sa 8:17; Michaelis, Laws of Moses, 1, 299). Ewald thinks that under the kings the ecclesiastical tithe system reverted to what he supposes to have been its original free-will character.

II. Classification of and Later Legislation upon the Tithes. — It will be seen from the above description that the tithes are divisible into four classes. As the anxiety to pay them properly called forth more minute definitions and further expansions of the Pentateuchal enactments, we shall give the most important practices which obtained during the second Temple in connection with each of these four classes of tithes.

1. The Levitical, or first, tithe (מִעֲשֵׂר רַאשׁוֹן). This tithe was paid after both the first-fruit (בַּבּוּרַים) and the priestly heave-offering (תְּרוּמָה) had been separated, the amount of which, though not fixed in the Mosaic law, was generally one fiftieth of the produce (comp. Exo 23:19; Deu 26:1, etc., with Mishna, Bikkurim; Num 18:8; Deu 18:4, with Mishna, Terumoth, 3, 7; 4:3; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Alathanuth Anjim, 6:2). As the Mosaic law does  not define what things are subject to this tithe, but simply says that it is to consist of both vegetables and animals (Lev 27:30 sq.), the Jewish canons enacted that as to the produce of the land “whatsoever is esculent, though still kept in the field, and derives its growth from the soil, is tithable; or whatsoever may be eaten from the commencement to the completion of its growth, though left in the field: to increase in size, is tithable, whether small or great; and whatsoever cannot be eaten at the beginning, but can only be eaten at the end of its growth, is not tithable till it is ripe for food” (Mishna, Maaseroth, 1, 1). It will be seen that this definition embraces even the smallest kitchen herbs and aromatic plants; and that it explains the remark of our Savior that tithe was paid of mint, dill, and cummin, which he, however, did not condemn, but, on the contrary, said, “These ought ye to have done” (Mat 23:23; Luk 11:42; comp. Mishna, Maaseroth, 1, 2-8).. The animals subject to this ‘Levitical tithe are still more indefinitely described in the Pentateuchal statute, which simply says, “As to all the tithe of herds and flocks, whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord” (Lev 27:32).

It will be seen; that this law does not say whether the tenth is to be paid of the newly born animals, whether it includes those newly purchased or exchanged, whether it is payable if a man has less than ten cattle, or at what age of the animals the tithe becomes due. The spiritual heads of the people had therefore most minutely to define these points so as to make the tithal law practicable. Hence the following canons obtained: All animals are tithable except those which are born of heterogeneous copulation (comp. Deu 22:9), which are damaged, which have come into the world irregularly, or which are bereaved of their mother; which have been purchased or received as presents. They are only tithable when there are ten newly born of the same kind, so that the offspring of oxen and small cattle must not be put together to make up the requisite number, nor are even those to be put together which are born in different years, though they belong to the same kind. Sheep and goats may be tithed together, provided they have all been born in the same season (Mishna, Bekoroth, 9:3, 4). The tithing is to take place three times in the year, about fifteen days before each of the three great festivals-viz. (a) on the first of Nisan, being fifteen days before Passover; (b) on the first of Sivan, being only five days before Pentecost, because the small number of animals born between these two festivals could not suffice for the celebration of Pentecost if the second tithe term were to be fifteen days before this festival; and (c) on the twenty-ninth of Elul instead of the  first of Tisri, which is, properly speaking, fifteen days before Tabernacles, because the first of Tisri is the Feast of Trumpets, or New Year. SEE FESTIVAL.

Those which were born in the month of Elul were tithed by themselves (ibid. Rosh hash-Shanah, 1, 51 with Bekoroth, 9:5,6). On each of the three occasions the herds of every owner extending over a pasture- ground not exceeding sixteen Roman miles were collected together into one fold, while those beyond the prescribed limits formed a separate lot. In the pen wherein the herd was thus gathered a small door was made which only admitted of one animal going out at a time, and the owner placed himself at this narrow opening, holding a rod or staff in his hand wherewith he counted each animal as it made its exit from the fold till be came to the tenth, which he marked with red color, saying, “This is the tithe” (ibid. Bekoroth, 10:7). The command “whatsoever passeth under the rod” (Lev 27:32) was thus literally carried out.

2. The priestly tithe, also called tithe of the tithe (הִמִּעֲשֵׂר מִעֲשֵׂר הִמִּעֲשֵׂר

מִעֲשֵׂר מַן, Num 18:26); the heave-offering of the tithe (תְּרוּמִת מִעֲשֵׂר), ἀπαρχῆς ἀπαρχή; (Philo, De Nom. Mut.), or δευτεροδεκάται (Jerome, on Ezekiel 45). This tithe had to be separated by the Levite from the tenth he had received from the Israelite. It had to be given to the priests in Jerusalem (Neh 10:38) before the Levite could use the rate paid to him. It had, moreover, to be a tenth part of the very tithe which the Levites received, and was therefore subject to the same laws and regulations to which the Levitical tithe was subject. After the Babylonian captivity, when the Levitical tithe was divided (see below), this so-called tithe of tithes necessarily ceased. Hence the priests, instead of receiving a tenth of the Levitical tithe as heretofore, took their share directly from the people (Heb 7:5). SEE SCRIBE.

3. The second tithe (מִעֲשֵׂר שֵׁנַי, δευτεροδεκάτη). This festival tithe could not be sold, nor given or received as a pledge, nor used as weight, nor exchanged, but might be given away as a present (Mishna, Maaser Sheni, 1, 1). If the distance to the national sanctuary was so great as to preclude the possibility of conveying it in kind, it might be converted into specie, and the money could only be expended in the metropolis in ordinary articles of food, drink, and ointment for the festival meals or festival sacrifices which were eaten at these social repasts (זַבְחֵי שְלֹמַים, ibid. 1, 7; 3, 2; Chagigth, 1, 3). There were storehouses (אוֹצָרוֹת לָשְׁכוֹת) in. one  part of the Temple, under the superintendence of priests and Levites, in which the tithe was kept (2Ch 31:11-14; Neh 10:38-39; Neh 12:44; Neh 13:12; Josephus, Ant. 20:8,8). The triennial, or poor, tithe (עָנַי

מִעֲשֵׂר, πτωχοδεκάται), also called the third tithe (מִעֲשֵׂר שְׁלַיישַׁי, ἡ τρίτη δεκάτη, Tob 1:7; Josephus, Ant. 4:8,22), and the second tithe (δεύτερον ἐπιδἐκατον, Sept., Deu 26:12), because it was properly the second tithe converted into the poor tithe, to be given to and consumed by the poor at home, instead of conveying it to the metropolis to be eaten by the owner. As every seventh year was a fallow year not yielding a regular harvest, it was enacted that the second tithe should be eaten in Jerusalem by the owner thereof and his guests in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the septennial cycle, and be given to the poor in the third and seventh years.

It will thus be seen that the whole series of taxes reached its completion at the end of every third and seventh year, or on the eve of Passover of the fourth and seventh y-ears. Hence it is that the third year is denominated the year of tithe (שְׁנִת הִמִּעֲשֵׂר) i e. when all the tithes had taken their rounds (Deu 26:12), and not because, as some critics will have it, the annual tithe of the earlier legislator, was afterwards changed by the Deuteronomist into a triennial tithe Hence, too, the spiritual heads of the Jewish people in and before the time of Christ constituted and denominated the Preparation Day of Passover of the fourth and seventh years a day of searching and removal (בעור) in accordance with Deu 26:12 (Mishna, Maaser Sheni, 5, 6), when every Israelite had to separate all the tithes which he ought to have paid in the course of the three years, but which, either through negligence or through some untoward circumstances, he had failed to do. At the evening sacrifice on the last day of Passover, every pilgrim, before preparing to return home, had to offer a prayer of confession, in accordance with Deu 26:13. As this confession (ודוי) is an expansion and traditional exposition of Deu 26:13-15,which accounts for the Chaldee and other versions of the passage in question, we give it entire: “I have removed the hallowed things from the house” (i.e. the second tithe and the quadrennial fruit [Lev 19:23, etc.]);'” have given it to the Levite” (i.e. the Levitical tithe); “and-also given it” (i.e. the priestly offering and the priestly tithe) “to the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow” (i.e. the poor tithe)... “from the house” (i.e. from the dough [comp. Num 15:17, etc.]) “according to all thy commandments which thou hast commanded me” (i.e. not given the second tithe before the first). “I have not transgressed thy commandments” (i.e.  not paid one kind for the other, the cut for the standing, the standing for the cut, the new for the old, nor the old for the new). “I have not forgotten” (i.e. to thank thee and to remember thy name thereby). I have not eaten thereof in my mourning; I have not given thereof to the dead” (i.e. for coffins, shrouds, or..mourners). “I have hearkened to the voice of the Lord my God” (i.e. have taken it to the chosen sanctuary). “I have done all that thou hast commanded me” (i.e. have rejoiced and caused others to rejoice therewith), etc. (Mishna, Maaser Sheni, 5, 10-13). In the two years of the septennial cycle, when the second tithe was converted into the poor tithe, there was no additional second tithe, inasmuch as the poor tithe took its place (Maimonides, Iad ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Mathanuth Anjin, 6:4).

The poor could go into a field where the poor tithe was lying and demand of the owner to satisfy their wants. The minimum quantity to be given to them was defined as follows : If the tithe be of wheat, I cab; barley, 1 cab; spelt; 1 cab; lenten-figs, 1 cab; cake-figs, the, weight of 25 sicli; wine, I log; oil, log; rice, cab; olives, 1 pound; pulse, 3 cabs; nuts, 10 nuts; peaches, 5 peaches; pomegranates, 2; citrons, 1; and if. of any other fruit, it shall not be less than may be sold for such a sum as will buy food sufficient for two meals. If the owner's means are slender and the poor so numerous that he is unable to give to each the specified measure, he is to produce the whole tithe and place it before them so that they may divide it among themselves. The owner may only give one half of the tithe to his own poor relatives, and the other he must distribute among the poor generally. If a man and woman apply together, the woman is to be satisfied first. No debts are allowed to be paid out of the poor tithe, nor a recompense to be made for benefits, nor captives redeemed, nor is it to be devoted to nuptial feasts or alms, nor is it to be taken out of Palestine into a foreign land (Maimonides, ibid. 6:7-17). Though no tithes were paid in Palestine in the sabbatical year, when all was in common, SEE SABBATICAL YEAR, yet the land of Egypt, Ammon, and Moab had to pay them for the support of the poor of Israel, because, the Sabbath of the soil was not observed in these countries, while the Babylonians had to pay the second tithe (Mishna, Yadaim, 4:3; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Mathanuth Anjim, 6:5).

III. Oriyin and Observance of the Tithal Law. — Without inquiring into the reason for which the number ten (q.v.) has so frequently been preferred as a number of selection in the cases of tribute-offerings (Philo derives δέκα from δέχεσθαι [De X. Orac. 2, 184]), both sacred and secular,  voluntary and compulsory, we must remark that the practice of paying tithes obtained among different nations from the remotest antiquity. Thus the ancient Phoenicians and the Carthaginians sent tithes annually to the Tyrian Hercules (Diod. Sic. 20:14; Justin, 18:7); the southern Arabians could not dispose of their incense before paying a tenth thereof to the priests at Sabota in. honor of their god Sabis (Pliny, Hist. iat. 12:32); the ancient Pelasgians paid a tithe of the produce of the soil and the increase of their herds to their deities (Dionys. Halic. 1, 19, 23, etc.); and the Hellenes consecrated to their deities a tenth of their annual produce of the soil (Xenoph. Hellen. 1, 7, 10), of their business profits (Herod. 4:152), of confiscated estates (Xenoph. Hellen. 1, 7, 10), of their spoils (Herod. 5, 77; 9:81; Xenoph. A nab. 5, 3, 4; Hellen. 1.5 3, 21; Diod. Sic. 11:33; Pausan. 3, 18, 5; 5, 10, 4; 10:10, 1; τὰς δεκάτας τῶν περιγινομένων τοῖς θεοῖς καθιεροῦν; Harpocration, s.v. Δεκατεύειν ; and Knobel, Comment. on Lev 27:30). Among other passages the following may be cited: 1 Macc. 11, 35; Herod. 1, 89; 7:132; Diod. Sic. 5, 421 Pausan. 5, 10, 2; Justin, 20:3; Arist. (Econ. 2, 2; Livy, 5, 21; Polyb. 9:39; Cicero, Veirr. 2, 3, 6, and 7 (here tithes of wine, oil, and “minutse fruges” are mentioned); Pro Leg. Manil. 6; Plnt. Ages. ch. 19:p. 389; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 12:14; Macrob. Sat. 3, 6; Rose, Inscr. Gr. p. 215; Gibbon, 3, 301, ed. Smith; and a remarkable instance of fruits tithed and offered to a deity, and a feast made, of which the people of the district partool, in Xenoph. A nab. 5, 3; 9, answering thus to the Hebrew poor man's tithe feast mentioned above.

In Biblical history the two prominent instances of early occurrence are: 1. Abram presenting the tenth of all his property, according to the Syriac and Arabic versions of Hebrews 7 :and Bashi in his. Commentary, but, as the passages themselves appear to show, of the spoils of his victory, to Melchizedek (Gen 14:20; Heb 7:2; Heb 7:6; Josephus, Ant 1, 10, 2; Selden, On Tithes, ch. 1). 2. Jacob, after his vision at Luz, devoting a tenth of all his property to God in case he should return home in safety (Gen 28:22). These instances bear witness to the antiquity of tithes in some shape or other previous to the Mosaic tithe system. There can therefore be no doubt that, like many other Pentateuchal ordinances, the inspired legislator adopted the tithal law into the divine code because he found that, with some modifications, this primarily voluntary tax was a proper stipend for the servants of the sanctuary, and that it would, at the  same time, be a means of promoting pilgrimage to the national sanctuary on the great festivals, and social intercourse between the rich and the poor.

During the monarchy, the payment of tithes was neglected, and it seems that the kings claimed them for themselves (1Sa 8:14-15; 1Sa 8:17; with 1 Macc. : 35). It was, however, re-established at the restoration of religion by the pious Hezekiah (2Ch 31:5-6; 2Ch 31:12), until after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity (Neh 10:38; Neh 12:44; Neh 13:5; Neh 13:12), when material alterations and modifications were made in the tithal law owing to the altered state of the commonwealth and to the disproportion of the Levites and laymen. Only 341 or 360 Levites returned at first from the Babylonian captivity, with about 37,319 laymen; while with Ezra only 38 Levites came back, with 1496 laymen; and there can be but little doubt that the same disproportion continued among those who returned afterwards, as well as in the gradual and natural increase of the nation. There were thus 97 laymen to 1 Levite, while the tithe of 9 laymen amounted to as much as was left for each private family; and if we take 10 laymen to 1 Levite, as the latter had to pay a tenth to the priest, the tithe when duly paid by all the people yielded ten times as much as the Levites required. On the other hand, there were in Judaea, after the return from Babylon, a disproportionately large ‘number of priests, since, exclusive of those who had no register (Ezr 2:62), 4289 of them came with Zerubbabel-i.e. twelve or thirteen times more than Levites-and two whole families, besides separate individuals, came with Ezra. These could not possibly have subsisted upon the legal dues (Neh 10:36-39). In addition to the miserably provided priests, there were the 612 Nethinim who came back with Zerubbabel and Ezra (Ezr 2:58; Ezr 8:20; Neh 7:60), for whom no provision whatever existed. Ezra had therefore to take the superabundant tithe from the Levites for the support of the priests and the Nethinim. Hence Josephus distinctly tells us that the priests received tithes in later times (Life, 15; Ant. 11:5, 8; 20:8, 8; 9, 2; Apion, 1, 22).

It is this distribution of the Levitical tithe between the priests and the Levites which is evidently alluded to when the Talmud says that Ezra transferred the tithes from the Levites to the priests as a punishment for their tardiness in returning from exile (Kethuboth, 26 a; Cholin, 131 b; Yebamnoth, 86 b; Sotah, 47 b), for it could not possibly mean that he took the whole tithe away from the Levites, since that would be at variance with other records (comp. Ezr 10:38-39; Neh 13:10; Neh 13:13; Tobit 1, 7,-with Tossephoth oi Kethuboth, 26 a), and would leave the Levites  wholly unprovided for, and visit the good Levites who did return with the punishment deserved by those who remained behind. It is, moreover, owing to this distribution of the Levitical tithe effected by Ezra that the tithe was afterwards divided into three portions, one of which was given by the owner to his friends the priests and Levites, the other was taken to the Temple storehouse, and the third portion was distributed in Jerusalem among the poor and the needy chaberim (חברים) =doctors of the law (Jerusalem Sotah, 9:11; Jerusalem Maaser Shemni, 5, 15; Babylon Yebamoth,86 b).

The board appointed to watch over the tithes, as well as the storehouses, which already existed in the time of Hezekiah for the reception of the tithes (2Ch 31:11-14), were now better organized than ever. To achieve the purpose intended by Ezra in the new division of the tithe, it was absolutely necessary that the collection and the distribution thereof should take place under the careful superintendence of a body consisting of both priests and Levites. Such a board was therefore duly appointed, and it was ordained that at least one portion of the tithes should be taken to Jerusalem for the support of the ministering Levites.

During the period of sacerdotal degeneracy and Grecian ascendancy in Palestine, the tithes were again discontinued; but at the rise of the Pharisees the strict payment of a tenth was made one of the two essential conditions exacted from every individual who desired to become a chaber (חבר)=member of this association. The reason for this is given in the article PHARISEE SEE PHARISEE

IV. Literature. —Mishna, tractates Maaseroth, Maaser Sheni, aind Bekoroth. 9:1-8; and the Gemaras on these Mishnas; Maimonides, Iad Ha- Chezaka, Hilchoth Mathanuth Anjim, 6:1-17; Hilchoth Maaser and M1aaser Sheni; Selden, The History of Tithes (1618); Hottinger, De Decimis Judaeorum (L. B. 1713); and other monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 170; Spencer, De Legibus Hebraeorum (Cantabrigie, 1727), lib. 3, c. 10; 2, 720, etc.; Michaelis, Commentaries on the Laws of Moses. (Engl. transl. London, 1814), art. 110, 102, 3, 141, etc.; Herzfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Israel (Nordhausen, 1855), 1, 62 sq., 138 sq.

## Tithes[[@Headword:Tithes]]

             (Anglo-Saxon, teotha, a tenth) a tenth part of the produce of the land, which by ancient usage, and subsequently by law, is set aside for the support of the clergy and other religious uses. In the Christian dispensation the very circumstance of the existence of the clergy is supposed by many to imply a certain fixed provision for their maintenance. This obligation has been put forward in ecclesiastical legislation from the earliest period. The Apostolic Canons, the Apostolic Constitutions, St. Cyprian on the Unity of the Church, and the works of Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, and the other fathers of both divisions of the Church, abound with allusions to it. In the early Christian Church the custom of consecrating to religious purposes a tenth of the income was voluntary, and it was not made obligatory until the Council of Tours in 567. The second Council of Macon, in 585, enjoined the payment of tithes under pain of excommunication; and Charlemagne, by his capitularies, formally established the practice within those portions of the ancient Roman empire to which his legislation extended.

The introduction of tithes into England is ascribed to Offa, king of Mercia, at the close of the 8th century; and the usage passed into other divisions of Saxon England, and was finally made general by Ethelwolf. They were made obligatory in Scotland in the 9th century, and not long after in Ireland.. At first the choice of the Church to whom a person paid tithes was optional; but by a decretal of Innocent III, addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury in 1200, all were directed to pay to the clergy of their respective parishes. According to English law, tithes are of three kinds- predial, mixed, and personal. Predial tithes are those which arise immediately from the ground, as grain, fruit, herbs, etc. Mixed tithes are those proceeding from things nourished by the earth, as calves, lambs, pigs, milk, cheese, eggs, etc. Personal tithes are those arising from the profits of personal industry in the pursuit of a trade, profession, or occupation. The latter were generally paid in the form of a voluntary offering at Easter, or some other period of the year. The law exempted mines, quarries, wild animals, game, fish, and also tame animals kept for pleasure, and not for use or profit.

Another and a more arbitrary distinction is into great and small — the first being tithes of grain, hay, wood, etc.; the second being the other kind of predial, as well as all personal and mixed tithes. The great tithes of a parish  belonged to the rector, and the small tithes to the vicar. Tithes were originally paid in kind, as the tenth sheaf, the tenth lamb; but the inconvenience and trouble involved in this mode of payment led to the adoption of other methods. This was done either by the payment of a fixed amount each year, irrespective of actual produce, or by a money payment mutually agreed upon; by a partial substitution of payment or labor, as when a person contributed a smaller amount of produce, but free from the expense of harvesting, etc.; or by the payment of a bulk sum in redemption of the impost, either for a time or forever, as the case might be, so that the land became tithe-free. By 1 Elizabeth, c. 19, and 13 Elizabeth, c. 10, such alienations of tithe-payment were restricted to a term of twenty-one years; or three lives.

Originally convents occupying lands in England paid tithes to the parochial clergy; but by a decretal of Paschal II they were exempted from such payments in regard to lands held by themselves in their own occupation. This exemption was confined by subsequent legislation to the four orders, Templars, Hospitallers, Cistercians, and Premonstratensians, and after the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, only in respect of lands held by them before that year. At the Reformation many of the forfeited Church lands when sold were held free of tithes.

These partial exemptions, and the fact that the tithes were a tax for the support of the clergy of the Established Church, made it very unpopular with those who were obliged to pay, and especially so to Dissenters. A measure of commutation became absolutely necessary, but, although recommended as far back as 1822, did not become law until 1838. Various statutes for England or Ireland have since been enacted regulating the payment of tithes (6 and 7 William IV, c. 71; 7 William IV and 1 Victoria, c. 69; 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 64; 2 and 3 Victoria, c. 32; and 5 and 6 Victoria, c. 54). Their object for England is to substitute a money rent-charge, varying on a scale regulated by the average price of grain for seven years for all the other forms of payment. In Ireland the settlement was effected by a commutation of tithe into a money rent-charge three fourths the former value. The Disestablishment Act of 1869 abolished tithes and created a common fund for the support of the Protestant Episcopal Church and clergy. In France tithes were abolished at the Revolution, and this example was followed by the other Continental countries. In the Canadian provinces of Quebec, tithes are still collected by virtue of the old French  law, yet in force there. In the United States, tithes are exacted by the Mormon hierarchy. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 5, ch. 5, § 1 sq.

## Titian, or Tiziano Vecellio[[@Headword:Titian, or Tiziano Vecellio]]

             one of the greatest of Italian painters, and the prince of colorists and portrait-painters, was born in the territory of Venice, at Capo del Cadore, in 1477. His early passion for art was carefully cultivated by his parents, who placed him under the instruction of Antonio Rossi of Cadore. At the age of ten years he was sent to Trevigi, and became the pupil of Sebastiano Zuccati. He studied in the school of the Bellini, first with Gentile and afterwards with Giovanni, with whom he was fellow-pupil with Giorgione, his own future rival. On the death of Giorgione, Titian rose rapidly in favor, and was soon afterwards invited to the court of Alphonso, duke of Ferrara. In 1523 the Senate of Venice employed him to decorate the hall of the council-chamber; and in 1530 he went to Bologna and painted a portrait of Charles V, who had come to be crowned by pope Clement VII. About this time he was invited to the court of the duke of Mantua, and in 1543 he met pope Paul III at Ferrara, by whom he was invited to Rome, but was obliged to decline by reason of previous engagements with the duke of Urbino. He went to Rome in 1548, where he was received with marks of great distinction, and where he met Michael Angelo. Declining the office of the leaden seal, he returned to Venice only to receive an invitation from Charles V to visit the court of Spain, and reached Madrid in 1550. Here he became a gentleman of the emperor's bedchamber, a count palatine of the empire, received the Order of St. Jago, and had bestowed upon him an annual income of two hundred ducats. After a residence of three years at Madrid, he returned to Venice, which he soon left for Innsbruck. Returning again to Venice, he continued there until his death, of the plague, Aug. 27, 1576. There is no list of the works of Titian, and it would not be an easy task to make one. One of his grandest achievements is the Assumption of the Virgin. From 1520 to 1530 the most celebrated of his works were, St. Peter Martyr: — Victory of the Venetians over the Janissaries: and St. Sebastian. Other noted paintings are, Annunciation (1537): —Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles (1541): — Sacrifice of Abraha (eod.): —David and Goliath (eod.): —Death of Abel (eod.) The Virgini (1543): —San Tiziano (eod.). Among the religious works which he executed for Philip II of Spain are, The Last Supper: — Christ in the Garden : —St. Margaret with the Dragon: —and a  Martyrdom of San Lorenzo. The Academy of Venice contains his Assumption and Presentation of the Virgin, and the Manfrini Palace in the same city The Entombment of Christ. In the Escurial is a Last Supper, upon which he labored seven years; in the Uffizi Gallery, A Virgin and Child with Saints; and in the Vatican, Christ Crowned with Thorns. See Northcote, Life of Titian (Lond. 1830, 2 vols.); Crowe and Cavalcaselle, Life of Titian (1875); Spooner, Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Titius, Gerhard[[@Headword:Titius, Gerhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Quedlinburg, December 17, 1620, and studied at different universities. In 1646 he was professor of Hebrew at Helmstadt, in 1650 doctor of theology, and died June 7, 1681. Titius was a voluminous writer. Of his publications we mention, De Principio Fidei Christianae sen Canonica Scriptura: — De Ministris Ecclesiae: — De Beatitudine et Damnatione AEterna ex Mischnajoth et Commentarsiis Rabbinorun Considerata: — De Theopaschitarum Haeresi: — De Orthodoxa Fidei Christianae Doctrina: — De Jesu Christi Officio Prophetico, Sacerdotali et Regio, etc. See Witte, Memoriae Theologorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Title[[@Headword:Title]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of ציּוּןtsiyun, a pillar or cippus set up as a sepulchral sign, 2Ki 23:17, or as a “waymark,” Jer 31:21; “sign,” Eze 39:15; and of τίτλος, Lat. titulus, a tablet with a superscription (Joh 19:19-20), set up by Pilate over Christ's cross (q.v.).

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

             in the canon law, is that by which a cleric holds his benefice. In Church records and deeds, it is a Church to which a cleric was ordained, and where he was to reside. It is also applied to a cure of souls and a ministerial charge. Augustine says that the title of the cross was written in Hebrew for Jews who gloried in God's law; in Greek, for the wise of the nations; in Latin, for Romans, the conquerors of the world. Hence churches were called titles, not only because the clergy took titles from them which fixed them to particular cures, but as dedicated to the Crucified. The appellation is first used by the Council of Braga (572). A title was also a right to serve some Church from which an ordained clerk took his title, a name derived from the titles of the martyrs tombs, at which service was originally said, and so called for the reasons given above, or the fiscal titulus which marked buildings belonging to the sovereign, and thus also churches dedicated to the King of kings. The earliest title was St. Pudentiana, now called St. Praxedes. The Roman cathedral had, in 142, a title or parish church attached to it by pope Pius I. The Council of Lateran (1179) enforced ordination on a distinct title.

## Title (3)[[@Headword:Title (3)]]

             to orders in Episcopal churches. This is best explained by quoting the 33rd canon of the Established Church of England:  “It has been long since provided by many decrees of the ancient fathers that none should be admitted, either deacon or priest, who had not first some certain place where he might use his function; according to which examples we do ordain that henceforth no person shall be admitted into sacred orders except (1) he shall at that time exhibit to the bishop of whom he desireth imposition of hands a presentation of himself to some ecclesiastical preferment then void in the diocese; or (2) shall bring to the said bishop a true and undoubted certificate that either he is provided of some church within the said diocese, where he may attend the cure of souls, or (3) of some ministers place vacant, either in the cathedral church of that diocese, or in. some other collegiate church therein: also situate, where he may execute his ministry; or (4) that he is a fellow, or in right as a fellow or (5) a conduct or chaplain in some college in Cambridge or Oxford; or (6) except he be a master of arts of five years standing that liveth of his own charge in either of the universities; or (7) except by the bishop himself that doth ordain him minister he be shortly after to be admitted either to some benefice or curateship then void. And if any bishop shall admit any person into the ministry that hath none of these titles as is aforesaid, then he shall keep and maintain him, with all things necessary till he do prefer him to some ecclesiastical living; and if the said bishop refuse so to do, he shall be suspended by the archbishop, being assisted with another bishop, from giving orders by the space of a year.”

In the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, canon 19 of 1832, “of the titles of those who are to be ordained priests,” declares —

“No person shall be ordained priest unless he shall produce to the bishop a satisfactory certificate from some church, parish, or congregation that he is engaged with them, and that they will receive him as their minister; or unless he be a missionary under the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese to which he belongs, or in the employment of some missionary society recognized by the General Convention; or unless he be engaged as a professor, tutor, or instructor of youth in some college, academy, or other seminary of learning duly incorporated” (Digest of the Canons, p. 20). . See Eden, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Church Dict. s.v.

## Tittle[[@Headword:Tittle]]

             (diminutive of tit), an old English word signifying the merest trifle (see Plulmptre, Bible Educator, 4:211), is used in the A. V. (Mat 5:18; Luk 16:17) as a rendering for κεραία, a little horn, hence a point (e.g. of a sail yard, Lucan, Navig. 4; Polyb. 14:10, 11; of an island, Philostr. Vit. Soph. 1, 21, 2); in the New Test. the apex of a Heb. letter, such as distinguishes ד from ד, ב from כ, i.e. the slightest distinction (so Philo, in Flacc. p. 984 b). SEE JOT.

## Tittmann, Johann August Heinrich[[@Headword:Tittmann, Johann August Heinrich]]

             a German divine, was born at Langensalza, Aug. 1,1773. He studied at Wittenberg and Leipsic, and in 1796 became one of the theological professors in the latter of these universities. He died Dec. 30, 1831. His writings are numerous, and belong to various departments of sacred science. The following only need to be specified here: Theolog. Encyklop. (1798): —De Synonymis N.T.(1829), the second part of which was edited after his death by Becher (1832); the whole, with some appended dissertations, translated into English by Craig (Edinb. Bib. Cabinet [1833- 37, 2 vols.]): —and his edition of the Greek New Test., “ad fidem optimortm librorum recens.” (1820-24). His polemical writings, in which he labors to reconcile theology with philosophy, and to defend evangelical truth against rationalism, are the most valuable productions of his pen.

## Tittmnann, Karl Christian[[@Headword:Tittmnann, Karl Christian]]

             father of the preceding, was born at Gmossbardau, near Grimma, Aug. 20, 1744. He was appointed deacon at Langensalza in 1770, professor of theology and provost at Wittenberg in 1775, and general superintendent there in 1784. In 1789 he was made Kirchenrath and superintendent at Dresden, and died there, Dec. 6, 1820; He was a man of cultured and elegant rather than powerful mind, and was deeply imbued with pious feeling and evangelical sentiment. These characteristics are apparent in his Meletenmata Sacrasive Comment. Exegetico-crit. dogmaticus in Evang. Joannis (Lips. 1816), a work full of good thoughts, good sense, and genuine piety, but deficient in critical acumen and exegetical ability. It has been translated into English, and forms 2 vols. of the Edinb. Bib. Cabinet. In his Opuscula Theologica (1803) are some dissertations of an exegetical  character. Perhaps his best work is his Tractatus de Vestigiis Gnosticorunm in N.T. frustra Quaesitis (Lips. 1773).

## Titular Bishops[[@Headword:Titular Bishops]]

             are bishops with no stated charge, but who are bishops inpartibus infidelium. The custom arose in the 12th and 13th centuries in the assigning of bishops to those parts which, though once Christianized, had at length fallen under Saracen dominion. The Church of Rome adopts the same custom, and has bishops of Tarsus, Ephesus, Aleppo, etc. This. Church has 229 titulars. The primitive Church made it a law that no one should be ordained at large, but should have a specific charge. “This rule concerned bishops as well as the inferior clergy; for the nullatenenses of later ages, as Panormita calls titular and utopian bishops, were rarely known in the primitive Church.”

## Titus[[@Headword:Titus]]

             (Graecized Τιτος, a common Latin name, e.g. of the celebrated Roman emperor whose triumphal arch [q.v.] still stands in Rome; once in the Apocrypha [2Ma 11:34] of a Roman ambassador to the Jews, SEE MANLIUS ), a noted Christian teacher, and fellow-laborer of Paul. He was of Greek origin (possibly a native of. Antioch), but was converted by the apostle, who therefore calls him his own son in the faith (Galatians 2, 3; Titus 1, 4). This is all that we know of his early history. The following is an account of his later movements and of the epistle to him. King (Who was St. Titus? [Dublin, 1853,.8vo]) tries to identify him with Timothy.

1. Sources of Information. —Our materials for the biography of this companion of Paul must be drawn entirely from the notices of him in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the: Galatians, and to Titus himself,  combined with the Second Epistle to Timothy. He is not mentioned in the Acts at all. The reading Τίτου Ι᾿ούστου in Act 18:7 is too precarious for any inference to be drawn from it. Wieseler, indeed, lays some slight stress upon it (Chronol. des apost. Zeit. [Gött. 1848], p. 204), but this is in connection with a theory which needs every help. As to a recent hypothesis that Titus and Timothy were the same person (King, Who was St. Titus? [Dublin, 1853]), it is certainly ingenious, but quite untenable (see 2Ti 4:10). The same may be said of the suggestion of Mircker (Meining. 1861),.that Titus of the epistles is the same person with Silvanus, or Silas, of the Acts, although there is nothing that absolutely forbids such an identification.

2. His, Known Journeys. —Taking the passages in the epistles in the chronological order of the events referred to, we turn first to Gal 2:1; Gal 2:3. We conceive the journey mentioned here to be identical with that (recorded in Acts 15) in which Paul and Barnabas, went from Antioch to Jerusalem to the conference which was to decide the question of the necessity of circumcision to the Gentiles (A.D. 47). Here we see Titus in close association with Paul and Barnabas at Antioch. He goes with them to Jerusalem. He is, in fact, one of the τινὲς ἄλλοι of Act 15:2, who were deputed to accompany them from Antioch. His circumcision was either not insisted on at Jerusalem, or, if demanded, was firmly resisted (οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι). He is very emphatically spoken of as a Gentile (῎Ελλην), by which is most probably meant that both his parents were Gentiles. Here is a double contrast from Timothy, who was circumcised by Paul's own directions, and one of whose parents was Jewish (Act 16:1; Act 16:3; 2Ti 1:5; 2Ti 3:15). Titus would seem, on the occasion of the council, to have been specially a representative of the church of the uncircumcision.

It is to our purpose to remark that, in the passage cited above, Titus is so mentioned as apparently to imply that he had become personally known to the Galatian Christians. This, again, we combine with two other circumstances, viz. that the Epistle to the Galatians and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians were probably written within a few months of each other SEE GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO, and both during the same journey. From the latter of these two epistles we obtain fuller notices of Titus in connection with Paul.  After leaving Galatia (Act 18:23), and spending a long time at Ephesus (Act 19:1-20; Act 19:1), the apostle proceeded to Macedonia by way of Troas. Here he expected to meet Titus (2Co 2:13), who had been sent on a mission to Corinth. In this hope he was disappointed [see TROAS], but in Macedonia Titus joined him (2Co 7:6-7; 2Co 7:13-15). Here we begin to see not only the above-mentioned fact of the mission of this disciple to Corinth, and the strong personal affection which subsisted between him and Paul (ἔν τῇ παρουσίᾷ αὐτοῦ, 2Co 7:7), but also some part of the purport of the mission itself. It had reference to the immoralities at Corinth rebuked in the first epistle, and to the effect of that first epistle on the offending Church. We learn, further, that the mission was so far successful and satisfactory: ἀναγγέλλων τὴν ὑμῶν ἐπιπόθησιν (2Co 7:7), ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν (2Co 7:9), τὴν πάντων ὑμῶν ὑπακοήν: (2Co 7:15); and we are enabled also to draw from the chapter a strong conclusion regarding the warm zeal and sympathy of Titus, his grief for what !was evil, his rejoicing over what was good: τῇ παρακλήσει ῃ παρεκλήθη ἐφ᾿ ὑμῖν (2Co 7:7); ἀναπεπαυται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πάντων ὑμῶν (2Co 7:13); τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐστιν (2Co 7:15).

But if we proceed further we discern another part of the mission with which he was entrusted. This had reference to the collection, at that time in progress, for the poor Christians of Judaea — καθὼς προενήρχατο, 2Co 8:6, a phrase which shows that he had been active and zealous in the matter, while the Corinthians themselves seem to have been rather remiss. This connection of his mission with the gathering of these charitable funds is also proved by another passage, which contains, moreover, an implied assertion of his integrity in the business (μή τι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος, 2Co 12:18), and a statement that Paul himself had sent him on the errand (παρεκάλεσα Τίτον, ibid.). Thus we are prepared for what the apostle now proceeds to do after his encouraging conversations with Titus regarding the Corinthian Church. He sends him back from Macedonia to Corinth, in company with two other trustworthy Christians, SEE TROPHIMUS; SEE TYCHICUS, bearing the second epistle, and with an earnest request (παρακαλέσαι 1Co 8:6; τὴν παράκλησιν, 2Co 8:17) that he would see, to the completion of the collection; which he had zealously promoted on his late visit (ἵνα καθὼς προενήρξατο, οὕτως καὶ ἐπιτελέσῃ, 2Co 7:6), Titus himself being in nowise backward in undertaking the commission. On a review of all these passages, elucidating as they do the characteristics of the man, the duties  he discharged, and his close and faithful co-operation with Paul, we see how much meaning there is in. the apostle's short and forcible description of him (Εἴτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου, κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός, 2Co 8:23).

All that has preceded is drawn from direct statements in the epistles; but by indirect though fair inference we can arrive at something further, which gives coherence to the rest, with additional elucidations of the close connection of Titus with Paul and the Corinthian Church. It has generally been considered doubtful who the ἀδελφοί were (1Co 16:11-12) that took the first epistle to Corinth. Timothy, who had been recently sent thither from Ephesus (Act 19:22), could not have been one of them (ἐὰν ἔλθῃ Τιμοτηψ 1Co 16:10), and Apollos declined the commission (1Co 16:12). There can be little doubt that the messengers who took that first letter were Titus and his companion, whoever that might be, who is mentioned with him in the second letter (Παρεκάλεσα Τίτου, καὶ συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφόν, 2Co 12:18). This view was held by Macknight, and very clearly set forth by him (Transl. of the Apostolical Epistles, with Comm. [Edinb. 1829], 1, 451, 674; 2, 2, 7,124). It has been more recently given by Prof. Stanley (Corinthians, 2nd ed. p. 348, 492), but it has been, worked out by no one so elaborately as by Prof. Lightfoot (Camb. Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, 2, 201, 202). There is some danger of confusing Titus and the brother (2Co 12:18), i.e. the brethren of 1Co 16:11-12, who (according to this view) took the first letter, with Titus and the brethren (2Co 8:16-24) who took the second letter. As to the connection between the two contemporaneous missions of Titus and Timotheus; this observation may be made here, that the difference of the two errands may have had some connection with a difference in the characters of the two agents. If Titus was the firmer and more energetic of the two men, it was natural to give him the task of enforcing the apostle's rebukes, and urging on the flagging business of the collection.

A considerable interval now elapses before we come upon the next notices of this disciple. Paul's first imprisonment is concluded, and his last trial is impending. In; the interval between the two, he and Titus were together in Crete (ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, Titus, 5). We see Titus remaining in the island when Paul left it, and receiving there a letter written to him by the apostle. From this letter we gather the following biographical details: ‘In  the first place, we learn that he, was originally converted through Paul's instrumentality; this must be the meaning of the phrase γνήσιον τέκνον, which occurs so emphatically in the opening of the epistle (Tit 1:4). Next we learn the various particulars of the responsible duties, which he had to discharge in Crete. He is to complete what Paul had been obliged to leave unfinished (ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ, Tit 1:5), and he is to organize the Church throughout the island by appointing presbyters in every city. SEE GORTYNA; SEE LASEA.

 Instructions are given as to the suitable character of such presbyters (Tit 1:6-9); and we learn, further, that we have here the repetition of instructions previously furnished by word of mouth (ὡς ἐγώ σοι διεταξάμην, Tit 1:5). Next he is to control and bridle (ἐπιστομιζειν, Tit 1:11) the restless and mischievous Judaizers, and he is to be peremptory in so doing (ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως, Tit 1:13 ). In;junctions in the same spirit are reiterated (Tit 2:1; Tit 2:15; Tit 3:8). He is to urge the duties of a decorous and Christian life upon the women (Tit 2:3-5), some of whom (πρεσβύτιδας, Tit 2:3), possibly, had something of an official character (καλοδιδασκάλους, ἵνα σωφρονίζωσι τὰς νέας, Tit 2:3-4). He is to be watchful over his own conduct (Tit 2:7); he is to impress upon the slaves the peculiar duties of their position (Tit 2:9-10); he is to check all social and political turbulence (3:1), and also all wild theological ‘speculations (Tit 2:9); and to exercise discipline on the heretical (Tit 2:10). When we consider all these particulars of his duties, we see not only the confidence reposed in him by the apostle, but the need there was of determination and strength of purpose, and therefore the probability that this was his character; and all this is enhanced if we bear in mind his isolated and unsupported position in Crete, and the lawless and immoral character of the Cretans themselves, as testified by their own writers (1, 12, 13). SEE CRETE.

The notices which remain are more strictly personal. Titus is to look for the arrival in Crete of Artenmas and Tychicus (Tit 3:12), and then he is to hasten (σπούδασον) to join Paul at Nicopolis, where the apostle is proposing to pass the winter (ibid.). Zenas and Apollos are in Crete, or expected there; for Titus is to send them on their journey, and supply them with whatever they need for it (Tit 2:13). It is observable that Titus and Apollos are brought into juxtaposition here, as they were before in the discussion of the mission from Ephesus to Corinth.  The movements of Paul, with which these later instructions to Titus are connected, are considered elsewhere. SEE PAUL; SEE TIMOTHY.

We need only observe here that there would be great difficulty in inserting the visits to Crete and Nicopolis in any of the journeys recorded in the Acts, to say nothing of the other objections to giving the epistle any date anterior to the voyage to Rome. SEE TITUS, EPISTLE TO.

On the other hand, there is no difficulty in arranging these circumstances, if we suppose Paul to have traveled and written after being liberated from Rome, while thus we gain the further advantage of an explanation of what Paley has well called the affinity of this epistle and the first to Timothy. Whether Titus did join the apostle at Nicopolis we cannot tell. But we naturally connect the mention of this place with what Paul wrote at no great interval of time afterwards, in the last of the Pastoral Epistles (Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν, 2Ti 4:10); for Dalmatia lay to the north of Nicopolis, at no great distance from it. SEE NICOPOLIS.

From the form of the whole sentence, it seems probable that this disciple had been with Paul in Rome during his final imprisonment: but this cannot be asserted confidently. The touching words of the apostle in this passage might seem to imply some reproach, and we might draw from them the conclusion that Titus became a second Demas: but, on the whole, this seems a harsh and unnecessary judgment.

3. Traditionary Close of his Career. —Whatever else remains is legendary, though it may contain elements of truth. Titus is connected by tradition with Dalmatia, and he is said to have been an object of much reverence in that region. This, however, may simply be a result of the passage quoted immediately above: and it is observable that of all the churches in modern Dalmatia (Neale, Ecclesiological Notes on Dalm. p. 175) not one is dedicated to him. The traditional connection of Titus with Crete is much more specific and constant, though here again we cannot be certain of the facts. . He is said to have been permanent bishop in the island, and to have died there at an advanced age (Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 4, 2; Theodoret, Ad 1 Timothy 3, 1; Const. Aost. 7:46; Jerome, Ad Titus 2, 7; Isidore, Vit. Sanct. 87). The modern capital, Candia, appears to claim the honor, of being his burial-place (Cave, Apostolici, 1716, p. 42). In the fragment De ita et Actis Titi, by the lawyer Zenas (Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N.T. 2, 831, 832), Titus is called bishop of Gortyna; and on the old site of Gortyna is a ruined church, of ancient and solid masonry, which bears the name of St. Titus, and where service is occasionally celebrated by priests from the neighboring hamlet of Metropolis (Falkener. Remacins in Crete,fronz a  MSS. History of Candia, by Onorio Belli, p. 23). The cathedral of Megalo Castron, in the north of the island, is also dedicated to this saint. Lastly, the name of Titus was the watchword of the Cretans when they were invaded by the Venetians; and the Venetians themselves; after their conquest of the island, adopted him to some of the honors of a patron saint; for as the response after the prayer for the Doge of Venice was “Sancte Marce, tu nos adjuva,” so the response after that for the duke of Candia was “Sancte Tite, tu nos adjuva” (Pashley, Travels in Crete, 1, 6. 175). The day on which Titus is commemorated is Jan. 4 in the Latin calendar, and Aug. 25 in the Greek.

We must not leave unnoticed the striking though extravagant panegyric of Titus by his successor in the see of Crete, Andreas Cretensis (published, with Amphilochius and Methodins, by Combefis, Paris, 1644). This panegyric has many excellent points, e.g. it incorporates well the more important passages from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The following are stated as facts. Titus is related to the proconsul of the island: among his ancestors are Minos and Rhadamanthus (οἱ ἐκ Διός). Early in life he obtains a copy of the Jewish Scriptures, and learns Hebrew in a short. time. He goes to Judaea, and is present on the occasion mentioned in Acts 1, 15. His conversion takes place before that of Paul himself, but afterwards he attaches himself closely to the apostle. Whatever the value of these statements may be, the following description of Titus (p. 156) is worthy of quotation: ὁ πρῶτος τῆς Κρήτων ἐκκλησίας θεμέλιος· τῆς ἀληθείας ὁ στῦλος· τὸ τῆς πίστεως ἔρεισμα· τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν κηρυγμάτων ἡ ἀσίγητος σάλπιγξ· τὸ ὑψηλὸν τῆς Παύλου γλώττης ἀπήχημα.

See Walch, De Tito Viro Apostolic. (Jen. 1741; also in his Miscellan. Sacra [Amst. 1744], p. 708 sq.); Howson, Companions of St. Paul (Lond. 1871), ch. 5.

## Titus, Epistle To[[@Headword:Titus, Epistle To]]

             This is the third of the so-called Pastoral Epistles of Paul, following immediately after those to Timothy.

I. Authenticity. —In this respect there are no specialties in this epistle which require any very elaborate treatment distinct from the other Pastoral Letters of Paul. SEE TIMOTHY, FIRST EPISTLE TO. If those two were not genuine, it would be-difficult confidently to maintain the genuineness  of this. On the other hand, if the Epistles to Timothy are received as Paul's, there is not the slightest reason for doubting the authorship of that to Titus. Amid the various combinations which are found among those who have been skeptical on the subject of the Pastoral Epistles, there is no instance of the rejection of that before us on the part of those who have accepted the other two. So far, indeed, as these doubts are worth considering at all, the argument is more in favor of this than of either of those. Tatian accepted the Epistle to Titus, and rejected the other, two. Origen mentions some who excluded 2 Timothy, but kept 1 Timothy with Titus. Schleiermacher and Neander invert this process of doubt in regard to the letters addressed to Timothy, but believe that Paul wrote the present letter to Titus. Credner, too, believes it to be genuine, though he pronounces 1 Timothy to be a forgery, and 2 Timothy a compound of two epistles.

To turn now from opinions to direct external evidence, this epistle stands on quite as firm a ground as the others of the pastoral group, if not a firmer ground. Nothing can well be more explicit than the quotations and references in Irenaeus, C. Haeres. 1, 16, 3 (see Tit 3:10); Clem. Alex. Strom. 1, 350 (comp. Tit 1:12), and Tit 3:3-4; by Tertull. De Prcescr. H1er. c. 6 (comp. Tit 3:10-11), and Adv. Marc. 5, 21; and by Origen, in many places (Lardner, Works, vol. 2, 8vo); to say nothing of earlier allusions in Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. 47 (see Tit 3:4), which can hardly be doubted; Theoph. Ad Autol. 2,. 95 (see Tit 3:5); 3, 126 (see Tit 3:1), which are probable; and Clem. Romans 2 Corinthians 1 (see ibid.), which is possible.

As to internal features, we may notice, in the first place, that the Epistle to Titus has all the characteristics of the other Pastoral Epistles. See, for instance, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος (Tit 3:8), ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία (Tit 1:9; Tit 2:1; comp. Tit 1:13; Tit 2:8), σωφρονεῖν, σώφρων, σωφρόνως (Tit 1:8; Tit 2:5-6; Tit 2:12), σωτήριος, σωτήρ, σώζω (Tit 1:3-4; Tit 2:10-11; Tit 2:13; Tit 3:4-5; Tit 3:7), Ι᾿ουδαϊκοὶ μῦθοι (Tit 1:14; comp. Tit 3:9), ἐπιφάνεια (Tit 2:13), εὐσέβεια (Tit 1:1), ) ἔλεος (Tit 3:5; in Tit 1:4 the word is doubtful). All this tends to show that this letter was written about the same time and under similar circumstances with the other two. But, on the other hand, this epistle has marks in its phraseology and style which assimilate it to the general body of the Epistles of Paul. Such may fairly be reckoned the following: κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ (Tit 1:3); the quotation from a  heathen poet (Tit 1:12); the use of ἀδόκιμος (Tit 1:16); the “going off at a word” (σωτῆρος...ἐπεφάνη γὰρ...σωτήριος .. . Tit 2:10-11); and the modes in which the doctrines of the atonement (Tit 2:13) and of free justification (Tit 3:5-7) come to the surface. As to any difficulty arising from supposed indications of advanced hierarchical arrangements, it is to be observed that in this epistle πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος are used as synonymous ( ἵνα καταστήσῃς πρεσβυτέρους... δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ... Tit 1:5; Tit 1:7), just as they are in the address at Miletus about the year A.D. 55 (Act 20:17; Act 20:28). At the same time, this epistle has features of its own, especially a certain tone of abruptness and severity, which probably arises partly out of the circumstances of the Cretan population, SEE CRETE, partly out of the character of Titus himself. If all these things are put together, the phenomena are seen to be very unlike what would be presented by a forgery, to say nothing of the general overwhelming difficulty of imagining who could have been the writer of the Pastoral Epistles, if it were not Paul himself.

To the objections of the German critics, founded upon the difficulty of ascertaining the proper date of this epistle, the best reply will be furnished by ascertaining, if possible, when and where the epistle was written (see below); but even should we fail in this, it would be strange were we to relinquish our conviction of the authenticity of an ancient writing simply because, possessing very imperfect information as to many parts of the alleged author's history, we were unable to say with certainty when he was in circumstances to compose it.

I. Date. —The only circumstances stated in the epistle itself calculated to aid us in determining this question are, that at the time it was written Paul had recently visited Crete (Tit 1:5); that he was about to spend the winter in Nicopolis (Tit 3:12); and that Apollos was about to visit Crete, on his way to some other place (Tit 3:13). There are three hypotheses that have been formed in order to meet these facts, especially the first, namely Paul's visit to Crete.

1. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles that Paul visited Crete on his voyage to Rome (Act 27:7); but the shortness of his visit at that time, the circumstances under which it was made, and the improbability of his expecting to spend the ensuing winter at Nicopolis, place it out of the question to suppose that it was to this visit he refers in this epistle. As this is, however, the only visit recorded by Luke, in rejecting it we are forced to  suppose another visit, and to find some period in the apostle's life when it was probable that such a visit was paid.

2. It has been thought by Hug that the period referred to in Act 18:18-19 admits of our placing this visit to Crete within it. Paul, at that time, was on his journey from Corinth to Palestine, but on some account or other landed at Ephesus. This leads to the suggestion that the apostle must either voluntarily have departed from the usual course in order to visit some place lying between Corinth and Ephesus; or that he must have been driven by stress of weather from the course he meant to pursue. In either case the probability of his visiting Crete at that time is strong. We find, from the above statement made by Paul in this epistle, that Apollos, if at this time on his way from Ephesus to Corinth (Act 18:24; Act 18:27; Act 19:1), was to touch at Crete; which, it has been assumed, renders it not improbable that it ‘was customary for ships sailing between these two ports to call at Crete by the way; and Paul may have availed himself of this practice in order to visit Crete before going to Palestine. Or he may have sailed in a ship bound directly from Corinth to Palestine, and have been driven out of his course, shipwrecked on Crete, and obliged to sail thence to Ephesus as his only remaining method of getting to his original destination — a supposition which will not appear very improbable when we remember that Paul must have suffered several shipwrecks of which Luke gives no account (2Co 11:25-26); and that his getting to Ephesus on his way from Corinth to Palestine is a fact for which, in some way or other, we are bound to account. (Paul evidently, however, took that route as the only one of general travel, there being no vessel sailing direct from Corinth to Caesarea or Antioch.) It was while staying on this occasion at Ephesus that Hug supposes Paul to have written this epistle.

As confirmatory of this have been adduced the two other facts above referred to as mentioned in the epistle itself, viz. the visit of Apollos to Crete, and Paul's intention to winter at Nicopolis. From Act 19:1 we learn that during the time Apollos was residing at Corinth, whence he had gone from Ephesus, Paul was engaged in a tour through the upper coasts (viz. Phrygia and Galatia; comp. Act 18:23), which ended in his return to Ephesus. This tour was commenced after the apostle had been at Jerusalem and Antioch (Act 18:22). It appears, therefore, that Paul left Antioch much about the same time that Apollos reached Corinth. But Apollos went to Corinth from Ephesus, Paul went to Jerusalem from Ephesus. At this city, therefore, they may have met; and before leaving it  Paul perhaps wrote this epistle, and gave it to Apollos to deliver to Titus at Crete, on his way to Corinth.

Further. Paul went up to Jerusalem to keep the feast; after which he visited Antioch, and then traveled for some considerable time in Upper Asia. He, therefore, is supposed to have spent the winter somewhere in Asia Minor. (On the contrary, he seems to have rapidly passed through that region.). Now there was a town named Nicopolis, between Antioch and Tarsus, near to which, if not through which, Paul must pass on his way from Antioch to Galatia (Strabo, 14:465, ed. Casaubon, fol. 1587). May not this have been the very place referred to in Tit 3:12? In such a locality it was quite natural for Paul to desire to spend the winter; and as Titus was a native of Asia, it would be well known to him, especially if he knew what route the apostle designed to pursue. All this, it is held, supports the hypothesis that Paul wrote this epistle before leaving Ephesus to go to Syria.

Another circumstance alleged in favor of this hypothesis is the close resemblance in sentiment and phraseology between this epistle and the first Epistle to Timothy. This resemblance is so close, and in some particulars so peculiar, that we are naturally led to conclude that both must have been written while the same leading ideas and forms of expression were occupying the apostle's mind. Now the First Epistle to Timothy is held by the maintainers of this theory to have been written after Paul had left Ephesus the second time to go into Macedonia, that is, about two years and a half after the period when Hug supposes the Epistle to Titus to have been written. To some this may appear too long a time to justify any stress being laid upon the similarity of the two epistles in this question of their respective dates; but when it is remembered that during the interval Paul had been dealing at Ephesus; with very much the same class of persons, to whom a great part of both epistles refer, and that both are addressed to persons holding the same peculiar office, the force of this objection will be weakened.

Against this date, on the contrary, may justly be adduced the many precarious, and (as above seen) some positively inaccurate, assumptions necessary to its support. The main objection, however, is the exceeding improbability that Paul, while on his way from Corinth to Palestine, which he was in haste to reach by a given day (Act 18:18; Act 18:20-21), could have found time to stop at Crete, found numerous churches there (Tit 1:5),  and leave Titus in charge of them. Nor have we any evidence that on the voyage in question Paul was accompanied by Titus; nor yet that the individuals mentioned in Tit 3:12-13, were at that time so located with reference to Paul and Titus. For these and other reasons, this hypothesis must be discarded as too problematical throughout.

3. As to the time and place and other circumstances of the writing of this epistle, the following scheme of filling up Paul's movements after his first imprisonment will satisfy all the conditions of the case: We may suppose him possibly after accomplishing his long-projected visit to Spain) to have gone to Ephesus, and taken voyages from thence, first to Macedonia and then to Crete; during the former to have written the First Epistle to Timothy, and after returning from the latter to have written the Epistle to Titus, being at the time of dispatching it on the point of starting for Nicopolis, to which place he went, taking Miletus and Corinth on the way. At Nicopolis we may conceive him to have been finally apprehended and taken to Rome, whence he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy. 1 Other possible combinations may be seen in Birks (Horae Apostolicae 301 at the end of his edition of the Horae Pauline, p. 299301) and in Wordsworth (Greek Testament, 3, 418,421.'It is an undoubted mistake to endeavor to insert this epistle in any period of that part of Paul's life which is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. There is in this writing that unmistakable difference of style (as compared with. the earlier epistles) which associates the Pastoral Letters with one another, and with the latest period of Paul's life; and it seems strange that this should have been so slightly observed by good scholars and exact chronologists, e.g. Archdn. Evans (Script. ioy. 3. 327-333) and Wieseler (Chronol. des capost. Zeitalt. 329-355), who, approaching the subject in very different ways, agree in holding the foregoing theory (No. 2) that this letter was written at Ephesus (between 1 and 2 Corinthians), when the apostle was in the early part of his third missionary journey (Acts 19). SEE PAUL; SEE TITUS.

III. Design and Contents. —The task which Paul had committed to Titus, when he left him in Crete, was one of no small difficulty. The character of the people was unsteady, insincere, and quarrelsome; they were given to greediness, licentiousness, falsehood, and drunkenness, in no ordinary degree; and the Jews who had settled among them appear to have even gone beyond the natives in immorality. Among such a people it was no easy office which Titus had to sustain when commissioned to carry forward  the work which Paul had begun, and to set in order the affairs of the churches which had arisen there, especially as heretical teachers had already crept in among them. Hence Paul addressed to him this epistle, the main design of which is to direct him how to discharge with success the duties to which he had been appointed. For this reason the apostle dilates upon the personal qualifications of Church officers and members, and their functions, with such local allusions as rendered these directions, especially pertinent. After the introductory salutation, which has marked peculiarities (Tit 1:1-4), Titus is enjoined to appoint suitable presbyters in the Cretan Church, and specially such as shall be sound in doctrine and able to refute error (Tit 1:5-9). The apostle then passes to a description of the coarse character of the Cretans, as testified by their own writers, and the mischief caused by Judaizing. error among the Christians of the island (Tit 1:10-16). In opposition to this, Titus is to urge sound and practical Christianity on all classes (Tit 2:1-10), on the older men (Tit 2:2), on the older women, and especially in regard to their-influence over the younger women (Tit 2:3-5), on the younger men (Tit 2:6-8), on slaves (Tit 2:9-10), taking heed meanwhile that he himself is a pattern of good works (Tit 2:7). The grounds of all this are given in the free grace which trains the Christian to self-denying and active piety (Tit 2:11-12), in the glorious hope of Christ's second advent (Tit 2:13), and in the atonement by which he has purchased us, to be his people (Tit 2:14). All these lessons Titus is to urge with fearless decision (Tit 2:15). Next, obedience to rulers is enjoined, with gentleness and forbearance towards all men, these duties being again rested on our sense of past sin (Tit 2:3), and on the gift of new. spiritual life and free justification (Tit 2:4-7). With these practical duties are contrasted those idle speculations which are to be carefully avoided (Tit 2:8-9); and with regard to those men who are positively heretical, a peremptory charge is given (Tit 2:10-11). Some personal allusions then follow: Artemas or Tychicus may be expected at Crete, and on the arrival: of either of them Titus is to hasten to join the apostle at Nicopolis, where he intends to winter; Zenas the lawyer, also, and Apollos, are to be provided with all that is necessary for a journey in prospect (Tit 2:12-13). Finally, before the concluding messages of salutation, an admonition is given to the Cretan Christians, that they give heed to the duties of practical useful piety (Tit 2:14-15).

IV. Commentaries. —The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole of this epistle exclusively: Megander, Expositio [includ. Timothy]  (Basil. 1536, 8vo); Willich, Expositio (Lips. 1540, 8vo); Hoffmann, Commentarius (Frcft. 1541, 8vo); Culmann, Notae (Norib. 1546, 8vo); Alesius, Explicatio (Lips. 1550, 8vo); Espencasus [Romans Cath.], Commentarius (Par. 1568, 8vo); Hunnius, Expositio (Marp. 1587,1604; Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); Rhodomann, Commentarius (Jen. 1597, 8vo); Maglian [R. C.], Commentarius (Lugd. 1609, 4to); Sotto [R. C.], Commentarius [includ. Timothy] (Par. 1610, fol.); Taylor, Commentary (Camb. 1612, 4to; 1658, fol.); Scultetnus, Observationes [includ. Timothy and, Philem.] (Frcft. 1624; Vitemb. 1630, 4to); Goupil [R. C.], Paraphrasis (Par. 1644, 8vo); Daille, Sermons [Fr.] (ibid. 1655, 8vo); Hobert [R. C.], Expositio [includ. Timothy and Philem.] (ibid. 1656, 8vo); Wallis, Expositio (Oxon. 1657, 8vo); Fecht, Expositio (Rost. 1692,1700, 4to); Rappolt, Observationes, (in his Opp. 1, 781); Breithaupt, Exercitatio (Hal. 1703, 4to); Outhof, Verkltaarting (Amst. 1704, 4to); Zentgrav, Commentarius (Arg. 1706, 4to); Gebhard, Paraphrasis (Gryph. 1714, 4to); Koehnen, Verklaaring (Utr. 1724, 4to); Vitringa, Verklaaring (Franek. 1728, 4to); Rambach, Erklarung [includ. Galatians] (Gies. 1739, 4to); Van Haven, Commentatio (Hal. 1742, 4to); Hurter, Cozmmentarius (Schafh. 1744, 4to); Mosheim, Erklarung (ed. Von Eincnm, Stend. 1779, 4to); Kiinol, Explicatio (Lips. 1788, 4to); Van den Ess, Compositio (L. B. 1825, 8vo); Paterson, Commentary [includ. Timothy] (Lond. 1848,18mo); Graham, Commentary (ibid. 1860,12mo). SEE EPISTLE. Titus, bishop OF BOSTRA, in Arabia, was driven from his see, under Julian, A.D. 362; returned under Valentinian; and died about A.D. 371. He wrote Contra Manichoos Lib. III, which is extant in a Latin translation in Biblioth. Pair. tom. 4. A discourse On the Branches of Palm, Greek and Latin, and a Commentary on Luke, in Latin, have been published under his name, but are questioned. —Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 1, 248. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Titus, Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus[[@Headword:Titus, Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus]]

             emperor of Rome, was the eldest son of Vespasian and Flavia Domitilla, and was born at Rome, Dec. 30, A.D. 40. He was educated at the court of Nero with Britannicus, and hence acquired some false moral principles which afterwards led him into many excesses. He was in charge of a legion  of the Roman forces in the last war of the Jews, and on his father's elevation to the imperial throne, he prosecuted the war to a successful close, sharing the honors of a triumph jointly with Vespasian. On his own elevation to the throne, he reformed his habits, and became celebrated for his virtues and popularity. He died Sept. 13, A.D. 81, in the third year of his reign. His career is given by the ancient historians Suetonius and Tacitus, and his connection with the Jews by Josephus. Monographs on him have been written in Latin by Jung (1761), and in French by Rolland (1830).

## Tizite[[@Headword:Tizite]]

             (Heb. Titsi', תִּיצי, patrial, as if from some unknown place or person called Tits; Sept. θωσαϊv v.r. Ι᾿εασεί; Vulg. Thosaites), the designation of Joha (q.v.), the brother of Jediael and son of Shimri, one of the heroes of David's army named in the supplementary list of 1Ch 11:45. The word is possibly a corruption for תַּרְצַי, Tirzite, i.e. inhabitant of Tirzah (q.v.).

## Toah[[@Headword:Toah]]

             (Heb. To'ach, תּוֹחִ, lowly; Sept. θοού v.r. θοουέ and θειέ; Vulg. Thohu), son of Zuph and father of Eliel in the genealogy of Heman the Levitical musician (1Ch 6:34; Hebrews 19:1); elsewhere called by the similar name TOHU (1Sa 1:1), or the different one (1Ch 6:26) NAHATH SEE NAHATH (q.v.). SEE SAMUEL.

## Tob[[@Headword:Tob]]

             (Heb. Tob, טוֹב, good, as everywhere; Sept. Τώβ; Vulg. Tob), the name of a region or district (אֶרֶוֹ; Sept. γῆ; Vulg. terra; A. V. land” ) into which Jephthah withdrew when expelled from home by his half-brethren (Jdg 11:3), and where he remained, at the head of a band of freebooters, till he was brought back by the sheiks (זְקֵנַים) of Gilead (Jdg 11:5). The narrative implies that the land of Tob was not far distant from Gilead; at the same time, from the nature of the case, it must have lain out towards the eastern deserts. It is undoubtedly mentioned again in 2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8 as one of the petty Aramitish kingdoms or states which supported the Ammonites in their great conflict with David; but in that passage the A.V. presents the name literatim as Ishtob (q.v.), i.e. man of  Tob, meaning, according to a common Hebrew idiom, the “men of Tob.” After an immense interval it appears again (Τώβιον or Τούβιον) in the Maccabaean history (1Ma 5:13), and was then the abode of a considerable colony of Jews, numbering at least a thousand males. SEE TOBIE. In 2Ma 12:17 its position under the name TUBIENI SEE TUBIENI (q.v.) is defined very exactly as at or near Charax, 750 stadia from the strong town Caspis, though, as the position of neither of these places is known, we are not thereby assisted in the recovery of Tob. The Targum and Abarbanel render it simply “good land,” while Kimchi and Ben-Gerson look upon Tob as the name of the lord or owner of the land. Eusebius and Jerome make it a country, but say nothing of its situation (Onomast. s.v.). Ptolemy (Geogr. 5, 19) mentions a place called θαῦβα as lying to the southwest of Zobah, and therefore possibly to the east or north-east of the country of Ammon proper. In Stephanus of Byzantium and in Eckhel (Doctr, Nunmm. 3, 352) the names Tubai and Tabeni occur. The name Tell Dobbe (Burckhardt, Syria, April 25), or, as it is given by the latest explorer of those regions, Tell Dibbe (Wetzstein, Map), attached to a ruined site at the south end of the Leja, a few miles north-west of Kenlawat, and also that of Ed-Dub, some twelve hours east of the mountain El-Kileib, are both suggestive of Tob. According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 200) the Talmud identifies it with a Gentile town called Susitha or Chephon, somewhere on the south-east shore of the lake of Tiberias; perhaps the Bippos (q.v.) so often mentioned by Josephus.

## Tob-adonijah[[@Headword:Tob-adonijah]]

             (Heb. Tôb Adoniyah, טרֹב אדוֹנַיָּה, good is Adonijah; Sept. Τωβαδονίας v.r. Τωβαδωβεία ; Vulg. Thobadonias), last named of the nine Levites sent by Jehoshaphat through the cities of Judah to teach the law to the people (2Ch 17:8). B.C. 910.

## Tobenz, Daniel[[@Headword:Tobenz, Daniel]]

             an Augustinian, was born at Vienna in 1743. In 1768 he was made a priest, in 1772 doctor of theology, and in 1775 professor of theology at Vienna.  In 1811 he retired from his professorship, and died August 20, 1819. He published, Institutiones, Usus et Doctrinae Patrum (Vienna, 1779-83): — Examen Tractatus Joannis Barbegraci de Doctrina Morali Patrum Ecclesie. (1785): — Commentarius in Novum Testamentum 1804-6, 2 volumes): — Paraphrasis Psalmorum ex Hebraica Adornata, Notis et Summariis Instructa (2d ed. 1814). His works were published under the title Opera Omnnia (1822, 15 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Tobey, Zalmon[[@Headword:Tobey, Zalmon]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Norfolk, Conn., July 27, 1791. His parents were Congregationalists. He pursued his collegiate studies for a time at Williams College, and then became a member of Brown University, where he graduated in the class of 1817. In the fall of this year, he was ordained to the work of the ministry in Canaan, Conn., and in the following spring became pastor of the Baptist Church at Fruit Hill, Providence, R. I., where he remained five years (1818-23). He became pastor of the Fourth Baptist  Church. Providence, Sept. 2, 1823, where he continued for about ten years (1823-33). During this period he fraternized chiefly with the Freewill Baptists, the Church of which he was pastor largely sympathizing with him. After being disconnected with the regular Baptists for several years, he returned to that body. His subsequent pastorates were in Bristol, R. I., for three years; Colebrook, Conn., for five years; and Pawtucket, R. I., for seven years. In the spring of 1851 he removed to Warren, R. I. He preached as occasion offered in and around Warren for several years. He died in Norfolk. Conn., where he was visiting his relatives, Sept. 17,1858. See Rev. Dr. H. Jackson, Funeral Sermon. (J. C. S.)

## Tobiah[[@Headword:Tobiah]]

             (Heb. Tobiyah', טוֹנַיָּה[once טֹביָּה,Nehemiah 2, 19], goodness of Jehovah; Sept. Τωβίας v.r. Τωβεία; Vulg. Tobia, Tobis), the name of two men. SEE TOBIAS; SEE TOBIAIL.

1. A person whose “children” were a family that returned with Zerubbabel, but were unable to prove their connection with Israel (Ezr 2:60; Neh 7:62). B.C. ante 536.

2. A base-born ally of the Samaritans who played a conspicuous part in the rancorous opposition made by Sanballat the Moabiite and his adherents to the rebuilding of Jerusalem under Nehemiah, B.C. 446. With an affectation of scorn, after the manner of Remus in the Roman legend, they looked on the constructions of the now hopeful and thriving Jews, and contemptuously said, “Even if a fox go up, he will break down their stone wall” (Neh 4:3). The two races of Moab and Ammon found in these men fit representatives of that hereditary hatred to the Israelites which began before the entrance into Canaan, and was not extinct when the Hebrews had ceased to exist as a nation. The horrible story of the origin of the Moabites and Ammonites, as it was told by the Hebrews, is an index of the feeling of repulsion which must have existed between these hostile families of men. In the dignified rebuke of Nehemiah it received its highest expression: “Ye have no portion, nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem” (2, 20). But Tobiah, though-a slave (Neh 4:10; Neh 4:19), unless this be a title of opprobrium, and an Ammonite, found means to ally himself with a priestly family, and his son Johanan, married the daughter of Meshullam the son of Berechiah (6, 18). He himself was the son in-law of Shechaniah the son of Arah (Neh 4:17), and these family relations created for ‘him a strong faction  among the Jews, and may have had something to do with the stern measures which Ezra found it necessary to take to repress the intermarriages with foreigners. Even a grandson of the high-priest Eliashib had married a daughter of Sanballat (13, 28). In 13:4 Eliashib is said to ‘have been allied to Tobiah, which would imply a relationship of some kind between Tobiah and Sanballat, though its nature is not mentioned. The evil had spread so far that the leaders of the people were compelled to rouse their religious antipathies by reading from the law of Moses the strong prohibition that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God forever (Neh 4:1). Ewald (Gesch. 4:173) conjectures that Tobiah had been a page (“slave”) at the Persian court, and, being in favor there, had been promoted to be satrap of the Ammonites. But it almost seems that against Tobiah there was a stronger feeling of animosity than against Sanballat, and that this animosity found expression in the epithet “the slave,” which is attached to his name. It was Tobiah who gave venom to the pitying scorn of Sanballat (Neh 4:3), and provoked the bitter cry of Nehemiah (Neh 4:4-5); it was Tobiah who kept up communications with the factious Jews, and who sent letters to put their leader in fear (Neh 6:17; Neh 6:19); but his crowning act of insult was to take up his residence in the Temple in the chamber which Eliashib had prepared for him in defiance of the Mosaic statute. Nehemiah's patience could no longer contain itself, “therefore,” he says, “‘I cast forth all the household stuff of Tobiah out of the chamber,” and with this summary act Tobiah disappears from history (Neh 13:7-8). SEE NEHEMIAH.

## Tobiah, Ben Eliezer[[@Headword:Tobiah, Ben Eliezer]]

             a Jewish writer, who flourished at Mayence, A.D. 1107, is the author of a commentary on the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth, i.e. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. This commentary, the proper title of which is Lekach Tob (לקח טוב) in allusion to his name, as is evident from the quotations made by Aben-Ezra and Rashbam, but which is erroneously called פסקתאor פסקתא זוטרתא, consists both of excerpts from the ancient expository works, such as Siphsra, Siphre, Tanchuma, etc., and of an attempt at a grammatical explanation of the text. A portion of it, embracing the commentaries on Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, was first published at Venice in 1546. With a Latin translationit was republished in Ugolino's Thesaurus Antiuita tum Sacsarum (ibid. 1764-69), vol. 15:16. Excerpts of the commentaries on the  five Megilloth were published by A. Jellinek (Leips. 1855-58). The whole MS. is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (Cod. Uri 124). See First, Bibl. Jud. 3, 427;. Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:159; Kitto, Cycop. s.v.; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, p. 233, 406; De'Rossi, Dizionario Storico (German transl.), p. 314; Zunz, Gottesd. Vortrage, p. 293-295. (B. P.)

## Tobias[[@Headword:Tobias]]

             (Τωβίας), the Greek form of the name Tobiah or Tobijah, as it occurs of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. The son of Tobit, and central character in the book of that name. SEE TOBIT, BOOK OF.

2. The father of Hyrcanus, apparently a man of great wealth and reputation, at Jerusalem in the time of Seleucus Philopator (2 Maccabees 3, 11). B.C. cir. 187. In the high-priestly schism which happened afterwards, SEE MENELAUS, “the sons of Tobias” took a conspicuous part (Josephus, Ant. 12, 5, 1). One of these, Joseph, who raised himself by intrigue to high favor with the Egyptian court, had a son named Hyrcanus (ibid. 4, 2). It has been supposed that this is the Hyrcanus referred to in 2 Maccabees 3, 11; and it is not impossible that, for some unknown reason (as in the case of the Maccabees), the whole family were called after their grandfather, to, the exclusion of the father's name. On the other hand, the natural recurrence of names in successive generations makes it more probable that the Hyrcanus mentioned in Josephus was a nephew of the Hyrcanus in 2 Macc. (comp. Ewald, Gesch.'d. Volkes Israel, 4., 309; Grimm, Ad Macc. loc. cit.).

## Tobie[[@Headword:Tobie]]

             the name of a district (τὰ Τωβίου v.r. Τουβίου; Vulg. loca Tubin), where, in the time of the Maccabees, was an extensive colony of Jews (1 Maccabees 5, 13); probably identical with the land of TOB SEE TOB (q.v.) mentioned in the history of Jephthah (Jdg 11:3, b).

## Tobiel[[@Headword:Tobiel]]

             (Τωβιήλ, for He טוֹבַיאֵל, goodness of God; comp. Tobael), the father of Tobit and grandfather of Tobias (Tob 1:1).

## Tobijah[[@Headword:Tobijah]]

             (Heb. Tobiyah, טוֹבַיָּה[once (Zec 6:10) in the prolonged form Tobiya'hu, טוֹבַיָּהוּ, goodness of Jehovah), the name of two men. SEE TOBIAH; SEE TOBIAS.

1. (Sept. Τωβίας, but some MSS. omit; Vulg. Thobias.) The eighth named of the nine Levites sent by Jehoshaphat to teach the law in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:8). . B.C. 910.

2. (Sept. οἱ χρήσιμοι αὐτῆς ; Vulg. Tobias.) Second named of the three or four representative men of the Jewish captives in the time of Zechariah, in whose presence the prophet was commanded to take crowns of silver and gold and put them on the head of Joshua the high-priest (Zec 6:10; Zec 6:14). B.C. 519. Rosenmüller conjectures that he was one of a deputation who came up to Jerusalem from the Jews who still remained in Babylon with contributions of gold and silver for the Temple. But Maurer considers that the offerings were presented by Tobijah and his companions, because the crowns were commanded to be placed in the Temple as a memorial of their visit and generosity. SEE ZECHARIAH.

## Tobit[[@Headword:Tobit]]

             (Sept. Τωβείθ, Τωβείτ, Τωβίτ; Vulg. Tobias; et. Lat. Tobi, Thobi, Tobis), the son of Tobiel and father of Tobias (Tobit 1, 1, etc.). The name appears to answer to טוֹבַי, Tob, which occurs frequently in later times (Fritzsche, Ad Tobit 1, 1), and not (as Welte, Einleitung, p. 65) to טוֹבַיָּה, Tobiah; yet in that case Τωβίς, according to the analogy of Λεϊvς (לֵוַי), would have been the more -natural form. The etymology of the word is obscure. Ilgen translates it simply “my goodness;” Fritzsche regards it as an abbreviation of טוֹבַיָּה, comparing Μελχί (Luk 3:24; Luk 3:28), חַזַקַי, etc. (Ad Tob. loc. cit.). The form in the Vulg. is of no weight against the old Latin, except so far as it shows the reading of the Chaldaic text which Jerome used, ia which the identity of the names of the father and son is directly affirmed (1, 9, Vulg.). SEE TOBIT, BOOK OF.

## Tobit, Book of[[@Headword:Tobit, Book of]]

             one of the deutero-canonical books of the Old Test., standing in most editions of the original between the Epistle of Jeremiah and. the Book of  Judith, but in the A. V. between 2 Esdr. and Judith. It is chiefly interesting for the insight which it gives us into the superstitious notions of the Jews during the period of the Apocrypha.

I. Title. —In the Greek the book is called simply Tobit (Τωβίτ, Τωβείτ) in the old MSS. At a later time the opening words of the book, Βίβλος λόγων Τωβιτ, were taken as a title. In Latin MSS. it is styled Tobis, Liber Thobis, Liber Tobic (Sabatier, p. 706), Tobit et Tobias, Liber utriusque Tobice (Fritzsche, Einleit. § 1). In the A. V. it is superscribed “The book of the words of Tobit, etc., who, in the time of Eiemessar (Shalmaneser), king of the Assyrians, was led captive out of Thisbe, which is at the right hand of Kydios of Nephthalim in Galilee, above Aser.” The word Tobit is probably a Hebrew form טוֹבית, signifying goodness, a name very appropriate in a narrative of virtue suffering, yet rewarded.

II. Design and Contents. — The object of this book is to show that God, in his mysterious providence, permits sore calamities to befall the most pious and God-fearing in the very act of, and apparently for, obeying his commandments, but that he at the same time exercises a special care over them in the midst of their sufferings, vouchsafes them a happy issue out of all their trials, and holds them up to the world at large as patterns of patience under tribulations, as such who have been deemed worthy of being tried and purified, and who have demonstrated that the effectual and fervent prayer of a “righteous man availeth much.” The method adopted by the writer for working out this design will be seen from the following analysis of the book itself.

Tobit

a Jew of the tribe of Naphtali, who strictly observed the law and remained faithful to the Temple service at Jerusalem (Tob 1:4-8), was carried captive to Assyria by Shalmaneser. While in captivity he exerted himself to relieve his countrymen, which his favorable position at court (ἀγοραστής, Tob 1:13, “purveyor”) enabled him to do, and at this time he was rich enough to lend ten talents of silver to a countryman, Gabael of Rages, in Media. But when Sennacherib succeeded his father, Shalmaneser, the fortune of Tobit was changed. He was accused of burying the Jews whom the king had put to death, and was only able to save himself, his wife, Anna, and his son Tobias, by flight. On the accession of Esar-haddon, he was allowed to return to Nineveh, at the intercession of his nephew, Achiacharuts, who  occupied a high place in the king's household (Tob 1:22); but his zeal for his countrymen brought him into a strange misfortune. As he lay one night in the court of his house, being unclean from having buried a Jew whom his son had found strangled in the market-place, sparrows “muted warm dung into his eyes,” and he became blind. Being thus disabled, he was for a time supported by Achiacharus, and after his departure (read ἐπορεύθη, Tob 2:10) by the labor of his wife. On one occasion he falsely accused her of stealing a kid which had been added to her wages, and in return she reproached him with the miserable issue of all his righteous deeds. Grieved by her taunts, he prayed to God for help; and it happened that on the same day Sara, his kinswoman (Tob 6:10-11), the only daughter of Raguel, also sought help from God against the reproaches of her father's household. For seven young men wedded to her had perished on their marriage-night by the power of the evil spirit Asmodsus (q.v.); and she thought that she should “bring her father's old age with sorrow unto the grave” (Tob 3:10). So Raphael was sent to deliver both from their troubles. In the meantime Tobit called to mind the money which he had lent to Gabael, and dispatched Tobias, with many wise counsels, to reclaim it (ch. 4). On this Raphael (under the form of a kinsman, Azarias) offered himself as a guide to Tobias on his journey to Media, and they “went forth both, and the young man's dog with them,” and Anna was comforted for the absence of her son (ch. 5). When they reached the Tigris, Tobias was commanded by Raphael to take “the heart, and liver, and gall” of “a fish which leaped out of the river and would have devoured him,” and instructed how to use the first two against Asmodaeus, for Sara, Raphael said, was appointed to be his wife (ch. 6). So when they reached Ecbatana, they were entertained by Raguel, and, in accordance with the words of the angel, Sara was given to Tobias in marriage that night, and Asmodaeus was “driven to the utmost parts of Egypt,” where “the angel bound him” (ch. 7, 8). After this Raphael recovered the loan from Gabael (ch. 9), and Tobias then returned with Sara and half her father's goods to Nineveh (ch. 10). Tobit, informed by Anna of their son's approach, hastened to meet him. Tobias, by the command of the angel, applied the fish's gall to his father's eyes and restored his sight (ch. 11). After this Raphael, addressing to both words of good counsel, revealed himself, and “they saw him no more” (ch. 12). On this Tobit expressed his gratitude in a fine psalm (ch. 13); and he lived to see the long prosperity of his son (Tob 14:1-2). After his death Tobias, according to his instruction, returned to Ecbatana, and “before he died he heard of the destruction of Nineveh,” of which “Jonas the prophet spake” (Tob 14:15; Tob 14:4).

III. Historical and Religious Character of the Book.

1. There are three theories about the reality of this story.

(1.) The opinion that this book records proper history was universally held by the Christian Church up to the time of the Reformation, and has even since been maintained by bishop Gray (A Key to the 0. T. p. 620, etc., ed. 1857), Welte (Einleit. p. 84 sq.), Scholz (Einleit. 2, 594 sq.), and most Roman Catholic writers. In support of this opinion may be urged,

a. The minute account which it gives of Tobit's tribe, his pedigree, place of birth, the time in which he lived, his family, his condition and employment, his captivity, poverty, blindness, recovery, age, death, and place of burial (1, 1, 13, 20, 21; 2, 10; 11:13; 14:11-13);

b. The exactness of the historical remarks about the Assyrian kings (1, 2, 13, 15, 21), without deriving the names Ε᾿νεμέσσαρος (=Shalmaneser) and Σαχερδονός from the Old Test., as well as the correctness of the geographical points (1, 14; 2, 21; 3, 7; 6:1, 11); c. The impossibility of tracing the main: features of the narrative to any Old Test. prototype, and of explaining them on the hypothesis of fiction. The obscure place Thisbe is given as Tobit's place of birth (1, 2), and many minute particulars of his life are described which have in themselves nothing whatever to do with the plot, and which can only be accounted for on the reality of the events. On the other hand, Bertholdt (Einleit. § 579) has given a summary of alleged errors in detail (e.g. 1, ,2, “Naphtali,” comp. with 2Ki 15:29; 2Ki 6:9, Rages, said to have been founded by Sel. Nicator), but the question turns rather upon the general complexion of the history than upon minute objections, which are often captious and rarely satisfactory (comp. Welte, Einleit. p. 84-94).

(2.) The opinion that it is a moral fiction was first thrown out by Luther (Vorrede aufs Buch Tobia [Bible, ed. 1534]), and has since been maintained by Rainold (Censur. 1, 726), J. A. Fabricius, Buddens (Hist. Eccles. 2, 489), Paul Faginus, Eichhorn (Einleit. p. 401 sq.), Bertholdt (Einleit. 5, 2477 sq.), De Wette (Einleit. § 309), Gutmann (Die Apokryphen. p. 143), Ewald (Gesch. d. V. J. 4:233 sq.), Fritszche (Kurgef. exeget. Handb. z. d. Apokryphen, 2, 14 sq.), Davidson (The Text of the O.T. Considered, p. 1001), Vaihüger (in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v. “Tobias”), Gratz (Gesch. der Juden, 4:180 [2nd ed. 1866]), etc. In support of this opinion it is urged-a. The narrative is completely isolated; and  though the events pretend to have occurred before and shortly after the fall of Nineveh (B.C. 606), no other document written at a later period refers to them. It bears a strong likeness to the tales of the Thousand and One Nights, with the obvious exception that the writer has a considerable acquaintance and sympathy with the writings of the Old Test. He writes in a pleasing style, and with a good deal of power. But he is clearly at variance with the sacred books of the holy nation on important points both of fact and principle. Tobit's age, his wife's, who died after him, and that of his son are much beyond the ordinary limit of old age in his day, and bring us back to the times of the patriarchs. He was fifty-eight years of age when he lost his sight, in the reign of Esar-haddon, and lived one hundred years after that time. Now, if, according to Rawlinson, Esar-haddon began to reign B.C. 680, Tobit must have survived the fall of Nineveh (B.C. 625 or 606), of which, he is made to prophesy (14, 4). He also takes no account of Sargon, who comes-in between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. He removes to Ely-mais, and yet is found at Nineveh (11, 16), though he does not intimate his return, unless it be in 3, 17, where he speaks of coming home. b. The name Tobit does not occur in the Old Test., and belongs to a later age. c. The form, spirit, and tone of the narrative show that it belongs to a very late period. The doctrine of good and evil spirits (3, 8; 6:14; 8:3; 12:15), the ascription of human lusts to spiritual beings (vi, 14), the notion of the seven presence-angels bringing the prayers of the pious before the Divine throne (12, 12, 15), the marriage instrument (כתובה), and the legal benediction pronounced over tie wedded pair (7, 13, 14), are of post-Babylonian origin... 1. The stories of the angel Raphael in a human form giving a false account of himself as being a kinsman of Tobit (5, 12), of Tobit becoming blind in both eyes by the falling of some dung of sparrows (2, 10), and of the marvelous fish (6, 2-5) are beyond all matter of fact. The modes of repelling evil spirits and curing blindness betray a superstitious or trifling mind. The angel is made to feign himself a man, a Jew of a family known to Tobit, and to be the voucher for the false charms which are introduced. Although the extraordinary character of the details, as such, is no objection against the reality of the occurrences, yet it may be fairly urged that the character of the alleged miraculous events, when taken together, is alien from the general character of such events in the historical books of Scripture; while there is nothing exceptional in the circumstances of the persons, as in the case of Daniel, which might serve to explain this difference.

(3.) The view that the narrative is based upon a real occurrence preserved by tradition, but poetically embellished to suit the spirit of the time in which it was written, is maintained by Arnald, Dereser, Ilgen, Keil, etc. The fact that there are different recensions and embellishments of the story, and that the Midrash Tanchuma (pericope האזינו) gives an independent version of it, seems to show that it was traditionally handed down from the time when the occurrence took place. It is quite possible that some real occurrences, preserved by tradition, furnished the basis of the narrative, but it does not follow by any means that the elimination of the extraordinary details will leave behind pure history (so Ilgen). As the book stands it is a distinctly didactic narrative. Its point lies in the moral lesson which it conveys, and not in the incidents. The incidents furnish lively pictures of the truth which the author wished to inculcate, but the lessons themselves are independent of them. Nor can any weight be laid on the minute exactness with which apparently unimportant details are described (e.g. the genealogy and dwelling-place of Tobit , 1, 1, 2; the marriage festival, 8:20; 11:18, 19, quoted by Ilgen and Welte), as proving the reality of the events, for such particularity is characteristic of Eastern romance, and appears again in the Book of Judith. The writer in composing his-story necessarily observed the ordinary form of a historical narrative.

2. The religious character of the book is one of its most important and interesting features, inasmuch as it shows the phases of faith which obtained prior to the advent of Christ, and explains many points in the New Test. Few probably can read the book in the Sept. text without assenting to the favorable judgment of Luther on its merits. Nowhere else is there preserved so complete and beautiful a picture of the domestic life of the Jews after the Return. There may be symptoms of a tendency to formal, righteousness of works out; as yet the works are painted as springing from a living faith. The devotion due to Jerusalem is united with definite acts of charity (1, 6-8) and with the prospect of wider blessings (13, 11). The giving of alms is not a mere scattering of wealth, but a real service of love (1, 16, 17; 2, 1-7; 4, 7-11, 16), though at times the emphasis which is laid upon the duty is exaggerated (as it seems) from the special circumstances in which the writer was placed (12, 9; 14:10). Of the special precepts one (4, 15, ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσης) contains the negative side of the golden rule of conduct (Mat 7:12),.which in this partial form is found among the maxims of Confucius.  But it is chiefly in the exquisite tenderness of the portraiture of domestic life that the book excels. The parting of Tobias and his mother, the consolation of Tobit (5, 17-22), the affection of Raguel (7, 4-8), the anxious waiting of the parents (10, 1-7), the son's return (9, 4; 11), and even the unjust suspiciousness of the sorrow of Tobit and Anna (2, 11-14) are painted with a simplicity worthy of the best times of the patriarchs. Almost every family relation is touched upon with natural grace and affection: husband and wife, parent and child, kinsmen, near or distant, master and servant, are presented in the most varied action, and always with life-like power (1, 22; 2, 10, 13, 14; 5, 14, 15, 17-22; 7,3-8, 16; 8:4-8; 10:1-7; 11:1-13; 12:1-5, etc.). Prayer hallows the whole conduct of life (4, 19; 6:17; 8:5-8, etc.); and even in distress there is confidence that in the end all will be well (4, 6, 14, 19), though there is no clear anticipation of a future personal existence (3, 6).

The most remarkable doctrinal feature in the book is the prominence given to the action of spirits, who, while they are conceived to be subject to the passions of men and material influences (Asmodaeus), are yet not affected by-bodily wants, and manifested only by their own will (Raphael, 12:19). Powers of evil (δαιμόνιον, πνεῦμα πονηρόν, 3, 8, 17; 6:7, 14, 17) are represented as gaining the means of injuring men by sin, while they are driven away and bound by the exercise of faith and prayer (8, 2,3). On the other hand, Raphael comes among men as “the healer” (comp. Dillmann, Das Buch Henoch, c. 20), and, by the mission of God (3, 17; 12:18), restores those whose good actions he has secretly watched (12, 12, 13), and “the remembrance of whose prayers he has brought before the Holy One” (12, 12). This ministry of intercession is elsewhere expressly recognized. Seven holy angels, of whom Raphael is one, are specially described as those “which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in aid out before the glory of God” (12, 15). It is characteristic of the same sense of the need of some being to interpose between God and man that singular prominence is given to the idea of” the glory of God,” before which these archangels appear as priests in the holiest place (8, 15; 12:15); and in one passage “the angel of God” (5, 16, 21) occupies a position closely resembling that of the Word in the, Targums and Phlilo (De Muet Norn. § 13, etc.). Elsewhere blessing is rendered to “all the holy angels” (11, 14, εὐλογημένοι as contrasted with εὐλογητός; comp. Luk 1:42), who are themselves united with “the elect” in the duty of praising God forever (8:15).  This mention of “the elect” points to a second doctrinal feature of the book, which it shares with Baruch alone of the Apocryphal writings, the firm belief in a glorious restoration of the Jewish people (14:5; 103, 9-18). But the restoration contemplated is national, and not the work of a universal Savior. The Temple is described as “consecrated and built for all ages” (1:4), its feasts are “an everlasting decree” (v. 6), and when it is restored the streets of Jerusalem shall say, “Blessed be God which hath extolled it forever” (13:18). In all there is not the slightest trace of the belief in a personal Messiah.

Comparisons have often been made between the Book of Tobit and Job, but from the outline which has been given it is obvious that the resemblance is only superficial, though Tob 2:14 was probably suggested by Job 2:9-10, while the differences are such as to mark distinct periods. In Tobit the sorrows of those who are afflicted are laid at once in prayer before God, in perfect reliance on his final judgment, and then immediately relieved by Divine interposition. In Job the real conflict is in the soul of the sufferer, and his relief comes at length with humiliation and repentance (Job 42:6). The one book teaches by great thoughts; the other by clear maxims translated into touching incidents. The contrast of Tobit and Judith is still more instructive. These books present two pictures of Jewish life and feeling, broadly distinguished in all their details, and yet mutually illustrative. The one represents the exile prosperous and even powerful in a strange land, exposed to sudden dangers, cherishing his national ties, and looking with unshaken love to the Holy City, but still mainly occupied by the common duties of social life; the other portrays a time of reproach and peril, when national independence was threatened, and a righteous cause seemed to justify unscrupulous valor. The one gives the popular ideal of holiness of living, the other of courage in daring. The one reflects the current feeling at the close of the Persian rule, the other during the struggles for freedom.

IV. Original Language, Versions, Condition of the Text, etc. —

1. The whole complexion of the book shows that it is of. Palestinian origin, and hence many have assumed that the languages in which the traditional story was first written down were Hebrew and Aramaic. Indeed, Jerome tells us that he made his Latin version from the Aramaic in one day, with the assistance of a Jew, who, being skilled in both Hebrew and Chaldee, dictated to him the import thereof in Hebrew (“Exigitis, ut-librum  Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad Latinum stylum traham, librum utique Tobiae quem Hebraei de catalogo divinarum Scripturarum secantes his quae Hagiographa [Apocrypha] memorant, manciparunt. Feci satis desiderio vestro, non tamen meo studio. Et quia vicina est Chaldseorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae pertissimum loquacem reperiens unius diei laborem arripui, et quidquid; ille mihi, Hebraicis verbis expressit,-hoc ego accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui” [Praf. in Tob.]). This has been thought to be corroborated by the fact that some of the difficulties in the Greek text can be removed on the supposition of a Hebrew original. Thus ἔκχεον τοὺς ἄρτους σου ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον τῶν δικαίων (4:17), which has no sense, seems to be a mistranslation of שלח לחמ ִבקרב הצריקי; the translator, by a transposition of the last two letters, having read בקברinstead of בקרבand שפ instead of שלח, as is evident from the antithetical clause, “Land give it not to the wicked,” in harmony with the traditional injunction להחזיק ידי עוברי עברה אסור, it is not lawful to strengthen the hands of the transgressor. So also καὶ εὐλόγησε Τωβίας τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (9, 6) may be accounted for only the supposition that it is a mistranslation of the Hebrew ויבר ִטוביה את אשתו. The correct rendering of it requires that either Gabael should be taken as the subject — i.e. “and he (i.e. Gabael) saluted Tobias with his wife” — or that both Tobias and his wife should be the subject — i.e. “and Tobias and his wife saluted them,” i.e. the two comers, Azarias and the servant. See also. Tob 5:11-12; Tob 5:18; Tob 6:9; arid for the Hebraizing style, 1,1; 13; 3, 5; 5, 14; 14:19; De Wette, Einleit. § 310; Gratz, Geschichte,: 4:466 (2nd ed.). On the other hand, superior clearness, simplicity, and accuracy of the Sept. text prove conclusively that this is nearer the original than any other text which is known, if it be not, as some have supposed (Jahn and Fritzsche doubtfully), the original itself. Indeed, the arguments, which have been brought forward to show that it is a translation are far from conclusive. The supposed contradictions between different parts of the book, especially the change from the first (1-3, 6) to the third person (3:7-14), from which Ilgen endeavored to prove that the narrative was made up of distinct Hebrew documents, carelessly put together, and afterwards rendered by one Greek translator, are explicable on other grounds; and the alleged mistranslations (3:6; 4:19, etc.) depend rather on errors in interpreting the Greek text than on errors in the text itself. The style, again, though harsh in parts, and far from the classical standard, is not more so than some books which were undoubtedly written  in Greek (e.g. the Apocalypse); and there is little, if anything, in it which points certainly to the immediate influence of an Aramaic text. (Tob 1:4, εἰς πάσας τὰς γενέας τοῦ αἰῶνος; comp. Eph 3:21; Tob 1:22, ἐκ δευτέρας ; Tob 3:15, ἵνα τί μοι ζῆν ; Tob 5:15, τίνα σοι ἔσομαι μισθὸν διδόναι ; Tob 14:3, προσέθετπ φοβεῖσθαι, etc.) To this it may be added that Origen was not acquainted with any Hebrew original (Ep. ad Afric. 13); and the Chaldee copy which Jerome used, as far as its character can be ascertained, was evidently a later version of the story. On the other hand, there is no internal evidence against the supposition that the Greek text is a translation. The Greek offers some peculiarities-in vocabulary: Tob 1:6, πρωτοκουρία, i. . e. ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κουρῶν, Deu 18:4; Deu 1:7, ἀποπρατίζομαι; Deu 1:21, ἐκλοιστία; Deu 2:3, στραγγαλόω, etc.: and in construction, Deu 13:7, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι τὴν μεγαλωσύνην ; Deu 12:4, δικαιοῦσθαί τινι; Deu 6:19, προσάγειν τινί (intrans.); Deu 6:6, ἐγγίζειν ἐν, etc. But these furnish no argument on either side.

2. There are extant different Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Hebrew texts of this book, differing more or less from one another in the details of the narrative; but yet, on the whole, so far alike that it is reasonable to suppose that all were derived from one written original, which was modified in the course of translation or transcription.

Besides the Greek text of the Sept. which was adopted into this version because it was that-of the Greek Church, there is a recension, one fragment of which (1:1-2, 2) is contained in the Cod. Sinaiticus (or Cod. Frid. Augustanus, ed. Tischendorf [Leips. 1846]), and another (6:9-13) in. the last three MSS. (44, 106, 107) of Holmes and Parsons.

Of Latin translations we have the ante-Hieronymian version, which was first published by Sabatier (Bibliorun Sacrosrum Latince Versiones Antiquae, 1743) from two MSS. of the 8th century, and which, according to the investigations of Fritzsche (p. 1 sq.), is mostly made from the recension of the Greek text, but partly (vi, 15-17; 7:15-18; 8:14-17; 12:6- 9, 11-22; 13:6-18) also from the common text, while 10:1-11, 19 is from a mixture of both texts. In this edition of the Vetus Latina, Sabatier also published, in the form of notes and as various readings, two other codd., one being of the same age as the MSS. of the ante-Hieronymian version, belonging to the library of St. Germanuts (No. 15), and concluding (13, 12) with Explicit Tobijustus; and the other belonging to the Vatican (No. 7). The text of the latter differs so materially from the other MSS. that it is  regarded as an independent version, though emanating from the same Greek source. It is less barbarous and more fluent in style, as well as more explicit its renderings, and it is to be regretted that it has survived as a fragment, containing only 1, 1-6; 12 (Bibl. Lat. 2, 706). There also, existed another Latin version, as is evident from the quotations of this book contained in the Speculum of Augustine, which Angelo Mai has published (Spicilegium Romanorum, 9:21-23). As to the Vulgate Latin version, Jerome tells us, as we have seen, that he made it in one day from the Syro- Chaldaic. It differs very materially from the Greek, and is evidently derived from a different form which this traditional story assumed in a different part of the country. The treatment of the text in this recension is very arbitrary, as might be expected from the above account, which Jerome gives of the mode in which it was made; and it is of very little critical value, for, it is impossible to distinguish accurately the different elements which are incorporated in it. It is evident that in this process Jerome made some use of the Old Latin version, which he follows almost verbally in a few places: 3, 3-6; 4:6,7, 11. 23, etc.; but the greater part of the version seems to be an independent work. On the whole, it is more concise than the Old Latin; but it contains interpolations and changes, many of which mark the asceticism of a late age: 2, 12-14 (parallel with Job); 3, 17-23 (expansion of 3, 14); 6:17 sq. (expansion of 6:18); 9:11, 12; 12:13 (“et quia acceptus eras Deo, necesse fuit ut tentatio probaret te” ).

The Syriac version is made from the two different recensions of the Greek; 1, 1-7, 9 being a translation of the common Greek text of the Sept.; while 7:10, etc., is from a text represented by the above-named three MSS. (44, 106,107) of Holmes and Parsons, according to the marginal annotations in Usher's MS.

Neubauer has lately discovered a Chaldee version among the MSS. of the Bodleian Library, which may prove to be a copy of that to which Jerome refers as the basis of his version.

There are four Hebrew versions of this book, the one first published in Constantinople, 1517; then with a Latin translation by Paul Fagius, and adopted in Walton's Polyglot (Lond. 1657), vol. 4. It is a free translation of the common Greek text, made by a learned Jew in the 12th century. The second is that first published with a Latin translation by Sebastian Minister (Basle, 1542; then again in 1549, 1556, 1563), and has also been inserted in Walton's Polyglot. This Hebrew version is more in harmony with the  Vetus Latina; and the author of it, who was a Jew, is supposed to have flourished in the 5th century. The: third Hebrew version was made from the common Greek text by J. S. Frinkel (Leips. 1830); and the fourth is by J. Siebenberger — it was published in Warsaw, 1840, with a Judaeo- German translation, a Hebrew commentary, and an elaborate Hebrew introduction.

As to the versions of the Reformation, Luther made his translation from the Vulgate; the Swiss-Zurich Bible (1531) is also from the Vulgate.: Coverdale (1535), as usual, followed the Zurich version, SEE COVERDALE; and he again was followed by Matthew's Bible (1537), Lord Cromwell's Bible (1539), — Cranmer's Bible (1540), and the Bishops Bible (1568). The Genevan version (1560) is the first made from the Greek, and our present A.V. (1611), as in most cases, followed the Genevan version, though this was interdicted by James I.

3. The first complete edition of the book was by Ilgen (Die Gesch. Tobi's …mit…einer Einleit. verssehen [Jen. 1800]), which, in spite of serious defects due to the period at which it was published, contains the most full discussion of the contents. The edition of Fritzsche (Exeget. Handb. [Leips. 1853], vol. 2) is concise and scholar like, but leaves some points without-illustration, In England the book, like the rest of the Apocrypha, seems to have fallen into neglect.

V. Author, Date, and Place of Composition. —As 12:20 tells us that Raphael, before his disappearance, commanded Tobit and his son Tobias to record the events; of their lives; and, moreover, since Tobit, in the first three chapters, speaks in the first person, while (ch. 13) his prayer is introduced by the statement Καὶ Τωβὶτ ἔγραψε προσευχὴν εἰς ἀγαλλίασιν καὶ ειπεν; the Church universal, up to the time of the Reformation, believed that Tobit himself wrote this book (B.C. cir. 600) as far as ch. 14; that 14:1-11 was written by his son Tobias; and that 12:12-15 was added by -the editor of this document immediately after the death of Tobias. This opinion is shared by bishop Gray, Prideaux, and others, who modify it by submitting that it was compiled from the memoirs of Tobit and Tobias; while Ilgen maintains that 1, 1-3, 7; 13:1-8, were written by Tobit in Assyria, B.C. 689; 3, 8-12, 2-22; 14:1-15, were written in Palestine, B.C. cir. 280; and that from these two Hebrew documents the Chaldee version was made B.C. cir. 120, which Jerome translated into Latin. Modern critics, however, conclude, from the whole complexion of the  book, its angelology, theology, etc., that it is a post-Babylonian production, and that it was -written by a Palestinian Jew. But these critics differ very materially about the precise date when the book was compiled, as will be seen from the following table:

The Catholic Church—Bishop Gray, IlgenB.C.689-600Ewald350Herzfeld300Bertholdt250-200EichhornA.D.10Fabricius100Grätz130But though internal evidence leaves it beyond the shadow of a doubt that the book was compiled after the Babylonian captivity, yet the arguments adduced by Gratz (Geschichte, 3, 466, 2nd ed.) to prove that it was written after the destruction of the Temple, and during, the persecutions of Hadrian, are inconclusive. The reference to the destruction of the Temple (13, 10, 16; 14:4) is designed to refer to what took place in the reign of Zedekiah, when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem and burned the sanctuary (2 Kings 25). The other remark of this learned historian-viz. that the bread of heathens (ἄρτος τῶν ἐθνῶν=פת נכרים), of which Tobit speaks (2Ki 25:1; 2Ki 25:10), was first interdicted shortly before the destruction of the Temple by Titus is based upon restricting the term ἄρτος to actual bread, whereas it signifies food generally, and this was prohibited long before the Christian era (comp. Daniel 1, 5). Indeed, the book is singularly devoid of the stringent Halachic expansions of the Mosaic enactments which obtained in later times: it contains no allusion whatever to the rewards in a future life, and has no reference to the party-strifes which were so rampant at the time of Christ, traces of which might naturally be expected in it if it had been written in or after the time of Christ. It is therefore most probable that the book was written B.C. cir. 250-200.

VI. Canonicity and Authority. —Like the other deutero-canonical books, Tobit'was, never included in the canon by the synagogue. This is established beyond the shadow of doubt, not only from the list of the Hebrew Scriptures given by the Jews themselves in the Talmud  (BabaBathra, 14), but from the oldest catalogues of the canon furnished by Christian fathers, such as Melito, Origen, etc. Indeed, Origen distinctly states that neither Tobit nor Judith was ever received h, the Jews as Sacred Scripture- ῾Εβραῖοι τῷ Τωβίᾷ οὐ χρῶνται (Ep. ad Affric. § 13; comp. De Orat. 1, 14).

It was, however, different in the Greek Church, where the text of the Sept. was received as canonical. There appears to be a clear reference to it in the Latin version of the Epistle of Polycarp (c. 10, eleemosyna de morte liberat; Tob 4:10; Tob 12:9). In a scheme of the Ophites, if there be no corruption in the text, Tobias appears among the prophets (Iren. 1, 30,11).. Forming part of the contents of this version, Clement of Alexandria quotes Tob 4:15; Tob 12:8,-as taken from - ἡ γραφή, Scripture (Strom. 2, 23,139). But though Origen himself also quoted it as Scripture, yet it is ranked by Christians among such as were read to the catechumens, and contains a plainer and less elevated doctrine (In Numbers Homil. 20). Even Athanasius, when writing without any critical regard to the canon, quotes Tobit as Scripture (Apol. c. Arian. § 11, ὡς γέγραπται, Tob 12:7); but when he gives a formal list of the sacred books, he definitely excludes it from the canon, and places it with other Apocryphal books among the writings which were to be read by those who were but just entering on Christian teaching, and desirous to be instructed in the rules of piety” (Ep. Fest. p. 1177, ed. Migne). This distinction, however, between canonical and apocryphal afterwards disappeared, to a great extent, in the Greek Church, as is seen from the fact that Bar-Hebraeus places Tobit among the sacred books in his Nomocanon of the Antiochenian Church (Mai, Script. Vett. Nova Collectio, 53; comp. Fritzsche, p. 18).

In the Latin Church Tobit was regarded with greater sacredness. Cyprian often quotes it as Holy Writ (De Opere et Eleemosynis Liber). Hilary cites it to prove the intercession of angels (In Psa 129:7), and tells us that some Christians added both Tobit and Judith to the other two-and-twenty canonical books to make up their canon of four-and-twenty books (Prol. in Psalms 15). Lucifer quotes it as authoritative (Pro Athan. 1, 871). Augustine includes it with the other Apocrypha of, the Sept. among “the books which the Christian Church received” (De Doctr. Christ. 2, 8). This is expressed still more distinctly in the Speculum (p. 1127, C., ed. Par. 1836): “Non sunt omittendi et hi [libri] quos quidem ante Salvatoris adventum constat esse conscriptos, sed eos non receptos a Judaeis recipit tamen ejusdem Salvatoris ecclesia.” The preface from which these words  are taken is followed by quotations from Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Tobit. In this Augustine was followed by tie mass of the later Latin fathers. Ambrose, in especial, wrote an essay on Tobias, treating of the evils of usury, in which he speaks of the book as “prophetic” in the strongest terms (De Tobia, l, 1; comp. Hexcem. 6:4). Jerome, however, followed by Rufinus, maintained the purity of the Hebrew canon of the Old Test., and, as has been seen, treated it very summarily.

The third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), Innocent I (405), and the councils of Florence (1439) and Trent (1546), declared it canonical. Indeed, in the old Roman Missal and in the Missal of Sarum there is a proper mass of Raphael, the archangel, and it is ordered in the prefatory rubric that the office be celebrated for pilgrims, travelers, sick persons, and demoniacs. This is followed by two short prayers, one addressed to God and the other to Raphael (comp. Arnald, Dissertation on Asodcus).

As to the Reformed Church, though Luther was the first who separated the deutero-canonical from the canonical books, yet he entertained the highest opinion of the book of Tobit. “If it is history,” says the great Reformer, “it is fine holy history; but if fiction, it is indeed right beautiful, wholesome, profitable fiction, and. play of an ingenious poet.... It is, therefore, profitable and good for us Christians to read this book as the production of an excellent Hebrew poet, who treats not on frivolous, but solid, matters” (Vorrede zum Buche-Tobia, in his translation of the Bible, ed. 1534). In the Anglican Church the book of Tobit is looked upon with still greater favor- 4, 7-16 is quoted in: the Homilies as the counsel of the holy father Toby (On A In2s-deeds, pt. 1); 4:10 is cited as a lesson taught by “the Holy Ghost in Scripture” (ibid. pt. 2)-; and 12:8 is adduced to show that the angel Raphael, told Tobias that “fasting used with prayer is of great efficacy” (Of Fasting, pt. 2). Passages of Tobit are also incorporated in the liturgy; 4:7-9 is among the passages used at the offertory; 3, 3, according to the Latin Vulgate, is introduced into the litany; 6:17, according to the Vulgate, is alluded to in the preface to the Marriage Service; while in the prayer following immediately after the versicles and responses in the same service in the First Book of Prayer of Edward VI, the following sentence is used: “And as thou didst send the angel Raphael to Thobie and Sara, the daughter of Raquel, to their great comfort, so vouchsafe to send thy blessing upon these thy servants” (Parker Society's ed. p. 131)..

VII. Commentaries. —The following are the special exegetical helps on this Apocryphal book: Fagius, Tobice Liber (Isny, 1542, 4to; also in the Lond. Polyglot, 1657, fol.); Miinster, סֵפר טוֹבַי(Basle, 1542, i549,1556, 1563, 4to; also in Walton's Polyglot); Drusius, Tobias Graece (Franeck. 1591, 8vo; also in his Criticae Sacrae); Senarius, In Libros Tobie, Judith, etc. (Mainz, 1610, fol.); Drexel, Tobias Illustratus (Mun. 1611, 1.2mo); Sanctius, In Libros Ruth, Tobias, etc. (Lugd. 1628, fol.); Justinian, Tobias Illustratus (Colossians 1629, fol.); Van Mauden, Tobias Delineatus (Antw. 1631, fol.); Βίβλος Λόγων Τωβίτ, etc. (in the eds. of the Apocrypha, F. ad M. 1634,1757, 8vo; by Augusti [Leips. 1804, 8vo]; Apel [ib.” 1836, 8vo]); Celada, Conmmenztarius in Tob. fist. (Lugd. 1644, fol.); Anon. Tobie, Judith, et Esther, avec Explication (Paris, 1688, 8vo); Van der Hardt,Emnigma Tobice, etc. (Helmnst. 1728, 4to); Aden, סֵפֵר טוֹבַיָּה .(Amst. 1736, 8vo); Sabatier, Liber Tobit (in the Vetus Latina [Par. 1751, fol.], vol. 1); Seller, Pred. üb. d. B. Tobias (Munich, 1780, 8vo); Le Clerc, Liber Tobice (Par. 1785, 8vo); Bauer, Das B. Tobias Erklar (Bramb. — Wiirtzb. 1787, 1793. 12mo); Eichhorn, Ueb. d. B. Tobias (in his Bibliothek, 2, 410-440 [ Leips. 1787-1800 ]); Ilgen, Die Gesch. Tobi's (Jen. 1800, 8vo); Hbpfner, Historia Tobice Graec (Viternb. 1802, 4to); Dereser, Tobias, Judith u. Esther erklar (Frankfort-on-the Main, 1803, 1833, 8vo); Paur, Das B. Tobias bearbeitet (Leips. 1817, 8vo); Van Ess, Liber Tobice (Tub. 1822, 8vo); Frainkel, Das B. Thobi (in his אִחֲרוֹנַיםִ כְּתוּםַים[Leips. 1830, 8vo]); Siebenberger. חִיֵּי טוֹבַיָּה(Heb. translation and commentary [Warsaw, 1839, 8vo]); Guttmann, Die Apokr. des A. T. (Altona, 1841,8vo); Cittadini and Bottari, Libri di Tobia, Giuditta, e Ester (Ven. 1844, 8vo); Fritzsche, Die Biicher Tobi und Judith (vol. 2 of the KurzgeJf exeg. Handb. [Leips. 1853,8vo]); Reusch, Das B. Tobias erklart (Freib. 1857, 8vo); Sengelmann, Das B. Tobit erklart (Hamb. 1857, 8vo). SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Tobler, Titus[[@Headword:Tobler, Titus]]

             a German writer known for his researches in Palestine, was born June 25, 1806, at Stein, in the canton of Appenzell, Switzerland. He studied at Zurich and Vienna, was promoted as doctor of medicine in Würzburg, and, after spending a time in Paris, returned in 1827 to his native place and settled there as a physician. In 1835-36 he traveled in Palestine for mere medical purposes (comp. Lustreise in Morgenland [Zurich, 1839,2 vols.]), but he soon became so interested in the topographico-geographical  exploration of the Holy Land that he undertook a second journey in .1845. See his Bethlehem (St. Gall.'1849): —Plan von Jerusalem (1850): — Golgatha (1851) . —Die Siloahquelle und der Oelberg (1852):. — Denkblätter aus Jerusalem (1853, 2nd ed. 1856): —and especially Topographie, von Jerusalem u. seinen Umgebungen (Berlin, 1853-54, 2 vols.): —Beitrcag zür medicin. Topographie von Jerusalem (ibid. 1855). He undertook a third journey, and published as the results, Planographie von Jerusalem (Gotha, 1858): —Dritte Waniderung nach Palestina (ibid.'1859). In 1865 he went for the fourthtime, but on account of the cholera he soon returned arid published Nazareth inPaldstina, nebst Anhang der vierten Waniderung (Berlin, 1868). Besides these works, he published, De Locis Sanctis, quaeperambulavit Antonius Martyr c. an. 570 (St. Gall. 1863): —Teodoricus de Locis Sanctis (ibid. 1865): Bibliographia Geographica Palestina (Leips. 1867): —Dergrosse Streit der Lateiner mit den Griechen in Palestina, etc. (St. Gall. 1870): — Palestinae Descriptiones ex Sceculo IV, V, et VI (ibid. 1869): — Desciptiones Terrce Sanctae ex Sceculo VIII, IX, XII, et XV (Leips. 1874): — Bibliographia Geogr. Palestinae ab. Anno CCCXXXIII usque ad Annum M(Dresden, 1875). Tobler died Jan. 21, 1871, at Munich. The interesting life of this man will be found in Heim's Dr. Titus Tobler, der Palestina fahrer; Ein appenzellisches Lebensbild: Nach handschriftlichen Quellen bearbeitet (Zurich, 1879). (B. P.)

## Toby, Thomas W., D.D[[@Headword:Toby, Thomas W., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was for several years a missionary to China, afterwards pastor in North Carolina, professor in various literary institutions, pastor at Union Springs, then at Camden, Alabama, and finally principal of the Collegiate Institute at Eufala, among the Creek nation. He died at Lake Weir, Florida, in February 1885, aged sixty-five years.

## Tochen[[@Headword:Tochen]]

             (Heb. To'ken, תֹּכֵן, task or measure [as in Ezekiel 5:18; 45:11]; Sept. θοκκάν v.r. θοχχάν; Vulg. Thochen), one of the towns in the tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:32); probably the same elsewhere (Jos 15:24) called TELEM SEE TELEM (q.v.) or TELAIM (1Sa 15:4).

## Todd, Ambrose S., D.D[[@Headword:Todd, Ambrose S., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, son of Reverend Ambrose Todd, was born at Huntington, Connecticut, December 6, 1798. His early education was acquired at Cheshire Academy, and Yale College conferred upon him the honorary degree of A.M. in 1824. He was ordained presbyter June 30, 1823, and his first charge comprised the parishes of Reading, Danbury, Greenwich, New Canaan, Darien, and Stamford. For thirty-eight years he was rector of St. John's, in the latter place, and died there, June 23, 1861. He filled many offices of honor and responsibility in the diocese, and was universally respected. See Amer. Quar Church Rev. 1862, page 557.

## Todd, David[[@Headword:Todd, David]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at West Hanover, Pa., Nov. 5, 1821. He left home at the age of fifteen to attend the preparatory school of Oberlin College. After finishing his collegiate studies there, he entered the theological department, and passed through the prescribed course. He commenced his labors in Illinois, supplying the churches of Knox and Ontario; ten miles distant from each other. In these places he gathered permanent congregations and organized churches. ‘He was ordained at  Victoria, Aug. 18, 1847. In 1849 he went to Bureau County, and took charge of a Congregational Church, where he labored with success until 1863, when he accepted a call to Pine Bluffs, Ark. He remained there until 1865, when, his health failing, he found it necessary to return to his Northern home. On his return he resumed his work as pastor, and finish-, ed his course-a faithful pastor and an excellent preacher, held in high esteem by the Church and community. He died at Granville, Ill., Aug. 10, 1874. (W. P. S.)

## Todd, Henry John[[@Headword:Todd, Henry John]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1763, and educated at Hertford College, Oxford, whence he proceeded as A.M. in 1786. He became a minor canon of Canterbury Cathedral soon after. In 17.92 he was presented to the vicarage of Milton, near Canterbury, and some years later to the rectory of All-hallows, Lombard Street, London. He was appointed by the archbishop keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth; and in 1820 he was presented, by the earl of Bridgewater, to the rectory of Settrington, in Yorkshire. In 1830 he was collated by the archbishop of York to the prebend of Hushwaite in that cathedral church; and, finally, in 1832, he was appointed archdeacon of Cleveland. He died at Settrington, Yorkshire, Dec. 24,1845. He wrote, Some Account of the Deans of Canterbury (Song of Solomon 1793, 8vso): — Catalogue of Books in the Library of Christ Church (ibid. 1802, 8vo): — Catalogue of the Archiepiscopal Manuscripts in the Library at Lambeth Palace (Lond, 1812, fol.): —Original Sin, Free-will, Regeneration, Faith, etc., as Maintained in Certain Declarations of our Reformers (ibid. 1818, 8vo): —Vindication of our Authorized Translation and Translators of the Bible (ibid. 1819, 8vo): —Observations on the Metrical Versions of the Psalms made by Sternhold, Hopkins, and others (ibid. 1819, 8vo; 1822, 8vo): —Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Rev. Brian Walton, Bishop of Chester (ibid. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo): — Account of Greek MSS., Chiefly Biblical, etc. (ibid. 1823, 8vo): — Archbishop Cranmer's Defense of the Doctrine of the Sacrament, with a Vindication of the Author against Lingard, Milner, and Butler (ibid. 1825, 8vo): —Of Confession and Absolution, and the Secrecy of Confession (ibid. 1828, 8vo): Life of Archbishop Cranmer (ibid. 1831, 2 vols. 8vo): Authentic Account of our Authorized Translation of the Bible and of the Translators, etc. (2nd ed. Malton, 1834, 12mo; Lond. 1835, 8vo). See English Cyclop. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Todd, Hugh[[@Headword:Todd, Hugh]]

             a learned English divine, was born at Blencow, Cumberland, in 1658. He became a charity scholar of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1672; fellow of University College, Dec. 23, 1678; A.M. and chaplain to bishop of Carlisle, July 2, 1679. In 1685 he was appointed one of the four canon residentiaries of Carlisle, and the same year obtained the vicarage of Stanwix, which he resigned in 1688. He resigned his residentiaryship in 1720, and died in 1728, being vicar of Penrith and rector of Arthuret. He published, Description of Sweden (1680, fol.): — Life of Phocion (1684 ): — Sermon (1707, 4to): — Sermon, etc. (1711, 4to).

## Todd, James Henthorne, D.D[[@Headword:Todd, James Henthorne, D.D]]

             an Irish clergyman, was born in Dublin, April 23, 1805; graduated at Trinity College, and became a fellow there in 1831. He was also regius professor in, and librarian of, the University of Dublin; treasurer and precentor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and president for five years (the usual term) of the Royal Irish Academy. He was one of the founders of the Irish Archaeological Society. His death took place June 28, 1869. He published, Histoaical Tablets and Medallions, etc. (1828, r. 4to): —Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the Writings of Daniel and St. Paul; Donellen Lecture (Dubl. 1840, 8vo; 1842, 8vo): —Six Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the Apocalypse of St. John; Donellen Lecture (ibid. 1846, 8vo): —Remarks on the Roman Dogma of Infallibility (ibid. 1848, 8vo): —Historical Memoirs of the Successors of St. Patrick and Archbishops of Armagh (ibid. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo): —The Waldensian MSS. preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, etc. (Lond. and Camb.'1865, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. Of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Todd, John (1)[[@Headword:Todd, John (1)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was a graduate of Nassau Hall in 1749, and was taken on trial by the New Brunswick Presbytery, May 7, 1750. He was licensed Nov. 13, and went to Virginia. A call was laid before the Presbytery May 22,1751, and he was ordained on its acceptance. He was installed, by Hanover Presbytery, pastor of Providence Church in Louisa County, Va. Davies delighted in him, and speaks of him as his favorite friend, relying on his judgment in cases of importance. Todd wrote to  Whitefield in 1755, giving an account of the wonderful work of God in his congregation. Colossians Gordon said, after hearing him, that he “never heard a sermon, but one from Mr. Davies with more attention and delight.” He obtained from the Rev. Dr. Gordon, of Stepney, near London, scientific apparatus and valuable books, which he gave to aid Transylvania University in founding a school. He was a man of great piety. and eminently useful in edifying the Church. He died July 27, 1793. (W. P.S.)

## Todd, John (2), D.D[[@Headword:Todd, John (2), D.D]]

             an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Rutland, Vt., Oct. 9, 1800; graduated at Yale College in 1822, spent four years at the Andover Theological Seminary, and was ordained and settled at Groton in 1827. He was settled over the Edwards Church, Northampton, Mass., in 1833; the First Congregational Church, Philadelphia, Pa., in 1836; and the First Congregational Church, Pittsfield, Mass., from 1842 to 1872. He died in Pittsfield, Aug. 24, 1873. He was one of the founders of the Mount Holvoke Female Seminary, and for several years president of the trustees of the Young Ladies Institute of Pittston. His degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Williams College in 1845. The following are some of his numerous publications: Lectures to Children (Northampton, 1834, 16mo), with translations and extended circulation: —Student's Manual (ibid. 1835, 12mo): —Index Rerum (ibid. 1834, 4to): —'Sabbath-school Teacher (ibid. 1836, 12mo): — Truth Made Simple (ibid. 1839, 18mo): — The Young Man (ibid. 1843, 18mo): — Simple Sketches (Pittsfield, 1843, 2 vols. 16mo): — Stories on the Shorter Catechism (Northampton, 1850-51, 2 vols. 18mo): —The Daughter at School (ibid. 1854,12mo): —Questions on the Lives of the Patriarchs (ibid. 1855,18mo): —Questions on the Life of Moses; Questions on the Books of Joshua and Judges (ibid. 1853): — The Bible Companion (Phila. 18mo):Future Punishment (N. Y. 1863, 32mo): —Hints and Thoughts for Christians (ibid. 1867, 12mo): — Woman's Rights (ibid. 1867, 18mo, 27 p.) Hints and Thoughts for Christians (Lond. 1869, 12mo): — Old-fashioned Lives (1870). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; John Todd, the Story of his Life, etc. (N. Y. 1876, 16mo).

## Todd, Jonathan[[@Headword:Todd, Jonathan]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in New Haven, Conn., March 20, 1713, and graduated at Yale College in 1732. After studying theology a  few months, he commenced preaching, and was settled at East Guilford, Conn., Oct. 24,1733. During 1750 and 1751, a pestilence prevailed among his people, taking off many of his substantial friends and supporters. He continued his labors until the last year of his life, which ended Feb. 24, 1791. Mr. Todd published a Sermon, Young People Warned (1740): — Election Sermon (1749): several memorial sermons and pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 383.

## Todd, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Todd, Nathaniel]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Rowley. Essex Co., Mass., Jan. 27, 1780; graduated at Brown University in September, 1800; studied theology privately; was licensed by Philadelphia. Presbytery, Oct. 19, 1803; ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Schenectady, N. Y., in 1805, where he labored with great success for several years. He was afterwards teacher and pastor at Woodbury, N. J.; thence successively principal of an academy at Westchester, Harrisburg, Lebanon, Mifflinburg, and Beaver, Pa., and for many years of a classical school in Allegheny City, Pa. He spent the greater part of his life in teaching, and died July 8, 1867. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 152.

## Todros, ben-Joseph, ha-Levi Abulafia[[@Headword:Todros, ben-Joseph, ha-Levi Abulafia]]

             a celebrated Cabalist, was born in 1234 at Toledo, and died about 1305. He occupied a high position as physician and financier in the court of Sancho IV, king of Castile, and was a great favorite of queen Maria de Molina. When this royal pair met Philip IV, the Fair, king of France, in Bayonne (1290), he formed one of the cortege; and his advocacy of his theosophy secured for the doctrines of the Cabala a kindly reception from the French Jews. His writings on the Cabala are, An Exposition of the Talmudic Hagadoth, entitled הכבוד אוצר: —A Commentary on Psalms 119 : —A Commentary on the Pentateuch, in which he propounds the tenets of the Cabala. These works, however, have not yet been published. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:204 sq.; Steinschneider, Catal. Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. 26772680; De'Rossi, Dizionario Storico, p. 315 (Germ. transl.); Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, p. 111; First, Bibl. Jud. 3, 428. (B. P.)

## Togarmah[[@Headword:Togarmah]]

             (Heb. Togarmah', תּוֹגִרְמָה[briefly תֹּגִרְמָה, Gen 10:13], of uncertain derivation; Sept. θοργαμά v.r. θέργαμα, etc.; Vulg. Thogarma), third named of the three sons of Gomer (the son of Japheth), his brothers being Asbkenaz and Riphath (Gen 10:13; 1 Chronicles 1, 6) B.C. post 2513. The descendants of Togarmah are mentioned among the merchants who trafficked with Tyre, the house of Togarmah being said to trade “in its fairs with horses, and horsemen, and mules” (Eze 27:14). They are named with Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya as followers of Gog, of the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, or, as it may be rendered (making the Hebrew Rosh. for chief, a proper name, as it is in the Sept. ῾Ρώς, and as the Jews say it ought to be rendered), the prince of Rosh or Russ, Meshech or Moshk, and Tubal or Tobolsk (Eze 38:5-6). supposed by some to mean the prince or power of Russia, the title of the emperor of Russia being prince or emperor of Russia, Moscow, and Tobolsk. Togarmah is said to be of the north quarters, and Gog is represented as a guard to it, possibly professing to guard. it, or offering to it a protectorate (Eze 38:7). The Jews say that by Togarmah, or the house of Togarmah, we are to understand the Turks. Torgama, therefore, as it is given in the Sept. (and in some Heb. MSS. תורגמה), has been thought by many to mean Turkoman, or the Turkoman hordes from whom the Turks have sprung. Togarmah, however, as a geographical term, is connected with Armenia, and the subsequent notices of the name (Eze 27:14; Eze 38:6) accord with this view. Armenia was, according to Strabo (11, 13, 9, 529), distinguished by the production of good horses (comp, Xenoph. Anab. 4:5, 24; Herod. 7:40). The countries of אררט, and מני(Μινυάς), and also הול, were contiguous to Togarmah (Josephus, Ant. 1, 1, 6).

The name itself may possibly -have reference to Armenia, for, according to Grimm (Gesch. d. deutsch. Spi-. 2, 825), Togarmah comes from the Sanskrit toka, “tribe,” and Arma =Armenia, which he further connects with Hermino the son of Mannus. The most decisive statement respecting the ethnographic relation of the Armenians in ancient literature is furnished by Herodotus, who says that they were Phrygian colonists, that they were armed in the Phrygian fashion, and were associated with the Phrygians under the same commander (Herod. 7:73). The remark of Eudoxus (Steph. Byz. s.v. Α᾿ρμενία) that the Armenians resemble the Phrygians in many respects in language (τῆ  φωνῇ πολλὰ φρυγίζουσι) tends in the same direction. It is hardly necessary to understand the statement of Herodotus as implying more than a common origin of the two peoples; for, looking at the general westward progress of the: Japhetic races, and on the central position which Armenia held in regard to their movements, we should rather infer that Phrygia was colonized from Armeniat than vice versa-. The Phrygians were indeed reputed to have had their first settlements in Europe, and thence to have crossed into Asia (Herod. 7:73); but this musts be regarded as simply a retrograde movement of a section of the great Phrygian race in the direction of their original home. The period of this movement is fixed subsequently to the Trojan war (Strabo, 14:680),. whereas the Phrygians appear as an important race in; Asia Minor at a far earlier period (id. 7:321; Herod 7, 8, 11). There can be little doubt that they were once the dominant race in the peninsula, and that they: spread westward from the confines of Armenia to the-shores of the Aegean. The Phrygian language is undoubtedly to be classed with the Indo-European family. The resemblance between words in the Phrygian and Greek tongues was noticed by the Greeks themselves (Plato, Cratyl. p. 410), and the inscriptions still existing in the former are decidedly Indo-European. (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 666). The Armenian language presents many peculiarities which distinguish it from other branches of the Indo-European family; but these may be accounted for partly by the physical character of the country, and partly by the large amount of foreign admixture that it has experienced. In spite of this, however, no hesitation is felt by philologists in placing Armenian among the Indo-European languages (Pott, Etym. Forsch. introd. p. 32; Diefenbach, Orig Europ. p. 43). With regard to the ancient inscriptions at Wan, some doubt exists; some of them, but apparently not the most ancient, are thought to bear a Tuiranian character (Layard, Nin and Bab. p. 402; Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 652); but, even. were this filly established, it fails to prove the Turanian character of the population, inasmuch as they may have been set up bforeign conquerors. The Armen'ians themselves haves associated the name of Togarmah with their early history in that they represent the founder of their race-. Haik, as a son of Thorgom (Moses Choren. 1, 4, 9-11. See Moses Chorenensis, Historiae Armen. lib. 3, Armenedidit, Lat. vert. notisque illustr W, et G. Whistonii [Lond. 1736]); Heeren, Ideen, 1, 1, 305; Michaelis, Spicilegium Geographie, 1, 67-78; Klaproth, Travels, 2, 64. SEE ARMAENIA.

## Toggenburg War[[@Headword:Toggenburg War]]

             the name given to an outbreak between Protestants and Catholics in Toggenburg (or Tockenburg), a district of the canton of St. Gall, Switzerland. The dispute between the Toggenburgers and the abbot of St. Gall, Leodegar Buirgisser, appeared at first to be purely political, and related mainly to the labor in road-building, which the abbot had enforced upon those under his jurisdiction. At first even Catholic localities, such as Schwyz, took part with the Toggenburgers against the abbot, without regard to ecclesiastical differences. But the confessional differences soon led to serious disturbances. In the lower country, especially in Hennau, the majority were Catholics. About Easter, in 1709, they closed the church against the evangelical party, and the result was a scuffle, in which many were wounded. Alarmed at this treatment, the Protestants sought shelter in the neighboring churches, but encouraged by their neighbors of Oberglatt, they returned in a week to Hennau, and sought to enter the church. The Catholic priest refused them, but, seeing the Protestants assembled in large numbers in the churchyard, counseled submission. But the Protestant minister was at this moment felled to the earth by a stone, and a severe struggle ensued. The priest was roughly handled, but was rescued by a member of the council, and one of his followers killed. The Reformed preacher, a native of Basle, was recalled, and a citizen of Zurich substituted, who was obliged to disguise himself for fear of the Catholics. The Catholic priest, after an absence of six weeks, was restored to his parish, under the protection of the abbot. The different cantons now took sides with the contending parties, and party feeling ran very high. Attempts were made, however, at mediation. An assembly was held at Baden, May 29, 1709, arbitrators were appointed, and proceedings begun; but all in vain. In the spring of 1712 the war broke out. It began in Toggenburg. The city of Wyl, to which the forces of the abbot had retired, was captured; the commander, Felber, was most shockingly mangled by his own people, and his corpse was thrown into the Sitter. Nabholz, at the head of the victors, marched to St. Gall, and seized the Thurgau and the Rhine valley. Meantime, the theatre of the war extended to the shores of the Reuss and the Aar. A murderous conflict, “the battle of the bushes,” gave the Bernese a bloody victory. The city of Baden surrendered to Zurich, and was allowed to retain its Catholic worship, but did not dare to interfere with the erection of a Reformed Church outside of the walls of the city. Through the interference of pope Clement IX, the fire of war, which seemed about  to be extinguished, was again stirred; and while the government was hesitating, the Catholic cantons of Schwyz, Unterwalden, and Zug, to the number of 4000, stormed the village of Sins. Bloody battles were fought il the vicinity of Lake Zurich, and at Bellenschantze. In Lucerne, the government was compelled by an uprising of the people to enter into the war. The Catholic parties to the war, about 12,000 strong, assembled at Mury. The Bernese were encamped at Vilmergen, and the great battle was fought on St. James's Day, July 25, and was not decided until six P.M., when the victory of the Reformers was complete. The peace, which was concluded in August at Aarau, provided religious liberty for Toggenburg. See Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Cent. 1, 34 sq.

## Tohu[[@Headword:Tohu]]

             (Heb. To'cihu, תֹּחוּ, lowly; Sept. θοού v.r. θοκέ; Vulg. Thohu), son of Zuph and father of Elihu among the ancestors of Samuel (1Sa 1:1); probably the same elsewhere called TOAH (1Ch 6:34) or NAHATH SEE NAHATH (q.v.) (1Ch 6:26).

## Tokens[[@Headword:Tokens]]

             (tesserce), bits of lead or of pewter, or cards, given to the members of a Church in full communion, which they hand to the elders as they approach- the Lord's table. The object is to keep out those who are -not known, or  who are under scandal, or for other reasons are deemed unworthy. SEE TESSEMIE.

## Tol[[@Headword:Tol]]

             (Heb. Toi', תֹּעַיin Samuel, but in Chronicles To'l, Heb. Tou', תֹּעוּboth meaning erring; Sept. θοού or θωού v.r. θαεί and θωά; Josephus, θαῖνος; Vulg. Thou), the king of Hamath on the Orontes, who, after the defeat of his powerful enemy the Syrian king Hadadezer by the army of David, sent his son Joram, or Hadoram to congratulate the victor and do him homage with presents of gold and silver and brass (2 Samuel 8; 2 Samuel 9, 10; 1Ch 18:9-10). B.C. 1036. “For Hadadezer had wars with Toi,” and Ewald (Gesch. 2, 199) conjectures that he may have even reduced him to a state of vassalage. There was probably some policy in the conduct of Toi, and his object may have been, as Josephus says it was (Ant. 7:5, 4), to buy off the conqueror with the “vessels of ancient workmanship” (σκεύη τῆς ἀρχαίας κατασκευῆς) which he presented.

## Tola[[@Headword:Tola]]

             (Heb. Tola', תּוֹלָע, a worm, as in Exo 16:20; Sept. θωλά v.r. θωλέ, etc.; Vulg. Thola), the name of two Hebrews.

1. The first-born of Issachar (Gen 46:13; 1Ch 6:1). B.C. 1856. He had six sons (1Ch 7:2), who became progenitors of families known collectively as the Tolaites (Num 26:23), and these in David's time mustered 22,600 valiant soldiers (1Ch 7:2).

2. Judge of Israel after Abimelech (Jdg 10:1-2). He is described in that passage as “the son of Puah, the son of Dodo, a man of Issachar.” In the Sept. and Vulg. he is made the son of Abimelech's uncle, Dodo (דּוֹדוֹ) being considered an appellative. But Gideon, Abimelech's father, was a Manassite. Tola judged Israel for twenty-three years (B.C. 1319-1296) at Shamir in Mount Ephraim, where he died and was buried. Josephus does not mention him (Ant. 5, 7,.6); but (as Whiston remarks) inasmuch as the total of the years there agree, his name seems to have fallen out of our copies. SEE JUDGE.

## Tolad[[@Headword:Tolad]]

             (Heb. Tolad', תּוֹלָד, birth; Sept. θωλάδ v.r. θουλαέμ), one of the towns in the tribe of Simeon in David's time (1Ch 4:29); probably the same elsewhere (Jos 15:30) called EL-TOLAD SEE EL-TOLAD (q.v.).

## Tolaite[[@Headword:Tolaite]]

             (Heb. Tola', תּוֹלָעָי, patronymic; Sept. θολαϊv; Vulg. Tholaites), the general name of the descendants of Tola (q.v.) the son of Issachar (Num 26:23).

## Toland, John[[@Headword:Toland, John]]

             one of the founders of modern deism, was born Nov. 30, 1669 or 1670, in the most northern isthmus of Ireland. His Christian-name was Janus Junius, but at school his master ordered him to be called John, which name he retained ever after. From the school at Redcastle, near Londonderry, he  went, in 1687, to the College of Glasgow, and after three years stay there visited the University of Edinburgh, where he was made A.M. in June, 1690. He afterwards went to the University of Leyden, where he was generously supported by, some eminent Dissenters in England. After a residence there of two years, he returned to England, and went to Oxford, which place he left in 1695, and went to London, whence he returned to Ireland in 1697. But so strong was the feeling aroused by his deistic notions and his own imprudent conduct that he soon returned to London. He accompanied the earl of Macclesfield to Hanover in 1701, and also made an excursion to Berlin, at which latter place he remained for some time, and then returned to England. In the spring of 1707 he again visited Germany, Holland, etc., reaching England in 1710. He died at Putney, near London, March 11, 1722. Of his many treatises we notice, Christianity not Mysterious (Lond 1 1696, 8vo ) which elicited at least fifty-four replies: — An Apology for Mr. Toland (ibid. 1697): —Amyntor, or a Defence of Milton's Life, etc. (1699, 8vo); this attack upon the canon of the New Test. was answered by Samuel Clark, Jeremiah Jones, Stephen Nye, and John Richardson, Socinianism Truly Stated (1705): —Dissertationes duce: Adeisidemon et Origines Judaicae (1709, 8vo): —Nazarenus (ibid. 1718, 8vo): —History of the Druids (Montrose, 1814, 8vo), etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Contemp. Rev. June, 1868.

## Tolbanes[[@Headword:Tolbanes]]

             (Sept. Τολβάνης, Vulg. Tolbanes), a corrupt Graecized form (1Es 9:25) for the name TELEM SEE TELEM (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 10:24).

## Toledo (French Tolet), Francisco De[[@Headword:Toledo (French Tolet), Francisco De]]

             a Spanish cardinal, was born at Cordova, Nov. 10, 1532. His education was gained at the University of Salamanca, and, after receiving his degree, he taught philosophy in the same institution. In 1558 he joined the Jesuits, and was sent to Rome to teach theology. Pius V, admiring his eloquence,  secured his services as preacher in ordinary, and Toledo held the position under four succeeding popes. At the same time he was councilor of the Inquisition, arid was employed in many ecclesiastical embassies. Among others, he went to Germany to urge a league with Poland against the Turks. Clement VIII gave him the cardinal's hat in 1593. Toledo died at Rome, Sept. 14, 1596. His works are chiefly commentaries: In Joannis Evangelium (Rome, 1588): —In XII Capita Evang. secundae Lucam (Venice, 1601, fol.): —In Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos (Rome, 1602, 4to): —Summ). Casuuns Conscientiae (ibid. 1602; Lyons, 1630, 4to). See Antonio, Bibl. Hisp. Nova; De Thou, Hist. sui Temp. —Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Toledo, Councils of[[@Headword:Toledo, Councils of]]

             (Concilium Toletannum). These councils, of which there were twenty-four, were held in the city of Toledo, in the province of the same name, in Spain. Toledo is the seat of an archbishopric; has a cathedral, founded in 1258, and completed in 1492; a foundling hospital, founded by cardinal Mendoza in 1494; and a theological seminary.

I. The First Council of Toledo was held on Sept. 1, 400, under Patronus, the bishop. The reason for assembling this council, which consisted of nineteen bishops, was the troubles and disturbances caused by the heresy of  the Priscillianists, which sprang up towards the close of the 4th century. Nineteen bishops, from all the Spanish provinces, attended. Many of the sect of the Priscillianists who presented themselves were received back into communion with the Church after having abjured their errors. In this council the bishop of Rome is, for the first time, spoken of simply by the title of “pope.” Twenty canons were also published.

1. Permits to admit married men to the office of deacon, provided they will observe continence.

2. Forbids to admit to any higher order than that of subdeacon a man who has publicly done penance, and even restricts his administration of that office.

4. Enacts that a subdeacon marrying a second time, shall be reduced to the rank of porter or reader, and shall not be permitted to read the Gospel or epistle; should he marry a third time, he shall be separated from the Church for two years, and then be admitted to lay communion only.

5. Deprives all priests and clerks who, having been appointed to any church in town or country, do not assist daily at mass.

7. Permits clerks whose wives do not lead a decorous life to bind them or. shut them up, and to make them fast; forbids them to eat with them Until they have done penance.

12. Forbids a clerk to leave his own bishop in order to attach himself to another.

13. Warns those who attend the other offices of the Church, but who do not communicate, that they must either receive the holy communion, or take place among the penitents, upon pain of excommunication.

14. Orders that any one who shall have received the holy eucharist without eating it shall be driven from the Church as guilty of sacrilege.

17. Excommunicates a married man keeping a concubine but permits unmarried men to do so. Allows either a wife or a concubine.

20. Restricts the consecration of the chrism to the bishops; orders all priests to send a deacon or subdeacon to the bishop at Easter, in order to receive it from him. See Mansi, Concil. 2, 1222.

II. The Second Council of Toledo was held about 447, during the popedom of Leo I, against the Priscillianists. Nineteen bishops attended, who condemned the heresy and the followers of Priscillian in a formulary of faith directed against all heretics, to which eighteen anathemas are attached. See Mansi, Concil. 3, 1465; Baronius, ann. 447, § 17, etc.

III. The Third Council of Toledo was held May 17, 531; Montanus, bishop of Toledo, presiding over seven other bishops. Five canons were published.

1. Relates to the treatment of children offered by their parents to be brought up for holy orders. Others relate to the continence of the clergy, the preservation of church property, etc.

In this council Toledo is, for the first time, spoken of as a metropolitan see. See Mansi, Concil. 4:1734.

IV. The Fourth Council of Toledo was held May 8, 589; Leander, the primate of Seville, presiding over seventy-two bishops, from the different provinces under the rule of king Reccaredus, who attended in person. Eight deputies were also present. The main object of the council was to confirm the conversion of the Goths who had abjured Arianism, and who here presented a confession of faith, in which they declared their assent to the first four ecumenical councils, and anathematized the principal errors of the Arian party. Twenty-three canons were published, and as many anathemas directed, as against other heresies and evils, so against those who deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and those who refuse to anathematize the Council of Arminum.

2. Directs that, according to the king's writ, the Constantinopolitan creed shall be sung by the people in every church in the kingdom before the Lord's Prayer in the encharistical office.

5. Relates to the rule of continence to be observed by heretical bishops, priests, and deacons, when reconciled to the Church, as well as by all clerks.

7. Orders that some portion of Holy Scripture shall be read daily at the tables of priests, to prevent idle conversation.
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12. Relate to penitence. Forbid to reconcile without penance; forbid the priest to admit to penance without first cutting off the hair of the penitent, if a man, or changing her dress, if a woman.

14. Forbids Jews to have Christian women for wives or concubines.

19. Leaves it to the bishop to fix the endowment to be given to a newly founded church.

22. Forbids to say anything but psalms at the funerals of the religious. See Mansi, 5, 997.

V. The Fifth Council of Toledo was held May 17, 597; sixteen bishops attended; two canons only remain, and the subscription of thirteen bishops only appear.

1. Orders that priests and deacons who will not observe the law of continence shall be degraded, shut up in a cloister, and put to penance.

2. Forbids the bishop to appropriate to himself the revenues of any church or chapel in his diocese, and declares that they belong to the ministering priest. See Mansi, 5, 1603.

VI. The Sixth Council of Toledo was held in 610; Aurasius, bishop of Toledo, presiding over fifteen bishops. The primacy of the see of Toledo over all the churches of Carthagena was established, and subsequently confirmed by an edict of king Gundemar. See Mansi, 1620.

VII. A national council was held in this city on Dec. 9, 633, assembled from the whole of Spain, and that part of Gaul which was in subjection to the Goths; Isidore of Seville presided, sixty-six archbishops and bishops being present among them were the metropolitans of Narbonne, Merida, Braga, Toledo, and Tarragona. Seventy-five canons were published.

1. Contains a profession of faith upon the subject of the Blessed Trinity and the incarnation.

2. Directs that the same order of prayer and of psalmody shall be observed throughout the kingdom, and the same manner of celebrating mass.

3. Orders that a national council shall be held annually, if possible; otherwise a council in each province.

4. Relates to the proper mode of holding synods, and is of some length. It orders that on the first day of the synod the church shall be cleared before sunrise and all the doors shut except one; that the bishops shall enter first and take their seats in a circle, according to the date of their consecration; then the priests; after them the deacons, who are ordered to stand in sight of the bishops; and. last of all, the laity and notaries. This done, the door is directed to be suit, and silence and devotion enjoined upon all. Then the archdeacon, standing up, shall bid them pray; upon which all shall prostrate themselves upon the floor, and, after private prayer mingled with sobs and tears, one of the bishops shall rise up and say a prayer, to which an shall respond Amen. All having risen up and taken their places, a deacon in an alb shall read the canons relating to the holding of councils, and the metropolitan shall invite the bishops to proceed to business. It is forbidden to proceed to another matter until the first has been disposed of. Any clerk or layman desiring to appeal to the council is enjoined to mention his cause to the metropolitan archdeacon; who shall declare it to the council. No bishop is allowed to leave the synod before the others, nor shall the council be dissolved until everything is settled.

5. Directs that metropolitans shall consult together before Epiphany concerning the proper time for celebrating Easter, and shall signify their determination to their suffragans.

6. Approves of leaving the question about single and trine immersion open; but orders single immersion to be practiced throughout Spain, to prevent schism.

7. Orders that the Passion be preached on Good-Friday, and that the people, in an audible voice, ask forgiveness of their sins, in order that, being thereby purified from sin, they may worthily celebrate the great festival of Easter, and partake of the holy Eucharist with a pure, heart.

8. Deprives of the Easter communion those who break their fast on Good- Friday before sunset, exception being made in favor of old and sick persons and children.

9. Relates to the benediction of the candles, etc., on Easter-eve.

10. Is directed against all abuse then prevalent in many churches-in which the Lord's Prayer was said on Sundays only orders all clerks to say it daily at the office, either openly or privately.

11. Forbids singing the Hallelujah during Lent.

12. Orders that immediately after the epistle the gospel should be read, which should be followed by the Lauds, which in some churches were improperly sung after the epistle.

13. Condemns the opinion of those who deemed it wrong to sing thymus composed by men in honor of the apostles and martyrs on account of their not being taken out of Holy Scripture nor authorized by tradition.

14. Orders that the canticle Benedicite Opera Omnia be sung on Sundays and feast-days at mass at the entrance of the chancel [in pulpito].

15. Orders, under pain of excommunication, that at the end of each psalm shall be sung “Glory and honor be to the Father,” etc., and not merely “Glory be,” etc.

17. Excommunicates those who refuse to acknowledge the inspiration of the Apocalypse, and also those who refuse to read it in church from Easter to Pentecost.

19. Enumerates the cases in which persons may not be admitted to holy orders.

25. Is directed against ignorance in the clergy; requires them to be acquainted with Holy Scripture and the canons.

26. Orders that a priest when appointed to any parish shall receive a copy of the ritual from the bishop, and that when the priests attend the litanies or synods they shall give account to the bishop of their manner of celebrating the holy office and administering holy baptism.

33. Forbids the bishop to take for his own share more than one third of the revenue of the churches within his diocese.

34. Enacts that thirty years possession shall give to a bishop lawful right over a Church situated in the diocese of another bishop if in the same province.

39. Forbids the deacons to pretend to the privileges of the priesthood and to sit ill the first places.

40. Forbids them to wear two stoles, which it declares to be unfit for even a bishop or priest; directs them to wear the stole over the left shoulder, and also that it be clean, and not worked with colors or with gold.

41. Orders all clerks, as well as the priests and deacons, to shave the entire crown of the head and to leave but a slight rim of hair in the form of a circle.

46. Orders that a clerk found plundering a tomb be deposed from every ecclesiastical rank and office, and subjected to three years penance.

51. Forbids bishops to ill-treat monks, but grants to them the exercise of their canonical authority over them, such as exhorting them to observe a good and holy life, instituting abbots and other officers, correcting those who infringe the rules, etc.

52. Enacts that monks forsaking the monastic state in order to marry and settle in the world shall be brought back and put to penance.

57. Forbids to compel Jews to profess Christianity; with regard to the compulsory conversions under king Sisbertus, it allows that they should continue to be considered as Christians because they had received baptism, chrism, and the holy Eucharist.

The following nine relate to the Jews, and to Christians who had apostatized to Judaism. The 66th and following eight relate to the case of slaves,

75. Anathematizes all who conspire against regal authority. See Mansi, 5, 1700.

VIII. The Eighth Council of Toledo was held in 636, under king Chintila, Eugenius, bishop of Toledo, presiding; twenty-two bishops in all were present. Nine canons were published, of which

1. Orders public litanies every year for three days, beginning Dec. 14, except one of the three should prove to be Sunday, in which case the-litany days were to be observed in the week following. All the others relate to the prince and the strengthening of his powers, etc. See Mansi, 5, 1735.

IX. This council was held Jan. 9, 638, under Silva, metropolitan of Narbonne, in the second year of the reign of king Chintila. Fifty-two  Spanish and Gallic bishops were present, either in person or by deputy. Eighteen canons were published.

3. Enacts that for the future no king should ascend the throne without making a vow to defend the Catholic faith and to rid the country of infidels; pronounces anathema against those who should violate this oath.

7. Orders that persons who, after having been admitted to penance, quit that state and resume the secular dress shall be arrested by the bishop, and compelled to perform their course of penance, whether they will or not, in some monastery. Fleury observes that this is the first time that we find mention of this compulsory penance, which evinced entire ignorance of the sound practice of antiquity. See Mansi, 5, 1740.

X. The Tenth Council was held about 646, under king. Chintasuinthus, by twenty-eight bishops present and the deputies of eleven who were absent. Six canons were published.

2. Allows the bishop, or any other priest who may be present, to complete the celebration of the sacred mysteries when the celebrating priest is unable to proceed thorough sickness; excommunicates those -who, without such cause, leave the celebration unfinished, or who celebrate after having partaken of the slightest particle of food. See Mansi, 5, 1863.

XI. This council was held in 653, under Orontius of Merida; the king, Resesuinthus, being present, and fifty-two bishops, with the deputies of ten absent. The prince read his profession of faith, in which he acknowledged the first four ecumenical councils. Twelve canons were published.

1. Contains a definition of faith.

2. Condemns all oaths and vows to commit evil actions.

3. Condemns all persons guilty of simony.

7. Condemns those who forsake the episcopal or sacerdotal office upon pretext of having been admitted to such holy office unwillingly; orders those who so return into the world and marry to be shut up for life in a monastery.

8. Forbids ordaining ignorant clerks.

9. Excludes from the Easter communion and from the privilege of eating meat for twelve months those who break the Lent fast.

12. Confirms the canons of a former council concerning the Jews. Besides the bishops and deputies present, we find among the signatures those of ten abbots; the archpriest of Toledo, and sixteen counts. After the subscriptions there is a synodal decree concerning the disposition of the king's property, and an edict of the king confirming it. See Mansi, 6:394.

XI. The Twelfth Council of Toledo was held Nov. 2, 655, Eugenius, the archbishop, presiding; sixteen bishops attended, and seventeen canons were published, most of which tend to repress the abuses committed by bishops in the administration of Church property.

11. Forbids to confer orders upon the slaves of the Church except they have been first set free by the bishop.

18. Orders that newly baptized Jews shall show themselves in the assemblies of the Christians on all Jewish festivals. See Mansi, 6:451.

XIII. Held Dec. 1, 656, under Reccasuinthus; twenty bishops were present, among whom were Eugenius, the metropolitan of Toledo; Fugitivus, the metropolitan of Seville; and St. Fructuosus, the metropolitan of Braga; five bishops who were absent sent deputies. Seven canons were published.

1. Orders that the Feast of the Annunciation shall in future be kept on Dec. 18, because that, falling in Lent, it interfered with the fast, and often with the celebration of Good-Friday.

3. Forbids bishops to present churches to their relations and friends for the sake of the revenue to be derived.

6. Directs that children devoted by their parents to the tonsure shall be compelled to lead the life of the religions; does not allow parents so to devote their children after they have attained ten years of age without their own consent.

7. Forbids selling Christians to Jews. See Mansi, 6:459.

XIV. Held Nov. 7, 675, under king Wamba; seventeen bishops (among whom was Quiritius of Toledo), the deputies of two others, and six abbots  were present. In this council the division of the country into dioceses was made, and sixteen canons of discipline were published.

3. Orders all the bishops of the province to conform to the order and ritual in use in the metropolitan Church.

4. Forbids suffering priests who are at variance to approach the altar of to receive their offerings.

6. Deprives ecclesiastics who take part in the judgment of capital cases.

8. Enacts penalties to be enforced against priests who demand a fee for christening or for the chrism; orders bishops to punish such offenders under pain of suspension.

13. Forbids persons possessed with a devil to serve at the altar or to approach it.

14. Orders that mass shall never be celebrated by one priest only; lest he should be taken ill and the mass left unfinished. See Mansi, 6:539.

XV. Held Jan. 9, 681, under king Ervigius. Julian of Toledo presided at the head of thirty-four bishops, among whom were the metropolitans of Seville, Braga, and Merida. Thirteen canons were published.

1. Approves of the resignation of king Wamba, who had assumed the religious habit.

4. Declares to be null and void the consecration of a bishop for a little town in the immediate vicinity of Toledo made by the bishop of Merida against his own will and against the canons at the command of Wamba; land generally forbids to consecrate a bishop to a place which has not hitherto had a bishop.

6. Enacts that, in order to prevent any further delay in filling up the vacant bishoprics, it shall be lawful for tile bishop ‘of Toledo to consecrate those persons whom the king shall choose,: without prejudice, however, to the rights of the province.

10. Confirms, with the king's consent, the privilege of asylum to those who take refuge in a church, or anywhere within thirty paces of it.

11. Orders the abolition of every remnant of idolatry. See Mansi, 6:1221.

XVI. Held in November, 683, under king Ervigius, who was present; forty-eight bishops, four of whom were metropolitans, attended, Julian of Toledo presiding. Twelve canons were published, the Nicene Creed having been first read, which from this time was sung in all churches in Spain.

The fifth is the extraordinary canon, which absolutely forbids the widows of kings to remarry, even with princes. From the tenth it appears not to have been uncommon at this period for persons (even bishops), in time of dangerous illness, to submit to be put to public penance without confessing, or their conscience accusing them of any particular sin, but for greater security. See Mansi, 6:1253.

XVII. This council was held at the request of pope Leo II, under king Ervigius, in 684, to receive and approve the Sixth (Ecumenical Council held at Constantinople against the Monothelites; seventeen bishops, ten deputies, and six abbots attended. In the answer of the bishops to Leo they make no mention of the fifth ecumenical council, saying, in canon 7, that they, decree that this council, the Seventh (Ecumenical) shall rank after the Council of Chalcedon in honor, place, and order. See Mansi, 6:1278.

XVIII. Held May 11,688, under king Egica, Julian of Toledo presiding over sixty bishops, in order to explain certain expressions made use of in a confession of faith drawn up by the Spanish bishops some years before which had given offence to pope Benedict II. These expressions related to the two wills in our Lord Jesus Christ; and it was decreed to be not contrary to Christian ‘truth to maintain that in God the will proceeds from the will—‘”voluntatem ex voluntate procedere.” ‘See Mansi, 6:1294.

XIX. This council was held May 2. 693; composed of fifty-nine bishops, five abbots, and the deputies of three bishops absent; there were also present the king, Egica, and sixteen lords. In this council the decision of the previous council concerning the procession of the will from the will, and of the essence from the essence, in God was further explained. Twelve or thirteen canons were published.

6. Relates to the conduct of some priests, who, instead of using bread made for the purpose in the holy Eucharist, contented themselves with offering on the holy table common bread cut into a round form. The canon orders that the bread used at the altar shall be made expressly for that purpose.

9. Excommunicated for life and deposed Sisbertus of Toledo, convicted of conspiring against the person of king Egica and his family. See Xansi, 6:1327.

XX. This council was held Nov. 9, 694. The, subscriptions of the bishops present are lost. Eight canons were published.

1. Directs that during the tree days preceding the opening of any council, and during which a strict fast ought to be observed, nothing shall be discussed which does not refer to matters of faith, morals; and ecclesiastical discipline.

3. Orders that bishops, following the example of our Lord, shall observe the ceremony of washing the feet of the poor on Holy Thursday.

5. Condemns to excommunication and perpetual imprisonment priests who, from a vile and wicked superstition, shall say the office of the mass for the dead for the living, in order by so doing to cause their death. See Mansi, 6:1361.

XXI. This council was held Nov. 21, 1324, by John, archbishop of Toledo. Eight canons ‘were published, in the preface to which it is ordered that they shall be observed together with those which the legate William de Gondi, bishop of Sabino, had made in the Council of Valladolid (1322). These canons, among other things, order bishops to attend the synods, and relate to the conduct and dress of clerks; forbid priests to demand anything for masses said by them but allow them to receive voluntary offerings; forbid to say more than one mass in a day, except on Christmas-day. See Mansi, 11; 1712.

XXII. This was held in 1339 by AEgidius, archbishop of Toledo, six bishops being present. Five canons were published.

2. Forbids to ordain any illiterate person.

3. Provides that in cathedral or collegiate churches some shall be compelled to study theology, the canon law, and the liberal arts.

5. Orders all rectors to keep a list of such of their parishioners as are of age, in order to effect the observation of the canon “omnis utriusque sexus.” See Mansi, 11:1869.

XXIII. (Also called COUNCIL OF ARENDA.) Held Dec. 5,1473, in the borough of Arenda, by Alphonso de Carille, archbishop of Toledo. This council was numerously attended, and twenty-nine canons were published.

1. Orders that provincial councils shall be held biennially and diocesan synods annually.

2. Orders curates to instruct their flocks in the principal articles of belief.

3. Forbids to promote to holy orders persons ignorant of Latin.

4. Forbids to receive a clerk from another diocese without letters from his bishop.
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6. Relate to the dress of bishops and clerks; forbid them to wear garments made of red and green silk, short garments, and white shoes, etc.

7. Relates to the proper observance of Sundays and festivals.

8. Forbids ecclesiastics to wear mourning.

9. Orders the punishment of incontinent clerks.

10. Forbids to admit to parochial churches or prebends persons ignorant of Latin, unless, for good cause, the bishop shall think fit to dispense With it.

11. Inflicts a pecuniary fine upon ecclesiastics who play with dice.

12. Orders that all priests shall celebrate mass four times in the year at the least, and bishops three times.

13. Forbids all preaching without the bishop's license.

14. Enacts penalties to be enforced against clerks in the minor orders who do not wear the clerical habit and observe the tonsure.

15. Forbids ecclesiastics to furnish soldiers to any temporal lord except the king, or to accept of lands upon condition of so doing.

16. Forbids the celebration of marriages at uncanonical times.

17. Excommunicates those who are married clandestinely without five witnesses, and suspends for three months the priest who shall officiate.

18. Excommunicates those who buy or sell the property of a vacant benefice.

19. Forbids the custom of performing, at certain times, spectacles, etc., and singing songs, and uttering profane discourses in churches.

20. Directs that persons dying of wounds received in duels shall not be allowed Christian burial, even though they may have received the sacrament of penance before death.

21. Excommunicates those who hinder the clergy from receiving tithe and enjoying their privileges, etc

23. Orders that sentences of excommunication pronounced in any one diocese shall be observed in all others.

24. Puts under an interdict the place from which any clerk has been forcibly expelled.

25. Forbids any sort of fee on account of ordination. 27. ‘Grants to the bishop the power of absolving from synodal censures.

28. Provides for the publication of these canons in diocesan synods and in cathedral churches. See Mansi, 13:1448.

XXIV. Held Sept. 8, 1565. Christopher de Sandoval, bishop of Cordova, was called upon to preside on account of his being the oldest bishop of the province. The bishops of Siguenqa, Segovia, Palencia, Cuenga, and Osma attended, with the abbot of Alcala el Real. Three sessions were held; in the first the decree of Trent relating to the celebration of provincial synods was read; also a profession of faith which was signed by all present. In the second session thirty-one articles of reformation were published relating to bishops, curates, officials, proctors, residence, and divine service. In the third session, held March 25, twenty-eight articles were drawn up, and the decrees of Trent relating to residence were read. Bishops were directed not to admit to the tonsure those who had no benefices immediately in view. Rules were laid down to guide curates in preaching and instructing their people, etc. See Mansi, 15:751.

## Toledo, Roderigo de[[@Headword:Toledo, Roderigo de]]

             an eminent Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Rada, in Navarre, about 1170. He was sent to Paris to complete his education, and on his return he attached himself to Sancho V, king of Navarre, by whom he was employed to negotiate a peace with Alfonso VIII of Castile. Procuring the favor of Alfonso, he was appointed by him bishop of Siguenza, and was afterwards made archbishop of Toledo. He showed great zeal in the frequent wars with the Moors, often directing in person inroads upon the Mohammedan territory. Nor did he have any less zeal for learning; he persuaded Alfonso to found the University of Palencia. At the Fourth Lateran Council he not only harangued the fathers in elegant Latin, but gained over the secular nobles and ambassadors by conversing with each of them in his mother tongue. He died in France in 1247, after attending the Council of Lyons convoked by Innocent IV. He wrote several historical works, most of which are still unedited. His Rerum in Hispania Gestarum Chronicon (Granada, 1545) is an invaluable production. It was subsequently published in a collection entitled Hispania Illustrata, by Andreas Schott (Frankf. 1603-8, 4 vols. fol.). He also wrote, Historia Arabum, published in vol. 2 of Andreas Schott's collection (1603); and subsequently (1625) by Erpennius, as an appendix to his Historia Salracenica of Georgius Elmacin. He wrote a history of the Ostrogoths, of the Huns, Vandals, Suevi, Alans,.and Silingi, published by R. Bell, in the collection entitled Rerum Hispanicarum Scriptoies Aliquot (Frankf. 1579, 3 vols. fol.): — also Breviarium Ecclesiae Catholicae, and others still unedited.

## Toledoth Jeshu[[@Headword:Toledoth Jeshu]]

             (תֹּלְדוֹת יְשׁוּ, i.e. History of Jesus). Under this title a Jewish apocryphal work, or rather libel, is extant, purporting to give the history of Jesus. It first became known to Christians in the 13th century; but who was the author of the Toledoth Jeshu is not known. In reality, we have two such books, each called Toledoth Jeshu, not recensions of an earlier text, but independent collections of the stories circulating among the Jews relative to the life of Christ. The name of Jesus, which in Hebrew is Joshua'or Jehoshua, is in both contracted into Jeshu by the dropping of an Ain, ישוֹfor ישועElias in Tishbi, s.v.” Jeshu,” says, “Because the Jews will not acknowledge him to be the Savior, they do not call him Jeshua, but reject the Ain and call him Jeshu.” Rabbi Abraham Perizol, or Farrissol, in his book Maggen Abraham, c. 59, says, “His name was Jeshua, but as'rabbi Moses Mairnonides has written it, and as we find it throughout the Talmud, it is written Jeshu. They have carefully left out the Ain because he was not able to save himself.” By omitting the Ain, the Cabalists gave a signification to the name. In its curtailed form it is composed of the letters Jod, Shin, Vav, which are taken to stand for שמו וזכרונו ימה, i.e. “his name and remembrance shall be extinguished.” This is the reason given in the Toledoth Jeshu.

The Toledoth Jeshu was known to Luther, who condensed it in. his Schenz Iamphoras (see his Werke [Hemberg, 1566], 5, 509-535), as the following passage (p. 515) will show, “The proud evil spirit carries on all sorts of mockery in this book. First he mocks God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and his Son Jesus Christ, as you may see for yourself, if you believe as a Christian that Christ is the Son of God. Next he mocks us, all Christendom, in that we believe in such a Son of God. Thirdly, he mocks his own fellow Jews, telling them such disgraceful, foolish, senseless affairs, as of brazen dogs and cabbage-stalks and such like, enough to make all dogs bark themselves to death, if they could understand it, at such a pack of idiotic, blustering, raging, nonsensical fools. Is not that a masterpiece of mockery which can thus work all three at once? The fourth mockery is this, that whoever wrote it has made a fool of himself, as we, thank God, may see any day.” Voltaire also knew the work; for in his Lettres sur les Juifs (Euvres, 1, 69, p. 36) he says, “Le Toledos Jeschu est le plus ancien ecrit Juif qui nous ait etd transmis contre notre religion. C'est ulie vie de Jesus Christ, toute contraire a nos Saints Evangiles elle  parait tre du premier siecle, et meme ecrite avant les evangiles.” He evidently seems to identify this work with the one mentioned by Justin Martyr in his colloquy with Tryphon, 17:108. Of the two widely differing recension of this book of unknown authorship, the first edition was published by Wagenseil, in his Tela Ignea Satanae, etc. (Altdorf, 1681); the second by Huldrich, at Leyden, in 1705, under the title Histo ia Jeschuce Nazareni, a'Judceis Blaspheme Corrupta. Neither can boast of an antiquity greater than, at the outside, the 12th century. It is difficult to say with certainty, which is the earlier of the two. Probably both came into use about the same time; the second certainly in Germany, for it speaks of Worms in the German empire. According to the first, Jesus was born in the year of the world 4671 =B.C. 910, in the reign of Alexander Jannseus (B.C. 106-79)! According to the second, he was born in the reign of Herod the Proselyte, i.e. B.C. 704. A comparison of both shows so many gross anachronisms as to prove that they were drawn up at a very late date, and by Jews singularly ignorant of the chronology of their history. As to the contents, its blasphemies are too gross and grotesque to need further notice. Being a late and detestable compilation, put together out of fragmentary. Talmudic legends, all respectable Jews themselves have regarded it as utterly contemptible.

Besides the editions of Wagenseil and Huldrich, see Clemens, Die geheimgehaltenen oder spenannten apokryo phischen Evangelien (Stuttg. 1850), pt 5; Aim, Die Urtheile heidnischer undjüdischer Schrif tsteller der vier ersten christlichen Jah rhunderte iiber Jesus und die ersten Christen (Leips.'1864), p. 137 sq.; Baring-Gould, The Lost and Hostile Gospels (Lond. 1874), p. 67 sq.; De'Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 316 sq. SEE JESUS CHRIST. (B. P.)

Toleration is the allowance given to that which is not approved. The Church, as the depository and dispenser of religious truth, cannot bring within the range of its theory the allowance of that which it holds to be an error. The Church of England holds (Art. vi) that it is not required of any man that anything should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation, which is not read in Holy Scripture or may not be proved thereby. . But if any man profess what is clearly contrary to that which the Church has laid down as an article of the faith, then, in the Church's view, he professes what is contrary to the Scripture, and there can be no warrant for allowing that which is contrary to Scripture. The Church, however, while refusing any allowance to error,  may refrain from denunciation and persecution of those who profess and maintain erroneous doctrines. —Hook, Church Dict. s.v. SEE PERSECUTION.

## Toleration, Acts of[[@Headword:Toleration, Acts of]]

             Previous to 1868 the statute law of Great Britain (see 35 Eliz. and 22 Car, II) forbade the public exercise of any other religion than that of the Church of England. The Toleration Act (I Will. and Mary, c. 18) frees from the penalty of nonconformity those who take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and who subscribe the declaration against popery of 30 Car. II, 2, c. 1, reserving in force 35 Car. II, c. 2, and 13 Car. II, c. 1, the acts, that is, for preventing dangers which may happen from popish recusants, and for preserving the king's person and government by disabling papists from sitting in Parliament. It did not relieve Dissenters from such previous acts as required members of town corporations, and all persons holding office, under the crown, to receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper according to the usage of the Church of England, which were continued in force until 1828, when they were repealed by the 9 Geo. IV, c. 17. Preachers taking the oaths and subscribing the Articles of Religion, except 34:35:36:and the clause of 20 regarding the power and authority of the Church, are freed from the penalties of the Acts of Nonconformity; and Baptist preachers are excused the part of Art. 27 touching infant baptism. Quakers, upon making a declaration of fidelity, and subscribing a profession of Christian belief, are exempted from the oaths and enjoy the privileges of other Dissenters.

By the 19 Geo. III, c. 44, Protestant Dissenting ministers and schoolmasters are exempted from the subscription to the articles on making and subscribing a declaration that the Scriptures contain the revealed will of God, and are received as the rule of doctrine and practice. By the 53 Geo. III, c. 106. the provisions of the Act of Will and Mary, also those of 9 and l10 Will. III respecting the denial of the Trinity, were repealed, the common law with respect to impugning the doctrine of the Trinity not being altered. By the 52 Geo. III, c. 155, the Five-mile and Conventicle acts, and an Act relating to Quakers (13 and 14 Car. II, c. 1), are repealed; all religious assemblies of fewer than twenty persons become lawful without registration; those of more than twenty persons are to be registered and certified; and a fine of twenty pounds is laid upon those who disturb any congregation assembled for worship. By 9 Geo. IV, c. 17,-the Test and Corporation acts are repealed, and a declaration substituted in  lieu of the sacramental test. See Blunt, Hist. of Doct. s.v.; Hook, Church Dict. s.v.

## Toles, Russell G., D.D[[@Headword:Toles, Russell G., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Dunham, N.Y., in 1811. He graduated from Madison University at an early age, studied theology, and then took charge of a Baptist Church in Cooperstown, where he was ordained. At the breaking-out of the rebellion he was given control of one branch of the Christian Commission, and stationed at Fortress Monroe. From these duties he was called to the Howard Mission of New York. He founded, with the aid of ten wealthy laymen, the Wanderers' Home, in Baldwin Place, Boston, in 1865. At first it was a mission school as well as a home, and children, and even infants, were carried there in the daytime by their parents, and then taken home at night; but eventually it became a permanent home for children until adopted into families. Dr. Toles died in Boston, July 11, 1884.

## Tolet (or Toletanus)[[@Headword:Tolet (or Toletanus)]]

             SEE TOLEDO.

## Toll[[@Headword:Toll]]

             (מַדָּה, Ezr 4:20, or [Chald.] מַנַדָּה, 4:13; 7:24, tribute [so called from being measured or apportioned], as Nehemiah 5, 4) is strictly a tax for passing along a highway or other thoroughfare. SEE TAX; SEE TRIBUTE. In the Roman period taxes were collected along the roads or along the navigable waters by the postiloces, or custom-house officers. There was also a class of publicans who had houses or booths built for them at the foot of bridges, at the mouth of rivers, and by the seashore, where they took toll of passengers that went to and fro. For this purpose they used tickets or seals, which, when a man had paid toll on one side of a river, were given him by the publican to show to him that sat on the other side that it-might appear he had paid. On these were written two great letters, larger than those in common use. Modern Oriental usages illustrate the custom referred to in Mat 9:9. Arriving at Persepolis, Mr. Morier observes, “Here is a station of rahdars, or toll-gatherers, appointed to levy a toll upon kafilahs, or caravans of merchants, and who in general exercise their office with so much brutality and extortion as to be execrated by all travelers. The collections of the toll are farmed, consequently extortion ensues; and, as most of the rahdars receive no other emolument than what they can exact over and above the prescribed dues from the traveler, their insolence is accounted for, and a cause sufficiently powerful is given for their insolence, on the one hand, and the detestation in which they are held on the other. Baf-gah means the place of tribute; it may also be rendered the receipt of custom, and perhaps it was from a place like this that our Savior called Matthew to follow him.” SEE CUSTOM, RECEIPT OF. At Smyrna the miriji sits in the house allotted to him, as Matthew sat at the receipt of custom (or in the custom-house of Capernaum), and receives the money which is due from various persons and commodities entering the city. “The exactions and rude behavior of these men,'” says Mr. Hartley, “‘are just in character with the conduct of the publicans mentioned in the New Test. When men are guilty of such conduct as this, no wonder that  they were detested in ancient times as were the publicans, and in modern times as are the mirijis.” SEE PUBLICAN.

## Tollner, Johann Gottlieb[[@Headword:Tollner, Johann Gottlieb]]

             a German theologian, was born Dec. 9, 1724, at Charlottenburg. He completed his studies at the Orphanage and the University of Halle under the guidance of Baumgarten, Knapp, Michaelis, Wolff, Weber, and Meier, and then became private tutor and military chaplain. In 1760 he was made professor of theology and philosophy at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. He delivered four lectures each day, wrote numerous learned books-his practice being to write upon one while dictating to an amanuensis the contents of another, so that two were in process of simultaneous preparation-and entered into most intimate and direct relations with his numerous students. He was accustomed to conduct devotional meetings after the ending of the public services of the Sabbath, and to train the students in homiletical and catechetical duties. During much of his public life his health was infirm. Extreme terrors sometimes came over him when about to ascend the pulpit, and rendered it impossible for him to preach; and upon these followed asthma and a racking cough, to which he finally succumbed at the age of forty-nine years. He died Jan. 20, 1774, while uttering the word “Overcome.”

Of Tollner's writings, the following may perhaps be regarded as of chief importance: Gedanken von der wahren Lehrart in d. dogm. Theologie (1759): —Grundriss der dogm. Theologie (1760): —Grundriss der MoralTheologie (1773): —Grundriss der Hermeneutik (1773): Grundriss der Pastoral-Theologie (1773): —Der thtige Gehorsam Christi (1773): — Theologische Untersuchungei (1773). He occupied entirely orthodox ground in theology, though the ethics of Christianity held the foremost place in his thoroughly practical mind, and though he made far-reaching concessions to rationalism. With reference to confessions of faith his position was independent, and with reference to the contradictions of his time he stood midway between the extremes. The school of Spener and Francke had gradually come to assume a position of hostility, or at least indifference, towards science, and over against it stood the scholastic or philosophical school of the Wolfdian type, which undertook to demonstrate everything mathematically. Tollner regarded both extremes as overstrained, and adopted the scientific method, which regarded ‘all dogmatic truths as constituting a science, i.e. a learned and comprehensive knowledge, and  which attempted a logical explanation of every tenet without the employment of any illustrations whatsoever.

Literature. —Hamberger, Gelehrtes Deutschland (with the first supplement by Mensel); Mensel, Lexikon d. teutschen Schriftsteller voni Jahre 1750-1800; Hirsching, Hist. —lit. Handbuch berühmter u. denkw. Professoren des 18ten Jahrhunderts (Leips. 1818), XIV, 2; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Toman[[@Headword:Toman]]

             (Heb. Teyman, תֵּימָן, the right, also the south, as often; Sept. Θαιμάν v.r. Θεμάν and Θαμάν; Vulg, Theman v.r. Meaidies, Auster), the name of a man, and also of a people and country.

1. The oldest son of Eliphaz the son of Esau (Gen 36:11). B.C. cir. 1960. It would appear that Teman was the first duke or prince (אִלּוּ) of  the Edomites (Gen 5:15); and that, having founded a tribe, he gave his name to the region in which it settled (Genesis 5:34).

2. The country of the Temanites, which formed in after-ages the chief, stronghold of Idumsean power. Hence, when the Lord by the mouth of Ezekiel pronounced the doom of Edom, he said, “I will make it desolate from Teman” (Eze 25:13). The Temanites were celebrated for their courage; hence the force and point of Obadiah's judgment: “Thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed” (Eze 25:9). They were also famous for wisdom; in allusion to which characteristic, and perhaps with special reference to Job's friend Eliphaz the Temanite, Jeremiah mournfully asks, “Is wisdom no more in Teman? is counsel perished from the prudent? is their wisdom vanished?” (Jer 49:7; Job 2:11; comp. Bar 3:22. See Pusey, On Obadiah, Bar 3:22).

The geographical position of “the land of Teman,” or, more literally, the “land of the Temanite,” as it is called in Gen 36:34 (מֵאֵרֵ הִתֵּימָנַי; Sept. ἐκ τῆς γῆς θαιμανών, A. V. “Temani”), is nowhere defined in Scripture; but there are several incidental notices which tend to fix it with considerable certainty.

1. It is intimately connected with Edom, and manifestly either formed a province of it, or lay upon its border (Jer 49:7; Jer 49:20). In one passage it is included in the same curse with Bozrah, the capital of Edom: “I will send a fire upon Teman, which shall devour the palaces of Bozrah” (Amo 1:12).

2. Habakkuk joins Teman in parallelism with Mount Paran (Hab 3:3); and this might probably indicate that the portion of Edom lying over against Kadesh, besideῥ which rose Mount Paran (q.v.), was called Teman. Perhaps, as the northern section of Edom was called Gebal, the southern section may have got the name Teman.

3. Ezekiel groups Teman in such a way with Edom and Dedan as would lead to the conclusion that it lay between them, and therefore on the south and south-east of the former (Eze 25:13). SEE DANIEL On the whole, it would appear that Teman was the name given by Esau's distinguished grandson to his possessions in the southern part of the mountains of Edom. As the tribe increased in strength and wealth, they spread out over the region extending southward along the shore of the Gulf of Akabah, and eastward into Arabia. This view is confirmed by a  passage in the book of Joshua, hitherto considered obscure and difficult, but which the advances recently made in Biblical geography tend to elucidate. The sacred writer-commences his description of the territory of Judah in these words: “This, then, was the lot of the children of Judah; even to the border of Edom the wilderness of Zin southward was the uttermost part of the south coast” (Eze 15:1). Besides being unintelligible, this is not a literal translation of the Hebrew; and the renderings of the Sept. and Vulg. are still worse. The Hebrew may be translated as follows: Towards (or along, אֶל) the border of Edom, the wilderness of Zin to the Negeb (נֶגְבָּה) from the extremity of Teman” (מַקְצֵה תֵימָן). The writer is describing the south-eastern section of the territory.

It extended along the border of Edom, including the wilderness of Zin from the extreme (north- western) corner of Teman to the Negeb. Teman is unquestionably a proper name, as is shown by the word מקצהbeing placed before it. So also is Negeb. The wilderness of Zin extended up as far-as Kadesh,-and a part of it was thus allotted to Judah.. Teman included the mountains of Edom as far north as Mount Hor, opposite Kadesh; and thus the territory of Judah reached to its extreme north-western corner. The Negeb included the downs along the southern base of the Judsean hills, and lay between them and the wilderness of Zin. The above translation is found in part in the Arabic version, and is adopted by Houbigant.

The accounts given by Eusebius and Jerome of Teman are not consistent. They describe it as a region of the rulers of Edom in the land of Gebalitis; and they further state that there is a village of that name fifteen (Jerome has five) miles from Petra. But in another notice they appear to distinguish this Teman from one in Arabia (Onomast. s.v. “Theman”). On the map in Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, Theman is identified with the modern village of Maan, east of Petra; but for this there seems to be no authority (Winer, Biblisches Realwörterb. s.v. “Theman.” See Porter, Handbook for Syr. and Pal. p. 58). The occupation of the country by the Nabathaeans seems to have obliterated almost all of the traces (always obscure) of the migratory tribes of the desert. SEE EDOM.

## Tomasini, Jacopo Filippo[[@Headword:Tomasini, Jacopo Filippo]]

             an Italian prelate, was born at Padua, Nov. 17, 1597; instructed by Benedetti of Legnano; afterwards entered the congregation of the regular canons of St. George, in Alga; and received the degree of doctor at Padua in 1619. He went to Rome, where he was cordially received, especially by Urban VIII, who would have appointed him to a bishopric in the island of Candia. At his own request, this was exchanged for the see of Citta Nuova, in Istria, to which he was consecrated in 1642. There he remained until his death, in 1654. He wrote, Illustrium Virorum Elogia Iconibus Exornata (Padua, 1630, 4to; 2nd vol. 1644): —Titus Livius Patavinus (ibid. 1630, 4to): —Petrarcha Redivivus Integrana Poetce Celeberrimi Vitam Iconib2us Ere Ccelatis Exhibens (ibid. 1635,4to): —Clarissimce Femninmce Cassandrae Fidelis Venetae Epistolae et Orationes Posthumae (ibid. 1636, 12mo): —De Donariis ac Tabellis Votivis, etc. (Utin. 1639, 4to): —Laursce Ceratae Epistolce, curm Notis, etc. (Padua, 1640, 12mo): Bibliothecce Patavince Manuscripta, etc. (ibid. 1639, 4to): Bibliothecae Venefce Manuscripta, etc. (Utin. 1650, 4to).

## Tomb[[@Headword:Tomb]]

             (גָּדַישׁ, a tumulus, Job 21:32; elsewhere “stack” or “shock” of corn; τάφος, μνῆμα, or , μνημεῖον, usually “sepulcher” ). The most conspicuous objects in Palestine to this day are its tombs, called, according to the person commemorated, or the purpose of commemoration, keber, or mazar, or wely. One does not find this to be the case throughout Europe, where tombs are not usually conspicuous; but in Egypt and Syria they meet the eye in all directions, and are, with a few exceptions, Mohammedan erections. In Egypt, the tombs of its ancient kings, and the more modern tombs of the Mamelukes, are very remarkable and interesting. In the Sinaitic desert there are some interesting graveyards, dotted with unhewn  stones and adorned with the retem, or broom; and one of these places of sepulture is known as Turbbet-es-Yahuid, the graves of the Jews. There is only one conspicuous monument in it, Kuber Nebi Harmin, the “tomb of the prophet Aaron,” on Mount Hor. But soon after entering Palestine you find tombs in all directions. At Hebron you have the tomb of Abraham and the patriarchs in the well-known cave of Machpelah, marked or rather concealed by a Moslem mosque. On one of the eastern hills, seen from the heights above Hebron, you have the tomb of Lot; farther on, the tomb of Rachel; and, then, as you approach Jerusalem, the tomb of David, outside the modern city, and the tomb of Samuel, on a height above Gibeon, some seven miles to the north-west, greets your eye. As you traverse the land you meet with these monuments in all positions-the tomb of Jonah near Sidon, and even the tomb of Abel a little farther north!

Besides these conspicuous objects, there are others less visible, but quite as remarkable. At Hebron there is the Jewish burying-ground covered with large slabs, and. curious tombs cut in the rock, with loculi on all sides, which are probably patriarchal, or at least Jewish. Around Jerusalem there. are numerous tombs, many of them remarkable for their beauty, their size, their peculiar structure. SEE JERUSALEM.

Almost all of these are Jewish, and give us a good idea of “how the manner of the Jews was to bury.” Whoever could afford it chose the rock, not the earth, for the covering of his body, and preferred to have his body deposited on a clean rocky shelf, not let down into and covered over with the soil. Hence our ideas of burial are not the same as those of the Jews. According to us, there is always the letting down into the earth; according to them, there is the taking possession of some stony chamber for the last sleep. Hence the expression “buried with him by baptism into death” would not to a Hebrew suggest immersion, as it seems to do to us, and to the early Christian the symbol of baptismal burial would be associated with the Lord's own tomb.

The first mention of a eber, or burying-place, in Scripture is in Gen 23:4, where Abraham asks the sons of Heth for the “possession of a keber,” receiving for answer, “In the choice of our kebers bury thy dead.” After this there is frequent mention of these sepulchers, and some of them are specially singled out for notice. Yet Machpelah was the most memorable; and we know not if ever a tomb was more touchingly and poetically described than by Jacob on his death-bed in Egypt, when, looking back on the land from which he was an exile, the land of his fathers sepulchers, he points as with his finger to the well-known patriarchal  burying place-” There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah” (Gen 49:31). We have also Kibroth-hataavah, the graves of lust, in the wilderness (Num 11:34); the tomb of Joash in Ophrah, where Gideon was buried (Jdg 8:32); the tomb of Manoah between Zorah and Eshtaol, where Samson was buried (Jdg 16:31); the tomb of Zeruiah (or her husband) in Bethlehem, where Asahel was buried (2 Samuel 2, 32); the tomb of Abner in Hebron (2Sa 3:32; 2Sa 4:12); the tomb in Giloh of Ahithophel's father, where his suicide son was buried; the paternal and maternal tomb in Gilead, in which Barzillai sought burial (2Sa 19:37); the tomb of Kish in Zelah, where the bones of Saul and Jonathan were deposited (2Sa 21:14); the tomb of the old prophet in Bethel (1 Kings 13,-30); the tomb of Elisha, probably near Jericho (2Ki 13:21); the tombs of” the children of the people,” in the valley of the Kedron (23, 6); the tombs in “the Mount,” near Bethel (2Ki 13:16); the tomb or tombs of David (Neh 3:16); the tombs of the kings (2Ch 21:20). The Newest references to “tombs” are chiefly in connection with the Lord's burial. His tomb is called sometimes τάφος (Mat 27:61), sometimes μνῆμα (Luk 23:53), and sometimes μνημεῖον (Joh 19:41).

At this day the tombs of Syria are either like our own, underground, as at Hebron, Tiberias, and the valley of Jehoshaphat; or in artificial excavations in the rock, as in the ridge south of Jerusalem (Aceldama), the tombs of the prophets on Olivet, the tombs of the kings and judges north and north-west of the city; or entirely above ground, as the tomb of Rachel, of Absalom, of Samuel, and of Joseph.

All (in Jewish ages) who could bear the cost seem to have chosen the rocky excavation for sepulture, as in the case of Joseph of Arimathsea. This is evident from such a passage as Isa 22:16, addressed to Shebna the treasurer,” What hast thou here, and whom hast thou here, that thou hast hewed thee out a sepulcher here, as he that heweth him out a sepulcher on high, that graveth an habitation for himself in a rock?” It is supposed by Lowth, Scott, Alexander, etc., that Shebna was a foreigner, and that the questions what and whom refer to this, implying that he had no right to such an honor. It was, perhaps, peculiarly a national privilege, so that, as no Gentile could inherit the land, none could obtain such a place for a tomb as he could call his own. The question then would be, “What connection hast thou with Israel that thou assumest one of Israel's special  privileges?” Possibly, however, he was only a person of low origin from a distant part of the country, and of ungodly principles, who vainly thought to establish for himself a name and a place in Jerusalem.

The large tombs, such as those of the kings and judges, have no inscriptions; but the flat stones in the valley of Jehoshaphat have their epitaphs, some of considerable length in Hebrew, with the title ציוןat the top, that word meaning originally a cippus or pillar (2Ki 23:17; Eze 39:15), and in Talmudical Hebrew denoting a sign or mark (Levi, Linguta Sacra, vol. 5, s.v.; Carpzov, Notes on Goodwin, p. 645). ‘This last writer tells us that the use of such a mark was specially to warn off passers-by lest they should contract uncleanness by touching the grave. For this end, also, the tombs were whitewashed every year on the 15th of Adar (Lamy, Apparatus Biblicus, I, 14). SEE SEPULCHRE.

## Tombs, John[[@Headword:Tombs, John]]

             a learned Baptist divine, was born at Bewdley, in Worcestershire, in 1603, and graduated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. There he gained such a distinction for ability and learning that he was appointed in 1624, catechetical lecturer, which position he held for about seven years. He then, we may presume, took orders and went to Worcester and after that to Leorminster, Hertfordshire, of which he had the living. Being obliged to leave it in 1641 by the king's soldiers, he went to Bristol, where the parliamentary general, Fiennes, gave him the living of All-Saints'. The next year he removed to London, when he made known his scruples respecting infant baptism; and not only made no converts among the clergy, but, being appointed preacher at Fenchurch, his congregation refused him both hearing and stipend. He accepted a call from Temple Church, where he remained four years, when he was dismissed for publishing a treatise on infant baptism. After this he went to Bewdley, and there-formed a Baptist church, while he continued minister of the parish, and had also the parsonage of Ross given to him. This last he resigned on being made master of Ledbury Hospital; and, his parishioners at Bewdley having forsaken him, he was restored to his first living at Leominster, and these two he held till the Reformation. He died at Salisbury, May 22, 1676. He published many tracts against infant baptism, Romanists, and Socuinans.

## Tombstone[[@Headword:Tombstone]]

             is a mark of a grave, or a monument, to remind the passer by that a person is buried beneath. In the earliest ages a heap of stones, or a single upright stone, such as the menhir, seems to have marked the resting place of the dead. Among the early Britons the cromlech that is, two or three stones standing upright, with one or more across them on the top was a common form of tomb. But contemporary with them was the simplest of all structures, the mound of earth.

When the Romans came, they brought over with them, among otthr customs their modes of burial. Considering the time of their occupation, the remains of their tombs belonging to this period are not so numerous as might be expected; but still there are several, and in most cases they consisted of a single stone with an inscription commonly addressed to one or more of the heathen gods. A few instances of stone coffins of this period have been found, as at York. To this kind of tomb, or rather stone coffin, the name of sarcophagus is usually applied.

The Saxon marks of interment were probably mounds of earth only; and it is only by the nature of the pottery or other implements and articles of dress found in the graves that the burial places of the Saxons can be distinguished from those of the Britons. Of course among the later Saxons, when Christianity prevailed and they were buried in the church- yard, more lasting memorials were erected, though, with the exception, perhaps, of a few doubtful fragments, we have no examples to refer to.

The sepulchral monuments throughout the Middle Ages were of great importance from an architectural point of view; and, while we find them following the prevailing style, we frequently find also that on them was lavished the most elaborate work possible. The examples which remain to us are those which were placed within the church. No doubt there were many tombs of no mean design or work placed in the church-yard, but they have, for the most part, perished.

Of the former we have many of the 12th century (some, perhaps, of the 11th). The covers of these were at first simply coped, afterwards frequently  ornamented with crosses of various kinds and other devices, and sometimes had inscriptions on them; subsequently they were sculptured with recumbent figures in high-relief, but still generally diminishing in width from the head to the feet to fit the coffins of which they formed the lids. Many of the figures of this period represent knights in armor with their legs crossed; these are supposed to have been either Templars, or such as had joined, or vowed to join, in a crusade to the Holy Land. The figures usually had canopies, which were often richly carved over the heads, supported on small shafts which ran along each side of the effigy, the whole worked in the same block of stone. This kind of tomb was sometimes placed beneath a low arch or recess formed within the substance of the church wall, usually about seven feet in length, and not more than three feet above the coffin, even in the center. These arches were at first semicircular or segmental at the top, afterwards obtusely pointed; they often remain when the figure or brass, and perhaps the coffin itself, has long disappeared and been forgotten. On many tombs of the 13th century there are plain pediment-shaped canopies over the heads of the recumbent effigies, the earliest of which contain a pointed trefoil-arched recess. Towards the end of the century, these canopies became gradually enriched with crockets, finials, and other architectural details.

In the reign of Edward I the tombs of persons of rank began to be ornamented on the sides with armorial bearings and small sculptured statues within pedimental canopied recesses; and from these we may progressively trace the peculiar minutiae and enrichments of every style of ecclesiastical architecture up to the Reformation.

Altar, or table tombs, called by Leland “high tombs,” with recumbent effigies, are common during the whole of the 14th century. These sometimes appear beneath splendid pyramidical canopies, as the tomb of Edward II in Gloucester Cathedral, Hugh le Despenser and Sir Guy de Brian at Tewkesbury; or flat festoons, as the tombs of Edward III and Richard II at Westminster, and Edward the Black Prince at Canterbury. Towards the middle of the 13th century the custom commenced, and in the earlier part of the 14th prevailed, of inlaying flat stone with brasses; and sepulchral inscriptions, though they had not yet become general, are more frequently to be met with. The sides of these tombs are sometimes relieved with niches, surmounted by decorated pediments, each containing a small  sculptured figure, sometimes with arched panels filled with tracery. Other tombs about the same period, but more frequently in the 15th century, were decorated along the sides with large square-paneled compartments, richly foliated or quatrefoil, and containing shields.

Many of the tombs of the 15th and 16th centuries appear beneath arched recesses fixed in or projecting from the wall, and enclosing the tomb on three sides. These were constructed so as to form canopies, which are often of the most elaborate and costly workmanship: they are frequently flat at the top, particularly in the later period. These canopies were sometimes of carved wood bf very elaborate workmanship; and sometimes the altar tomb of an earlier date was at a later period enclosed within a screen of open-work, with a groined stone canopy, and an upper story of wood, forming a mortuary chapel or chantry, as the shrine of St. Frideswide at Christ Church, Oxford.

In the early part of the 16th century the monuments were generally of a similar character to those of the preceding age; but alabaster slabs with figure son them, cut in outline, were frequently used. The altar-tombs with figures in niches, carved in bold relief, were also: frequently of alabaster, which was extensively quarried in Derbyshire. Towards the middle of this century the Italian style of architecture had come into general use; Wade's monument, in St. Michael's Church, Coventry, 1556, is a good example of the mixture of-the two styles which then prevailed.

In the two following centuries every sort of barbarism was introduced on funeral monuments; but the ancient style lingered longer in some places than in others. The tomb of Sir Thomas Pope, founder of Trinity College, Oxford-who died in 1558-in the chapel of that society, show's the altar- tomb in its debased form, after the true era of Gothic architecture had passed away.

A few traces of square tombs remain in our churchyards, but they are in all cases much decayed by the weather. There is also a kind of stone known as a head-stone, which is chiefly used in modern times; but while there are  few medieval examples remaining, there is no reason to suppose but that they were very numerous. One at Temple Bruer is probably of the 12th century; another at Lincoln is probably of the 13th. A very simple example from Handborough church-yard is possibly of the 15th century.

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

             an English prelate, the son of George and Susan Pretyman, was born at Bury St. Edmund's, Suffolk, Oct. 9,1750. He was educated at Bury School and at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he took his A.B. degree, and was senior wrangler in 1772 , The following year he was elected a fellow of his college, and was immediately appointed tutor to Mr. Pitt. Between 1773 and 1775 he was ordained deacon and priest, and in the latter year proceeded A.M., becoming in 1781 moderator of the university. He became private secretary to Mr. Pitt when -the latter was made chancellor of the exchequer, in 1782. In this year he was collated to the rectory of Corwen, in Merionetlhshire, and in 1784 he was appointed to a prebendal stall in Westminster. He was presented in 1785 to the rectory of Sudborne- cum-Offord, in Suffolk; and in January, 1787, was advanced to the bishopric of Lincoln and the deanery of St. Paul's, when he ceased to be. private secretary to Mr. Pitt. In 1813 he refused the see of London, and continued bishop of Lincoln over thirty-two years, being translated to the see of Winchester in July, 1820, in which he continued till the time of his death, Nov. 14, 1827. His publications are, Elements of Christian Theology (1799, 2 vols. 8vo; republished din: 19. editions): — Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, with an Account of English Translations of the Bible and Liturgy (Oxf. 1835, 12mo): —Refutation of Calvinism (Lond. 1811, 8v.o; 4th ed. in preparation the same year): —Sermons, etc. See Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             a prelate of the Church of England, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, from which he graduated in 1822. After having served for several years as minister of St. Matthew's Chapel, Spring Gardens, Westminster; he was nominated, in 1842, to the bishopric of Gibraltar; which extends over Malta and the neighboring islands. He died at Gibraltar in 1863. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. April, 1863, p. 154.

## Tomlinson, Joseph Smith, D.D[[@Headword:Tomlinson, Joseph Smith, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Georgetown, Ky., March 15, 1802. He was educated at the Transylvania University, and was licensed to preach before his graduation in 1825. He was appointed professor of mathematics and natural philosophy of Augusta College the same year, and also admitted to the traveling connection. In due time he was ordained both deacon and elder. After having served some time as professor of Augusta College, he was chosen its president, and held the office until the institution ceased to exist in 1849. He was subsequently elected to a professorship in the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, 0., but did not accept it, though he acted as agent for the institution for two years. He then accepted a professorship in the Ohio University at Athens, and after a year's service was chosen its president. This he declined because of ill-health. Subsequently he was elected to the presidency of the Springfield High-school and of the State University of Indiana, both of which he declined under the conviction that the state of his body and mind disqualified him for them. He died at Neville, O., June 4, 1853. Dr. Tomlinson was a man of superior accomplishments; as a preacher and pulpit orator, his high reputation was well founded; and his religious life was pure and consistent. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:706.

## Tommasi, Giuseppe Maria[[@Headword:Tommasi, Giuseppe Maria]]

             a learned Italian cardinal, and son of Julius Tommasi, duke of Palma, was, born at Alicata, Sicily, Sept. 14, 1649. He entered the society of the Theatines, and cardinal Albali, when he became pope, appointed in first qualificator of the Holy Office, then consultor of the Congregation of the Rites, and lastly cardinal (May 18,1712). This last honor he did not long enjoy, as his death occurred Jan. 1, 1713. In the Vatican and other libraries Tommasi discovered many manuscripts of importance in ecclesiastical history, and published, Codices Sacramentorum Nongentis Annis Vetustiores (1680, 4to), a collection of MSS. — Responsoria et Antiphonaria (1686). See. Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tonei, Simeon De[[@Headword:Tonei, Simeon De]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Moray in 1171. He was a monk of Melrose, and before that he had been abbot at Cogshall, in Essex, England. He died in 1184. See Keith, Scoftish Bishops, page 136.

## Tongan Version[[@Headword:Tongan Version]]

             The Tonga dialect, belonging to the Polynesian or Malayan languages, is spoken in, Tonga, or Tongataboo, the largest of the Friendly Islands. In  1850 it was estimated to contain 9000 inhabitants, of whom considerably more than half bad been converted to Christianity, the Protestants among them numbering, 5000. As early as 1797 the London Missionary Society had sent nine missionaries to that island, but they had; to give up that station on account of the ferocious disposition of the natives. The agents of the Wesleyan; Missionary Society were at length enabled in 1826, to settle peaceably in Tonga, and they now extend the blessings of Christian instruction to all the islands of this archipelago. At first only detached portions of Scriptures were translated into Tongan, until, in. theyear 1847, the version of the New Test. was completed, and an edition of 4000 copies left the mission press at Vavau. A new edition, consisting of 10,000 copies, was furnished in 1852 by the British and Foreign Bible Society; and, owing to the rapid circulation, of this edition, another of 10,000 copies was undertaken in 1860, under the editorial care of the Rev; Thomas West. In the same year the preparation for translating, printing, etc., of the Old Testament was commenced, which was completed in 1863. As to the results of the dissemination of the Word of God, we may notice that up to March 31, 1889, 35,276 copies, either in part or in whole, were circulated. (B. P.)

## Tongs[[@Headword:Tongs]]

             is the rendering, in the A.V., of two Heb. words:

1. מֶלְקָחִיַם, melkacha yinr (1Ki 7:49; 2Ch 4:21; Isa 6:6'), or מִלְקָחִיַם, malkachac yin (Exodus 25:38; 27:23 [“snuffers” ]; Num 4:9), both from לָקִח, to take, and signifying prop. pincers, either for holding coals or for trimming a lamp, SEE SNUFFERS; and

2. מִעֲצָד, maatsad (Isa 44:12), an axe (q.v.) (as rendered in Jer 10:3), from עָצִד, to fell a tree.

## Tongue[[@Headword:Tongue]]

             (לָשׁוֹן, lash6nd γλῶσσα) is used in Scripture in various senses.

1. It stands, literally, for the human tongue (Jdg 7:5; Job 27:4; Psa 35:28; Psa 39:1; Psa 39:3; Psa 51:14; Psa 66:17; Pro 15:2; Zec 14:12; Mar 7:33; Mar 7:35; Luk 1:64; Luk 16:24; Rom 3:13; 1Co 14:9; Jam 1:26; Jam 3:5-6; Jam 3:8; 1Pe 3:10; Rev 16:10; Eccles. 17:6; Wis 10:21; 2Ma 7:4); and so for the tongue of the dog (Psa 68:23), of the viper (Job 20:16), of idols (Bar 6:8); the tongues of the seven brethren cut out (2Ma 7:4; 2Ma 7:10; comp. Pro 10:20).

Various explanations have been offered why (in the passage first cited above) Gideon's three hundred followers should have been selected because they lapped water out of their hands, standing or perhaps moving onward, while they who stayed and “bowed down to drink” were rejected. Josephus says that the former thereby showed their timorousness and fear of being overtaken by the enemy, and that these poor-spirited men were chosen on purpose to illustrate the power of God in the victory (Ant. 5, 6, 3).

On Mar 7:33; Mar 7:35, Dr. A. Clarke offers the interpretation that it was the deaf and stammering man himself who put his own fingers into his ears to intimate his deafness; spat or emptied his mouth that the Savior might look at his tongue; touched his own tongue to intimate that he could not speak; looked up to heaven as imploring divine aid; and groaned to denote his distress under his affliction; and that our Savior simply said, “Be opened” (Commentary). This explanation certainly clears the passage of some obscurities.

Jam 3:8, Dr. Macknight translates, “But the tongue of men no one can subdue;” that is, the tongue of other men, for the apostle is exhorting the Christian to subdue his own (comp. Jam 3:13). He observes that (Ecumenius read the passage interrogatively, as much as to say, “Wild beasts, birds, serpents, marine animals, have been tamed by man, and can no man tame the tongue?'”

2. It is personified. “Unto me every tongue shall swear,” that is, every man (Isa 45:23; comp. Rom 14:11; Php 2:11; Isa 54:17). The tongue is said to rejoice (Act 2:26); to meditate (Psa 52:2); to hate (Pro 26:28); to be bridled (Jam 1:26); to be tamed (3:8; comp. Sir 28:18, etc.). It is apostrophized (Psa 120:3).

3. It is used by metonymy for speech generally. Let us not love in tongue only” (1Jn 3:18 ‘comp. γλώσση φίλος, Theogn. 63, 13; Job 6:30; Job 15:5; Pro 6:24); a soft tongue,” i.e. soothing language  (Pro 25:15); “accuse not a servant to his master,” literally “hurt not with thy tongue” (Pro 30:10); “the law of kindness is in her tongue,” i.e. speech (Pro 31:26; Isa 3:8; Isa 1:4; Wis 1:6). On the “confusion of tongues,” SEE BABEL; SEE ETHNOLOGY; SEE LANGUAGE, etc.

4. For a particular language or dialect spoken by any particular people. “Every one after his tongue” (Gen 10:5; Gen 10:20; Gen 10:31); ‘So also in Deu 28:49; Est 1:22; Dan 1:4; Joh 5:2; Act 1:19; Act 2:4; Act 2:8; Act 2:11; Act 26:14; 1Co 12:10; 1Co 13:1; 1Co 14:2; Rev 16:16).

5. For the people speaking a language (Isa 66:18; Dan 3:4; Dan 3:7, etc.; Rev 5:9; Rev 7:9; Rev 10:11; Rev 11:9; Rev 14:6; Rev 17:15).

6. It is used figuratively for anything resembling a tongue in shape. -Thus, “a wedge of gold,” literally a “tongue” (Jos 7:21; Jos 7:24; γλῶσσα μία χρυσῆ ; Vulg. regula aurea). The French still say, un lingot dor, “a little tongue of gold,” whence, by corruption, our word “ingot,” “The bay that looketh southward,” literally “tongue” (Jos 15:2; Jos 18:19); “a tongue of fire” (Isa 5:24; comp. Act 2:3; Isa 11:15).

7. Some of the Hebrew idioms, phrases, etc., formed of this word are highly expressive. Thus, “an evil speaker” (Psa 140:11; אַישׁ לָשׁוֹן, literally “a man of tongue;” comp. Sir 8:3, and see Ecc 10:11, Hebrew, or margin); “a forward” or rather “false tongue” (Pro 10:31; לְשׁוֹן תִּהְפֻּכוֹת, “a tongue of revolvings” ); “a wholesome tongue” (Pro 15:4; לָשׁוֹן מִרַפֵּא, literally “the healing of the tongue,” reconciliation, etc.; Sept. ἴασις γλώσσης, lingua placabilis); “a backbiting tongue” (Pro 25:23; סֵתֶר, secret); “slow of speech” (Exo 4:10; כְּבֹד לָשׁוֹן, literally “heavy of tongue,” unfit to be an orator, βραδύγλωσσος; contrast Sir 4:29); “the tongue of the stammerer” (Isa 32:4), i.e. rude, illiterate (comp. 35:6; on Isa 28:11, see Lowth). In Isa 33:19, it means a foreign language, which seems gibberish to those who do not understand it (comp. Eze 3:5); “the tongue of the learned” (Isa 1:4), i.e. of the instructor. The lexicons will point out many other instances.

8. Some metaphorical expressions are highly significant. Thus, Hos 7:16, “the rage of the tongue,” i.e. verbal abuse; “strife of tongues” (Psa 31:20); scourge of the tongue” (Job 5:21, SEE EXECRATION; comp. Sir 26:6; Sir 28:17); “snare of the slanderous tongue” (Sir 51:2); on the phrase “strange tongue” (Isa 28:11), see Lowth, notes on Isa 28:9-12, and afterwards the vivid -rendering of the Vulg.; “to slip with the tongue” (Sir 20:18; Sir 25:8), i.e. use inadvertent or unguarded speech; “they bend their tongues, their bows, for lies” (Jer 9:3), i.e. tell determined and malicious falsehoods; “they sharpen their tongues” (Psa 104:3), i.e. prepare cutting speeches (comp. Psa 57:4) ) “to smooth the tongue” (Jer 23:31), employ flattering language; “to smite with the tongue” (Jer 18:18), i.e. to traduce-if it should not be rendered, “on the tongue,” alluding to a punishment for false witness; ‘to lie in wait with the tongue” (Sir 5:14); “to stick out the tongue” (Isa 57:4), i.e. to mock; “against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue” (Exo 11:7), i.e. none shall hurt them; but both Sept. and Vulg. have “not a dog belonging to the children of Israel shall howl,” which, as opposed to the “great cry” in Egypt over the first-born, means, not one of the children of Israel shall have cause to wail (Jos 10:21; Jdt 11:9). “To hide under the tongue” means to have in the mouth, whether spoken of hidden wickedness (Job 20:12; comp. Psa 10:7) or delicious language (Son 4:11); “the word of God in the tongue” denotes inspiration (2Sa 23:2); “to divide the tongues of the wicked” is to raise up dissensions among them (Psa 55:9; comp. 2Sa 15:34; 2Sa 17:14-15). “The tongue cleaving to the palate” signifies profound attention (Job 29:10) or excessive thirst (Lam 4:4; comp. 22:16); “to cause the tongue to cleave to the palate” is to inflict supernatural dumbness (Eze 3:26; Psa 137:6). To gnaw one's tongue is a sign of fury, despair, and torment (Rev 16:10).

9. Some beautiful comparisons occur. “An evil tongue is a sharp sword” (Psa 57:4); “the tongue of the wise is health” (Pro 12:18); “like choice silver” (Pro 10:20), i.e. his words are solid, valuable, sincere.

10. The vices of the tongue are specified in great variety: flattery (Psa 5:9; Proverbs 28:33); backbiting (Psa 15:3), literally “run about with the: tongue” (Pro 25:23); deceit (Psalm 1:19); unrestrained speech (Psa 73:9); lying (Psa 109:2); “a lying tongue hateth those that are afflicted by it” (Pro 26:28; comp. Tacit. Agr. 42,” Proprium humani ingenii est, odisse quem laeseris” ). “They have taught their tongue to speak lies. and weary themselves to  commit iniquity” (Jer 9:5) words which beautifully illustrate the fact that falsehood and vice are not natural, but are a restraint and compulsion upon nature: “double-tongued” (1Ti 3:8), δίλογος, saying one thing to this man and another to that (comp. Sir 5:9; Sir 5:14; Sir 28:13). The retribution of evil-speakers is represented as brought on themselves (Isa 64:8).

11. The virtuous uses of the tongue are specified: “keeping the tongue” (Psa 34:13; 1Pe 3:10; Pro 21:23); “ruling the tongue” (Sir 19:6; Jam 1:26); the origin of the right and wrong use of the tongue traced to the heart (Mat 12:34).

12. Mistranslations: as “holding the tongue;” the Hebrews had no such idiom (Psa 39:2; Sir 20:1; Sir 20:7; comp. the Bible and Prayer-book version of Hab 1:13). In Ezr 4:7, “the Syrian tongue,” literally “in Syriac” (Est 7:4). Our mistranslation of Pro 16:1 has misled many: “The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord;” literally,” Of man are the dispositions of the heart, but a hearing of the tongue is of the Lord.”

13. The miraculous gift of tongues, as well as its corresponding gift of interpretation, has been the subject of two opinions. It was promised by Christ to believers: they shall speak γλώσσαις καιναῖς (Mar 16:17); and fulfilled at Pentecost, when the apostles and their companions “began to speak ἑτέραις γλώσσαις (Act 2:4; Act 2:11; comp. Act 10:46; Act 19:6; 1Co 12:30; 1Co 14:2; 1Co 14:39). In the last passage we have “to pray in a tongue” (1Co 14:14), “to speak words in a tongue” (1Co 14:19), “tongues” (1Co 12:10; 1Co 12:28; 1Co 13:8; 1Co 14:22; 1Co 14:26). The obvious explanation of most of these passages is, to speak in other living languages, the supernatural acquisition of which demonstrated the truth of the Gospel, and was a means of diffusing it. Some verses in 1 Corinthians 14 :however, have given rise to the notion of a strange, ecstatic, inspired, unearthly language; but these all admit of a different solution. In 1Co 14:2, “he who speaketh in a tongue” evidently means, he who speaks some foreign living language; the supplied word “‘unknown” in the A.V. is needless, and misleads the English reader. It is further said that “he edifieth himself” (which, as Macknight justly pleads, required that he should understand himself), and edifieth the Church also if an interpreter were present (1Co 14:28). The apostle says (1Co 14:14), “If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful,” which words in English seem to intimate that  the speaker might not understand himself; but the words ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου sigify “my meaning” (comp. 1Co 2:16; Vulg. “sensum Domini” ), or, as Hammond and Schleusner say, “my faculty of thinking upon and explaining to others the meaning of what I utter” (comp. 1Co 14:15; 1Co 14:19), though in 1Co 14:15 some take τῷ νοϊv as a dativus commodi, and ‘render “that others may understand.” The key to the difficulties of this subject is the supposed absence of an inspired interpreter (1Co 14:28), in which case the gift would not be profitable to the hearers. ‘The gift of tongues was to cease (1Co 13:8). Irenieus testifies (1Co 5:6) that it subsisted in the Church in his time. When Paul says, that though he should speak with the tongue of men and of angels, it would be nothing without charity, he uses a supposed ‘hyperbole; as when we say, angelical beauty, angelical voice, etc., e.g. “I would have every one set a due value on the gift of tongues; but though a man possessed the most exquisite eloquence, this inestimable gift would be of little use to him, as to salvation, if he be without charity.” See Macknight, Notes on 1 Corinthians 14; Oihausen, Comment. on Acts 2, 4; Neander, Hist. of the Apostolic Age, and in Bibl. Repos. 4:249, etc.; Stosch, Archaeol. (Econ. N.T. p. 93; Gataker, ad M. Anton. p. 120; and Ernesti, Lex. Techn. Gr. Rhet. p. 62. SEE SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

## Tongues Of Fire[[@Headword:Tongues Of Fire]]

             In the account of the first descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles, it is stated (Act 2:3) that “there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire (διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός), and it sat upon each of them.” They were appearances of tongues, which were luminous but did not burn; not confluent into one, but distributing themselves on the assembled. As only similar to fire, they bore an analogy to electric phenomena; their tongue like shape referred as a sign to that miraculous speaking which ensued immediately after, and the fire-like form to the divine presence (comp. Eze 3:2), which was here operative in a  manner so entirely peculiar. The whole phenomenon is here to be understood as a miraculous operation of God manifesting himself in the Spirit, by which, as by a preceding sound from heaven, the effusion of the Spirit was made known as divine, and his efficacy in the minds of those. who were to receive him was enhanced” (Meyer, ad loc.). See. Thilo, De Linguis qgnitis (Viteb. 1675). SEE FIRE; SEE TONGUE.

## Tongues, Confusion of[[@Headword:Tongues, Confusion of]]

             The Biblical account of this is given in the usual anthropomorphic style of Scripture in Gen 11:1-9, and has been the occasion of much discussion and speculation. To inquire into the date of this part of Genesis would lead us into a long discussion it may be sufficient to express an opinion that the indications of 10:12 perhaps (strangely ignored by most writers), and Gen 11:18 certainly, seem to point to an age mulch before that of Moses. See below. We propose under the present head to treat the subject under two aspects, the historical and the linguistic, referring the reader to other and kindred articles for further details on this disputed question.

I. The Event. —The part of the narrative relating to the present subject thus commences: “And the whole earth [or land, אֶרֵוֹ] was of one language [or lip, שָׂפָה] and of one speech [or words, דְּבָרַים].” The journey and the building of the tower are then related and the divine determination to “confound their language that they may not understand one another's speech.” The scattering of the builders and the discontinuance of the building of the city having been narrated, it is added,  “Therefore is the name of it called Babel, because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth, and [or for] from: thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth” (Gen 11:1-9).

1. Character of the Infliction. — An orderly and peaceful distribution and migration of the families descended from Noah had been directed by divine authority and carried into general effect. But there was a part of mankind who would not conform themselves to this wise and benevolent arrangement. This rebellious party, having discovered a region to their taste, determined to remain in it. They built their houses in contiguity, and proceeded to the other method described for guarding against any further division of their company. This was an act of rebellion against the divine government. The omniscient and righteous God therefore frustrated it by inflicting upon them a remarkable affection of the organs of speech, which produced discord and separation.

At the same time, we cannot dogmatically affirm that this infliction was absolutely and visibly miraculous. It is an undeniable character of the scriptural idiom, especially in the Old Test., that verbs denoting direct efficiency are used when only mediate action is to be understood, or permission, or declaration. Instances are numerous, e.g.:” God caused me to wander” (Gen 20:13); “I have made-given-sustained” (Gen 27:37); the “hardening of wicked men's hearts” (Exodus 7; - Isaiah 6 :etc.); ‘I will come up into the midst of them” (Exo 33:5). All such declarations are perfectly true. The Infinitely Wise and Holy and Powerful worketh all things according to the counsel: of his own will, as much when his operation is through the instrumentality of rational creatures and the free exercise of their own faculties as when there is a miraculous intervention. Shuckford inclines at least to the opinion that the whole was the result of natural and moral second causes, fulfilling the purposes of the Most High (Connect. of Hist. 1, 133-135). This view, however, does not seem to meet adequately the judicial character of the passage.

Still it is unnecessary to assume that the judgment inflicted on the builders of Babel amounted to a loss, or even a suspension, of articulate speech. The desired object would be equally attained by a miraculous forestallment of those dialectical differences of language which are constantly in process of production, but which, under ordinary circumstances, require time and  variations of place and habits to reach such a point of maturity that people are unable to understand one another's speech. The elements ‘of the one original language may have remained, but so disguised by variations of pronunciation, and by the introduction of new combinations, as to be practically obliterated. Each section of the, human family may have spoken a tongue unintelligible to the remainder, and yet containing a substratum which was common to all. Our own experience suffices to show how completely even dialectical differences render strangers unintelligible to one another; and if we further take into consideration the differences of habits and associations, of which dialectical differences are the exponents, we shall have no difficulty in accounting for the result described by the sacred historian.

2. Date of the Incident. —This is not definitely given in the sacred narratives. By many interpreters it is thought that we cannot satisfactorily place it so early as at one hundred years after the Flood, as it is in the commonly received chronology, and hence they are inclined to one of the larger systems-that of the Septuagint, which gives five hundred and thirty years, or that of Josephus, adopted, with a little emendation, by Dr. Hales, which gives six hundred years; and thus we have at least five centuries for the intervening period. Prof Wallace, in his elaborate work, makes ‘it more than eight centuries (Dissertation on the True Age of the World and the Chronology to the Christian Era [1844], p. 29.8). We see no reason to depart from the usual view, countenanced by the position of the incident in the context and the express indication in Gen 11:2 (“as they journeyed from the east” ), that it took place not very long after the Deluge.

3. Extent of the Catastrophe. —Upon the question whether all of mankind were engaged in this act of concerted disobedience, or only a part, we confess ourselves unable to adduce irrefragable evidence on either side, but we think that there is a great preponderance of argument on the part of the latter supposition. The simple phraseology of the text wears an appearance of favoring the former; but the extreme brevity and insulated character of these primeval fragments forbid our arguing from the mere juxtaposition of the first and the second sentence. It is a common idiom in Hebrew that a pronoun, whether separate or suffixed, stands at the introduction of a new subject, even when that subject may be different and remote from the nearest preceding, and requires to be supplied by the intelligence of the reader (see. e.g., Psa 9:13 [12]; Psa 18:15 [14]; Psa 44:3 [2]; Psa 65:10 [9];  Psa 105:37). So far as the grammatical structure is concerned, we may regard the two sentences as mutually independent, and that, therefore, the question is open to considerations of reason and probability. It is difficult to suppose that Noah and Shem, and all others of the descendants of Noah, were confederates in this proceeding. Hence the opinion has been maintained, more or less definitely, by many critics and expositors that it was perpetrated by only a part of mankind, chiefly, if not solely, the posterity of Ham, and upon the instigation and under the guidance of Nimrod, who (Gen 10:10) is declared to have had Babel for the head place of his empire. The latter part of this position is asserted by Josephus, and the whole by Augustine and other ancients. Of modern writers who have maintained this opinion, we may specify Luther, Calvin (by apparent implication), Cornelius Lapide, Bonfrere, Poole (in his English Annotations), Patrick, Wells, Samuel Clarke (the annotator), Henry (by implication); narratives derived from Arabian and Hindu sources, in Charles Taylor's Illustrations of Calmet, frag. 528; and the late Jacob Bryant, who, though too imaginative and sanguine a theorist, and defective in his knowledge of the Oriental tongues, often gives us valuable collections of facts, and sound reasonings from them. A considerable part of his celebrated work, the Analysis of Ancient Mythology, is occupied with tracing the historical vestiges of the builders of Babel, whom, on grounds of high probability at least, he regards as Cuthites (assumed to be a dialectic variety for Cushites), the descendants of Cush, the son of Ham, but with whom were united many dissatisfied and apostate individuals of the branches of Japheth. Dr. Doig, in the article “Philology,” in the Encyclop. Britannica (7th ed. 1842), has entered at some length into this question, and arrives at the following conclusion” From these circumstances, we hope it appears that the whole mass of mankind was not engaged in building the tower of Babel; that the language of all the human race was not confounded upon that occasion, and that the dispersion reached only to a combination of Hamites, and of the most profligate part of the two other families who had joined their wicked confederacy.” Nevertheless, as this was the first occurrence of any dialectical variety, it is properly given by the sacred writer as the initial point of that wide ethnic diversity of tongues which has since gradually spread over the earth.

4. Traces of the Event. —

(1.) Monumental. —The history of the confusion of languages was preserved at Babylon, as we learn by the testimonies of classical and  Babbylonian authorities (Abydenus, Fragm. Hist. Graec. [ed. Didot], vol. 4). Only the Chaldaeans themselves did not admit the Hebrew etymology of the name of their metropolis; they derived it from Babel, the door of El (Kronos, or Saturnus), whom Diodorus Siculus states to have been the planet most adored by the Babylonians.

The Talmudists say that the true site of the tower of Babel was at Borsif, the Greek Borsippa, the Birs Nimrfid, seven miles and a half from Hillah, S.W., and nearly eleven miles from the northern ruins of Babylon. Several passages state that the air of Borsippa makes forgetful (אויר משכח, avir mashkach); and one rabbi says that Borsif is Bulsif, the confusion of tongues (Bereshith Rabba, fol. 42, p. 1). The Babylonian name of this locality is Barsip, or Barzipa, which we explain by “Tower of Tongues.” The French expedition to Mesopotamia found at the Birs Nimruid a clay cake, dated from Barsip the 30th day of the 6th month of the 16th year of Nabonid, and the discovery confirmed the hypothesis of several travellers, who had supposed the Birs Nimrtid to contain the remains of Borsippa.

Borsippa (the Tongue Tower) was formerly a suburb of Babylon, when the old'Babel was merely restricted to the northern ruins, before the great extension of the city, which, according to ancient writers, was the greatest that the sun ever warmed with its beams. ‘Nebuchadnezzar included it in the great circumvallation of 480 stades, but left it out of the second wall of 360 stades; and when the exterior wall was destroyed by Darius, Borsippa became independent of Babylon. The historical writers respecting Alexander state that Borsippa had a great sanctuary dedicated to Apollo and Artemis (Strabo, 16:739; Stephanus Byz. s.v. (Βόρσιππα), and the former is the building elevated in modern times on the very basement of the old tower of Babel.

This building, erected by Nebuchadnezzar, is the same that Herodotus describes as the tower of Jupiter Belus. In the Expedition en Messopotamie, 1, 208, there is given a description of this ruin, proving the identity. This tower of Herodotus has nothing to do with the pyramid described by Strabo, which is certainly to be seen in the remains called now Babil (the Mujellibeh of Rich). The temple of Borsippa is written with an ideogram (bit-zi-da), composed of the signs for house and spirit (anima), the real pronunciation of which was probably sarakh, tower. The temple consisted of a large substructure, a stade (six hundred Babylonian feet) in breadth and seventy-five feet in height, over which were built seven other  stages of twenty-five feet each. Nebuchadnezzar gives notice of this building in the Borsippa inscription. He named it the temple of the Seven Lights of the Earth, i.e. the planets. The top was the temple of Nebo, and in the substructure (igar) was a temple consecrated to the god Sin, god of the month. This building, mentioned in the East India House inscription (Colossians 4 :l. 61), is spoken of by Herodotus (1, 181, etc.).

Here follows the Borsippa inscription: “Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, shepherd of peoples, who attests the immutable affection of Merodach, the mighty ruler-exalting Nebo; the savior, the wise man who lends his ears to the orders of the highest god; the lieutenant without reproach, the repairer of the Pyramid and the Tower, eldest son of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.

“We say Merodach, the great master, has created me: he has imposed on me to reconstruct his building. Nebo, the guardian over the legions of the heaven and the earth, has charged my hands with the scepter of justice.

“The Pyramid is the temple of the heaven and the earth, the seat of Merodach, the chief of the gods; the place of the oracles, the spot of his rest, I have adorned in the form of a cupola, with shining gold.

“The Tower, the eternal house, which I founded and built; I have completed its magnificence with silver, gold, other metals, stone, enameled bricks, fir, and pine.

“The first, which is the house of the earth's base, the most ancient monument of Babylon, I built and finished it; I have highly exalted its head with bricks covered with copper.

“We say for the other, that is, this edifice, the house of the Seven Lights of the Earth, the most ancient monument of Borsippa: A former king built it (they reckon forty-two ages), but he did not complete its head. Since a remote time people had abandoned it, without order expressing their words. Since that time, the earthquake and the thunder had dispersed its sun-dried clay; the bricks of the casing had been split, and the earth of the interior had been scattered in heaps.'' Merodach, the great lord, excited my mind to repair this building. ‘I did not change the site, nor did I  take away the foundation-stone. In a fortunate month, an auspicious day, I undertook to build porticos around the crude brick Inasses, and the casing of burnt bricks. I adapted the circuits. I put the inscription of my name in the Kitir of the porticos.

“I set my hand to finish it, and to exalt its head. As it had been in former times, so I founded, I made it; as it had been in ancient days, so I exalted its summit.

“Nebo, son of himself, ruler who exaltest Merobach, be propitious to my works to maintain my authority. Grant me a life until the remotest time, a sevenfold progeny, the stability of my throne, the victory of my sword, the pacification of foes, the triumph over the lands! In the columns of thy eternal table, that fixes the destinies of the heaven and of the earth, bless the course of my days, inscribe the fecundity of my race.

“Imitate, O Merodach, king of heaven and earth, the father who begot thee; bless my buildings, strengthen my authority. May Nebuchadnezzar, the king-repairer, remain before thy face!”

This allusion to the Tower of the Tongues is the only one that has as yet been discovered in the cuneiform inscriptions (see Expedition en Mesopotamie, 1, 208). The story is a Shemitic and not merely a Hebrew one, and we have no reason whatever to doubt of the existence of the same story at Babylon. The ruins of the building elevated on the spot ‘where the story placed the tower of the dispersion of tongues have therefore a more modern origin, but interest, nevertheless, by their stupendous appearance. SEE BABEL.

(2.) Historical. —The following are the principal passages of ancient authors, resciued from the wreck of time by the quotations of Josephus and Eusebius. It scarcely need be said that we do not adduce these fragments as authorities in any other sense than that they repeat the traditional narratives which had descended from the remotest antiquity among the people to whom they relate. The “Sibyl” cited by-Josephus is the fictitious appellation of some unknown author, probably about the 2nd century B.C. Alexander Cornelius Polyblistor flourished about one hundred years before Christ. Eupolemus was probably an Asiatic Greek, two or three centuries earlier. Abydenus (if he was Palaephatils) lived in the middle of the 4th century B.C.  “Concerning this tower, and the discordance of language; among men, the Sibyl also makes mention, saying thus: All men having one language, some of them built a very high tower, as if they proposed by means of it to climb to heaven; but the gods, by sending storms of wind, overthrew the tower, and gave to each person a peculiar language: and on this account the city came to be called Babylon'” (Josephus, Ant. 1, 4, 3).

The Sibyl here quoted may be that very ancient anonymous authority to which we have obscure references (in the discourse of Theophilus to Autolycus) in Plutarch's Morals, in Virgil's Pollio, and 2 the Stromata of Clemens Alexandrinus.

“Alexander Polyhistor a man of the highest celebrity for talents and attainmlents, in the estimation of those Greeks who are the nmost profoundly and accurately learned has the following passage: Eupolems, in his book concerning the Jews of Assyrial, says that the city of Babylon was first) built by those who had been preserved from the Deluge; that they were giants [the Greeks used this word to signify, not so much men of enormous stature as their mythological heroes, of great prowess, and defying the gods]; that they also erected the tower of which history gives account; but that it was overthrown -by the mighty power from God, and consequently the giants were scattered abroad over the whole earth'” (Eusebius, Praepar. Evang . col. 16SS).

“Further, with respect to the narrative of Moses concerning the building of the tower and how, from one tongue, they were confounded so as to be brought into the use of many dialects, the author before mentioned [Abydenus], in his book concerning the Assyrians, gives his confirmation in these words: ‘There are some who say that the first men sprang out of the earth; that they boasted of their strength and size; that they contemptuously maintained themselves ‘to be superior to the gods that they erected a lofty tower where now is Babylon; then, when it had been carried on almost up to heaven, the very winds came to assist the gods, and overthrew the vast structure upon its builders. Its ruins were called Babylon. The men, who before had possessed one tongue, were brought by the gods to a many sounding voice; and afterwards war arose between Kronos [Saturn] and Titan. Moreover, the place in  which they built the tower is now called Babylon, on account of the con fusing of the prior clearness with respect to speech; for the Hebrews call confusion Babel'” (Eusebius, Praepar. Evang. 9:14).

Abydenus, the Grecian historian of Assyria, is known to us only by citations in Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Syncellus, but they confirm his respectability as a writer.

On the event under discussion, see. the Latin monographs by Linck (Vitemb. 1656), Zobell (ibid. 1664), Schroeder (Groning. 1752), Kanne (Norimb. 1819), and in English by. Wetton (Lond. 1732); also the literature cited by Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. col. 179,180.

II. Philological and Ethnological Considerations. The unity of the human race is most clearly implied, if not positively asserted, in the Mosaic writings. The general declaration “So God created man in his own image ... male and female created he them” (Genesis 1, 27) is limited as to the mode in which the act was carried out by the subsequent narrative of the creation of the protoplast Adam, who stood alone on the earth amid the beasts of the field until it pleased Jehovah to create “an help meet for him” out of the very substance of his body (2, 22). From this original pair sprang the whole antediluvian population of the world; and hence the author of the book of Genesis conceived the unity of the human race to be of the most rigid. nature-not simply a generic unity nor, again, simply a specific unity (for unity of species may not be inconsistent with. a plurality of original centers), but a specific based upon a numerical unity, the species being nothing else than the enlargement of the individual. Such appears to be the natural meaning of the first chapters of Genesis when taken by themselves:; much more so when read under the flected light of the New Test.; for not only do we meet with references to the historical fact of such an origin of the human race — e.g. in Paul's declaration that God “hath made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth” (Act 17:26)-but the same is evidently implied in the numerous passages which represent Jesus Christ as the counterpart of Adam in regard to the universality of his connection with the human race. Attempts have indeed been made to show that the idea of a plurality of original pairs is not inconsistent with the Mosaic writings; but there is a wide distinction between a view not inconsistent with and a view drawn from, the words of the author the latter is founded upon the facts i.e. relates, as well as his mode of relating them; the former takes advantage of the weaknesses  arising out of a concise or unmethodical style of composition. Even if such a view could be sustained in reference to the narrative of the original creation of man, it must inevitably fail in reference to the history of the repopulation of the world in the postcriluvian age; for, whatever objections may be made to the historical accuracy of the history of the Flood it is at all events clear that the historian believed in the universal destruction of the human race, with the exception of Noah and his family, and consequently that the unity of the human race was once more reduced to one of a numerical character. To Noah the historian traces up the whole postdiluvian population of the world: “These are the three sons of Noah: and of them was the whole earth overspread” (Gen 9:19).

Unity of language is assumed by the sacred historian apparently as a corollary of the unity of, race. No explanation is given of the origin of speech, but its exercise is evidently regarded as coeval with the creation of man. No. support can be obtained in behalf of any theory on, this subject from the first recorded instance of its exercise (“Adam gave names to all cattle”), for the simple reason that this notice is introductory to what follows: “but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him” (Genesis 2, 20). It was not so much the intention of the writer to state the fact of man's power of speech as the fact of the inferiority of all other animals to him, and the consequent necessity for the creation of woman. The proof of that inferiority is, indeed, most appropriately made to consist in the authoritative assignment of names, implying an act of reflection on their several natures and capacities, and a recognition of the offices which they were designed to fill in the economy of the world. The exercise of speech is thus most happily connected with the exercise of reflection, and the relationship between the inner act of the mind (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) and the outward expression (λόγος προφορικός) is fully recognized. Speech, being thus inherent in man as a reflecting being, was regarded as handed down from father to son by the same process of imitation by which it is still perpetuated. Whatever divergences may have arisen in the antediluvian period, no notice is taken of them, inasmuch as their effects were obliterated by the universal catastrophe of the Flood. The original unity of speech was restored in Noah, and would naturally be retained by his descendants as long as they were held together by social and local bonds.

The confusion of tongues and the dispersion of nations are spoken of in the Bible as contemporaneous events. “So the Lord scattered them abroad” is stated as the execution of the divine counsel “Let us confound their  language.” The divergence of the various families into distinct tribes and nations ran parallel with the divergence of speech into-dialects and languages, and thus the tenth chapter of Genesis is posterior in historical sequence to the events recorded in the eleventh chapter. Both passages must be taken into consideration in any disquisition on the early fortunes of the human race. We propose, therefore, to inquire, in the first place, how far modern researches into the phenomena of language favor the idea that- there was once a time when “the whole earth was of one speech and language; and, in the second place, whether the ethnological views exhibited in the Mosaic table accord with the evidence furnished by history and language, both in regard to the special facts recorded in it and in the general scriptural view of a historical, or, more properly, a gentilic unity of the human race. These questions, though independent, yet exercise a reflexive influence on each other's results. Unity of speech does not necessarily involve unity of race, nor yet vice versa; but each enhances the probability of the other, and therefore the arguments derived from language, physiology, and history may ultimately furnish a cumulative amount of probability which will fall but little below demonstration.

(A.) The advocate of the historical unity of language has to encounter two classes of opposing, arguments: one arising out of the differences, the other out of the resemblances, of existing languages. On the one hand, it is urged that the differences are of so decisive and specific a character as to place the possibility of, a common origin wholly out of the question; on the other hand, that the resemblances do not necessitate the theory of a historical unity, but may be satisfactorily accounted for on psychological principles. It will be our object to discuss the amount, the value, and the probable origin of the varieties exhibited by languages, with a view to meet the first-class of objections. But, before proceeding to this, we will make a few remarks on the second class, inasmuch as these, if established, would nullify any conclusion that might be drawn from the other.

A psychological unity is not necessarily opposed to a gentilic unity. It is perfectly open to any theorist to combine the two by assuming that the language of the one protoplast was founded on strictly psychological principles. But, on the other hand, a. psychological unity does not necessitate a gentilic unity. It permits of the theory of a plurality of protoplasts, who, under the influence of the same psychological laws, arrived at similar independent results. Whether the phenomena of language are consistent with such a theory, we think extremely doubtful; certainly  they cannot furnish the basis of it. The whole question of the origin of language lies beyond the pale of historical proof, and any theory connected with it admits neither of being proved nor disproved. We know, as a matter of fact, that language is communicated from one generation to another solely by force of imitation, and that there is no play whatever for the inventive faculty in reference to it. But in what manner the substance of language was originally produced we do not know. No argument can be derived against the common origin from analogies drawn from the animal world; and when Prof. Agassiz compares similarities of language with those of the cries of animals (Voan Bohlen, Introd. to Genesis 2, 278), he leaves out of consideration the important fact that language is not identical with sound, and that the words of a rational being, however originally produced, are perpetuated in a manner wholly distinct from that whereby animals learn to utter their cries. Nor does the internal evidence of language itself reveal the mystery of its origin; for, though a very large number of words may be referred either directly or mediately to the principle of onomatopoeia, there are others as, for instance, the first and second personal pronouns which do not admit of such an explanation. In short, this and other similar theories cannot be reconciled with the intimate connection evidently existing between reason and speech, which is so well expressed in the Greek language by the application of the term λόγος to each, reason being nothing else than inward speech, and speech nothing else than outward reason, neither of them possessing an independent existence without the other. As we conceive that the psychological as opposed to the gentilic unity involves questions connected with the origin of language, we can only say that in this respect it falls outside the range of our inquiry.

Reverting to the other class of objections, we proceed to review the extent of the differences observable in the languages of the world in order to ascertain whether they are such as to preclude the possibility of a common origin. Such a review must necessarily be imperfect, both from the magnitude of the subject and also from the position of the linguistic science itself, which as yet has hardly advanced beyond the stage of infancy. On the latter point we would observe that the most important links between the ‘various language families may yet be discovered in languages that are either unexplored or, at all events, unplaced. Meanwhile, no one can doubt that the tendency of all linguistic research is in the direction of unity. Already it has brought within the bonds of a well-established relationship  languages so remote from each other in external guise, in age, and in geographical position as Sanskrit and English, Celtic and Greek. It has done the same for other groups of languages equally widely extended, but presenting less opportunities of investigation. It has recognized affinities between languages which the ancient Greek ethnologist would have classed under the head of “barbarian” in reference to each other, and even in many instances where the modern philologist has anticipated no relationship. The lines of discovery, therefore, point in one direction, and favor the expectation that the various; families may be combined by the discovery of connecting links into a single family, comprehending in its capacious bosom all the languages of-the world. But should such a result never be attained, the probability of a common origin would still remain unshaken; for the failure would probably be due to the absence, in many classes and families, of that chain of historical evidence which in the case of the Indo- European and Shemitic families enables us to trace their progress for above three thousand years. In many languages no literature at all, in many others no ancient literature, exists to supply the philologist with materials for comparative study: in these cases it can only be by laborious research into existing dialects that the original forms of words can be detected amid the incrustations and transmutations with which time has obscured them.

In dealing with the phenomena of language, we should duly consider the plastic nature of the material out of which it is formed, and the numerous influences to which it is subject. Variety in unity is a general law of nature, to which even the most stubborn physical substances yield a ready obedience. In the case of language it would be difficult to set any bounds to the variety which we might a priori expect it to assume. For, in the first place, it is brought into close contact with the spirit of man, and reflects with amazing fidelity its endless variations, adapting itself to the expression of each feeling, the designation of each object, the working of each cast of thought or stage of reasoning power. Secondly, its sounds are subject to external influences, such as peculiarities of the organ of speech, the result either of natural conformation, of geographical position, or of habits of life and associations of an accidental character. In the third place, it is generally affected by the state of intellectual and social culture of a people, as manifested more especially in the presence or absence of a standard literary dialect, and in the processes of verbal and syntactical structure, which again react on the very core of the word and produce a variety of sound mutations. Lastly, it is subjected to the wear and tear of time and use,  obliterating, as in an old coin, the original impress of the word, reducing it in bulk, producing new combinations, and occasionally leading to singular interchanges of sound and idea. The varieties resulting from the modifying influences above enumerated may be reduced to two classes, according as they affect the formal or the radical elements of language.

(I.) Widely as languages now differ from each other in external form, the raw material (if we may use the expression) out of which they have sprung appears to have been in all cases the same. A substratum of significant monosyllabic roots underlies the whole structure, supplying the materials necessary, not only for ordinary predication, but also for what is usually termed the “growth” of language out of its primary into its more complicated forms. It is necessary to point this out clearly in order that we may not be led to suppose that the elements of one language are in themselves endued with any greater vitality than those of another. Such a distinction, if it existed, would go far to prove a specific difference between languages, which could hardly be reconciled with the idea of their common origin. The appearance of vitality arises out of the manipulation of the roots by the human mind, and is not inherent in the roots themselves.

1. The proofs of this original equality are furnished by the languages themselves. Adopting for the present the threefold morphological classification into isolating, agglutinative, and inflecting languages, we shall find that no original element exists in the one, which does not also exist in the other. With regard to the isolating class, the terms “monosyllabic” and “radical,” by which it is otherwise described, are decisive as to its character. Languages of this class are wholly unsusceptible of grammatical mutations; there is no formal distinction between verb and noun, substantive and adjective, preposition and conjunction; there are no inflections, no case or person terminations of any kind; the bare root forms the sole and whole substance of the language. In regard to the other two classes, it is necessary to establish the two distinct points (l).that the formal elements represent roots, and (2) that the roots both of the formal and the radical elements of the word are monosyllabic. Now it may be satisfactorily proved by analysis that all the component parts of both inflecting and agglutinative languages are reducible to two kinds of roots, predicable and pronominal-the former supplying the material element of verbs, substantives, and adjectives; the latter that of conjunctions, prepositions, and particles; while each kind, but more particularly the pronominal, supplies the formal element, or, in other words, the terminations of verbs,  substantives, and adjectives. Whether the two classes of roots, predicable and pronominal, are further reducible to one class is a point that has been discussed, but has not as yet been established (Bopp, Compar. Gram. § 105; Müller, Lectures, p. 269). We have further to show that the roots of agglutinative and inflecting languages are monosyllabic. This is an acknowledged characteristic of the Indo-European family; monosyllabism is, indeed, the only feature which its roots have in common; in other respects they exhibit every kind of variation, from a unilateral root, such as i (ire), up to combinations of five letters, such as scand (scandere), the total number of admissible forms of root amounting to no less than eight (Schleicher, § 206). In-the Shemitic family monosyllabism is not a prima facie characteristic of the root; on the contrary, the verbal stems exhibit bisymbalism with such remarkable uniformity that it would lead to the impression that the roots also must have been bisyllabic. The bisymbolism, however, of the Shemitic stem is in reality triconsonantalism, the vowels not forming any part of the essence of the root, but being wholly subordinate to the consonants. It. is at once apparent that a triconsonantal and even a quadriconsonantal root may be in certain combinations unisyllabic. But, further, it is more than probable that the triconsonantal has been evolved out of a biconsonantal root, which must necessarily be unisyllabic if the consonants stand. as they invariably do in Shemitic roots, at the beginning and end of the word. With regard to the agglutinative class, it may be assumed that the same law which we have seen to prevail in the isolating and inflecting classes prevails also in this holding as it does an intermediate place between those opposite poles in the world of language.

2. From the consideration of the crude materials of language, we pass on to the varieties exhibited in its structure, with a view to ascertain whether in these there exists any bar to the idea of an original unity.

(1.) Reverting to the classification already noticed, we have to observe, in the first place, that the principle on which it is based is the nature of the connection existing between the predicable and the relational or inflectional elements of a word. In the isolating class these two are kept wholly distinct; relational ideas are expressed by juxtaposition or by syntactical arrangement, and not by any combination of the roots. In the aggluti, native class the relational elements are attached to the principal or predicable theme by a mechanical kind of junction, the individuality of each being preserved even in the combined state. In the inflecting class the  junction is of a more perfect character, and may be compared to a chemical combination, the predicable and relational elements being so fused together as to present the appearance of a single and indivisible word. It is clear that there exists no insuperable barrier to original unity in these differences, from the simple fact that every inflecting language must once have been agglutinative, and every agglutinative language once isolating. If the predicable and relational elements of an isolating language be linked together, either to the eve or the ear, it is rendered agglutinative; if the material and formal parts are pronounced as one word, eliminating, if necessary, the sounds that resist incorporation, the language becomes inflecting.

(2.) In the second place, it should be noted that these three classes are not separated from each other by any sharp line of demarcation. Not only does each possess, in a measure, the quality predominant in each other, but, moreover, each graduates into its neighbor through its bordering members. The isolating languages are not wholly isolating: they avail themselves of certain words as relational particles, though these still retain elsewhere their independent character; they also use composite, though not strictly compound, words. The agglutinative are not wholly agglutinative; the Finnish and Turkish classes of the Ural-Altaian family are in certain instances inflectional, the relational adjunct being fully incorporated with the predicable stem, and having undergone a large amount of attrition for that purpose. Nor, again, are the inflectional languages wholly inflectional; Hebrew, for instance, abounds with agglutinative forms, and also avails itself largely of separate particles for the expression of relational ideas; our own language, though classed as inflectional, retains nothing more than the vestiges of inflection, and is in many respects as isolating and juxtapositional as any language of that class. While, therefore the classification holds good with regard to the predominant characters of the classes, it does not imply differences of a specific nature.

(3.) But, further, the morphological varieties of language are not confined to the exhibition of the single principle hitherto described. A comparison between the westerly branches of the Ural-Altaian, on the one hand, and the Indo-European, on the other, belonging respectively to the agglutinative and inflectional classes, will show that the quantitative amount of synthesis is fully as prominent a point of contrast as the qualitative. The combination of primary and subordinate terms may be more perfect in the Indo-European, but it is more extensively employed in  the Ural-Altaian family. The former, for instance, appends to its verbal stems the notions of time, number, person, and occasionally of interrogation; the latter further adds suffixes indicative of negation, hypothesis, causativeness, reflexiveness, and other similar ideas, whereby the word is built up tier on tier to a marvelous extent. The former appends to its substantial stems suffixes of case and number; the latter adds governing particles, rendering them post-positional instead of prepositional, and combining them synthetically with the predicable stem. If, again, we compare the Shemitic with the Indo-European languages, we shall find a morphological distinction of an equally diverse character. In the former the grammatical category is expressed by internal vowel-changes, in the latter by external suffixes. So marked a distinction has not unnaturally been constituted the basis of a classification, wherein the languages that adopt this system of internal flection stand by themselves as a separate class, in contradistinction to those which either use terminational additions for the same purpose, or which dispense wholly with inflectional forms (Bopp, Compar. Gram. 1, 102). The singular use of preformatives in the Coptic language is, again, a morphological peculiarity of a very decided character. Even within the same family, say the Indo-European, each language exhibits an idiosyncrasy in its morphological character whereby it stands out apart from the other members with a decided impress of individuality The inference to be drawn from the number and character of the differences we have noticed is favorable, rather than otherwise, to the theory of an original unity. Starting from the same common ground of monosyllabic roots, each language-family has carried out its own special line of development, following an original impulse, the causes and nature. of which must remain probably forever a matter of conjecture. We can perceive, indeed, in a general way, the adaptation of certain forms of speech to certain states of society. The agglutinative languages, for instance, seem to be specially adapted to the nomadic state by the prominence and distinctness with which they enunciate the leading idea in each word, an arrangement whereby communication would be facilitated between tribes or families that associate only at intervals. We might almost imagine that these languages derived their impress of uniformity and solidity from the monotonous steppes of Central Asia, which have in all ages formed their proper habitat. So, again, the inflectional class reflects cultivated thought and social ‘organization, and its languages have hence been termed “state or political.” Monosyllabism, on the other hand, is pronounced to be suited to the most primitive stage of thought and society,  wherein the family or the individual is the standard by which things are regulated (Miller, Philos. of list. 1, 285). We should hesitate, however, to press this theory as furnishing an adequate explanation of the differences observable in language families. The Indo-European languages attained their high organization amid the same scenes and in the same nomad state as those wherein the agglutinative languages were nurtured, and we should rather be disposed to regard both the language and the higher social status of the former as the concurrent results of a higher mental organization.

3. If from words we pass onto the varieties of syntactical arrangement, the same degree of analogy will be found to exist between class and class, or between family and family in the same class; in other words, no peculiarity exists in one which does not admit of explanation by a comparison with others. The absence of all grammatical forms in an isolating language necessitates a rigid collocation of the words in a sentence according to logical principles. The same law prevails to a very great extent in our own language, wherein the subject, verb, and object, or the subject, copula, and predicate, generally hold their relative positions in the order exhibited, the exceptions to such an arrangement being easily brought into harmony with that general law. In the agglutinative languages the law of arrangement is that the principal word should come last in the sentence, every qualifying clause or word preceding it, and being, as it were, sustained by it. The syntactical is thus the reverse of the verbal structure, the principal notion taking the precedence in the latter (Ewald, Sprachw. Abhandl. 2, 29). There is in this nothing peculiar to this class of languages, beyond the greater uniformity with which the arrangement is adhered to; it is the general rule in the classical, and the occasional rule in certain of the Teutonic, languages. In the Shemitic family the reverse arrangement prevails; the qualifying adjectives follow the noun to which they belong, and the verb generally stands first; short sentences are necessitated by such a collocation, and hence more room is allowed for the influence of emphasis in deciding the order of the sentence. In illustration of grammatical peculiarities, we may notice that in the agglutinative class adjectives qualifying substantives, or substantives placed in apposition with substantives, remain undeclined; in this case the process may be compared with the formation of compound words in the Indo-European languages, where the final member alone is inflected. So, again, the omission of a plural termination in nouns following a numeral may “be paralleled with a similar usage in our own language, where the terms “pound” and “head”  are used collectively after a numeral. We may again cite the peculiar manner of expressing the genitive in Hebrew. This is effected by one of the two following methods — placing the governing noun in the status constructus, or using the relative pronoun with a preposition before the governed case. The first of these processes appears a strange inversion of the laws of language; but an examination into the origin of the adjuncts, whether prefixes or affixes, used in other languages for the indication of the genitive will show that they have a more intimate connection with the governing than with the governed word, and that they are generally resolvable into either relative or personal pronouns, which serve the simple purpose of connecting the two words together (Garnett, Essays, p. 214- 227). The same end may be gained by connecting the words in pronunciation, which would lead to a rapid utterance of the first, and consequently to the changes which are witnessed in the status constructus. The second or periphrastic process is in accordance with the general method of expressing the genitive; for the expression “the Song which is to Solomon” strictly answers to “Solomon's Song,” the s representing (according to Bopp's explanation) a combination of the demonstrative sa and the relative ya. It is thus that the varieties of construction may be shown to be consistent with unity of law, and that they therefore furnish no argument against a common origin.

4. Lastly, it may be shown that the varieties of language do not arise from any constitutional inequality of vital energy. Nothing is more remarkable than the compensating power apparently inherent in all language, whereby it finds the means of reaching the level of the human spirit through a faithful adherence to its own guiding principle. The isolating languages, being shut out from the manifold advantages of verbal composition, attain their object by multiplied combinations of radical sounds, assisted by an elaborate system of accentuation and intonation. In this manner the Chinese language has framed a vocabulary fully equal to the demands made upon it; and though this mode of development may not commend itself to our notions as the most effective that can be devised yet it plainly evinces a high susceptibility on the part of the linguistic faculty, and a keen perception of the correspondence between sound and sense. Nor does the absence of inflection interfere with the expression even of the most delicate shades of meaning in a sentence; a compensating resource is found partly in a multiplicity of subsidiary terms expressive of plurality, motion, action, etc., and partly in strict attention to syntactical arrangement. The  agglutinative languages, again, are deficient in compound words, and in this respect lack the elasticity and expansiveness of the Indo-European family; but they are eminently synthetic, and no one can fail to admire the regularity and solidity with which its words are built up, suffix on suffix, and. when built up, are suffused with a uniformity of tint by the law of vowel harmony. The Shemitic languages have worked out a different principle of growth, evolved, not improbably, in the midst of a conflict between the systems of prefix and suffix, whereby the stem, being, as it were, enclosed at both extremities, was precluded from all external increment, and was forced back into such changes as could be effected by a modification of its vowel sounds. But whatever may be the origin of the system of internal inflection, it must be conceded that the results are very effective, as regards both economy of material and simplicity and dignity of style.

The result of the foregoing observations is to show that the formal varieties of language present no obstacle to the theory of a common origin. Amid these varieties there may be discerned manifest tokens of unity in the original material out of which language was formed, in the stages of formation through which it has passed, in the general principle of grammatical expression, and, lastly, in the spirit and power displayed in the development of these various formations. Such a: result, though it does not prove the unity of language in respect to its radical elements, nevertheless tends to establish the a priori probability of this unity; for if all connected with the forms of language may be referred to certain general laws, if nothing in that department owes its origin to chance or arbitrary appointment, it surely favors the presumption that the same principle would extend to the formation of the roots, which are the very core and kernel of language. Here, too, we might expect to find the operation of fixed laws of some kind or other, producing results of a uniform character; here, too, actual variety may not be inconsistent with original unity.

(II.) Before entering on the subject of the radical identity of languages, we must express our conviction that the time has not yet arrived for a decisive opinion as to the possibility of establishing it by proof. Let us briefly review the difficulties that beset the question. Every word as it appears in an organic language, whether written or spoken, is resolvable into two distinct elements, which we have termed predicable and formal, the first being what is commonly called the root, the second the grammatical termination. In point of fact, both of these elements consist of independent roots; and in  order to prove the radical identity of two languages, it must be shown that they agree in both respects, that is, in regard both to the predicable and the formal roots. As a matter of experience, it is found that the formal elements (consisting, for the most part, of pronominal bases) exhibit a greater tenacity of life than the others; and hence agreement of inflectional forms is justly regarded as furnishing a strong presumption of general radical identity. Even foreign elements are forced into the formal mould of the language into which they are adopted, and thus bear testimony to the original character of that language. But though such a formal agreement supplies the philologist with a most valuable instrument of investigation, it cannot be accepted as a substitute for complete radical agreement: this would still remain to be proved by an independent examination of the predicable elements.

The difficulties connected with these latter are many and varied. Assuming that two languages or language-families are under comparison, the phonological laws of each must be investigated in order to arrive, in the first place, at the primary forms of words in the language in which they occur, and, in the second place, at the corresponding forms in the language which constitutes the other member of comparison, as has been done by Grimm for the Teutonic as compared with the Sanskrit and the classical languages. The genealogy of sound, as we may term it, must be followed up by a genealogy of signification, a mere outward accordance of sound and sense in two terms being of no value whatever, unless a radical affinity be proved by an independent examination of the cognate words in each case. It still remains to be inquired how far the ultimate accordance of sense and sound may be the result of onomatopoeia, of mere borrowing, or of a possible mixture of languages on equal terms. The final stage in etymological inquiry is to decide the limit to which comparison may be carried in the primitive strata of language-in other words, how far roots, as ascertained-from groups of words, may be compared with roots, and reduced to yet simpler elementary forms. Any flaw in the processes above described will, of course, invalidate the whole result. Even where the philologist is provided with ample materials for inquiry in stores of literature ranging over long periods of time, much difficulty is experienced in making good each link in the chain of agreement; and yet in such cases the dialectic varieties have been kept within some degree of restraint by the existence of a literary language, which, by impressing its authoritative stamp on certain terms, has secured both their general use and their external integrity. Where no literature exists, as is the case with the general mass of languages in the world, the difficulties are infinitely increased by  the combined effects of a prolific growth of dialectic forms, and an absence of all means of tracing out their progress. Whether, under these circumstances, we may reasonably expect to establish a radical unity of language is a question, which each person must decide for himself. Much may yet be done by a larger induction and a scientific analysis of languages that are yet comparatively unknown. The tendency hitherto has been to enlarge the limits of a “family” according as the elements of affinity have been recognized in outlying members. These limits may perchance be still more enlarged by the discovery of connecting-links between the language- families, whereby the criteria of relationship will be modified, and new elements of internal unity be discovered amid the manifold appearances of external diversity.

Meanwhile we must content ourselves with stating the present position of the linguistic science in reference to this important topic. In the first place, the Indo-European languages have been reduced to an acknowledged and well-defined relationship: they form one of the two families included under the head of “inflectional” in the morphological classification. The other family in this class is the (so-called) Shemitic, the limits of which are not equally well defined, inasmuch as it may be extended over what are termed the sub-Shemitic languages, including the Egyptian or Coptic. The criteria: of the proper Shemitic family (i.e. the Aramsean, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic languages) are distinctive enough; but the connection between the Shemitic and the Egyptian is not definitely established. Some philologists are inclined to claim for the latter an independent position, intermediate between the Indo-European and Shemitic families (Bunsen, Philippians of- Hist. 1, 185 sq.). The agglutinative languages of Europe and Asia are combined by Prof. M. Muller in one family named “Turanian.” It is conceded that the family bond in this case is a loose one, and that the agreement in roots is very partial (Lectures, p. 290-292). Many philologists of high standing, and more particularly Pott (Ungleich. d. mensch. Rassen, p. 232), deny the family relationship altogether, and break up the agglutinative languages into a great number of families. Certain it is that within the Turanian circle there are languages such, for instance, as the Ural-Altaian which show so close an affinity to one another as to be entitled to form a separate division, either as a family, or a subdivision of a family; and, this being the case, we should hesitate to put them on a parity of footing with the remainder of the Turanian languages. The Caucasian group, again, differs so widely from the other members of the family as to  make the relationship very dubious. The monosyllabic languages of South- eastern Asia are not included in the Turanian family by Prof M. Muller (Lectures, p. 290, 326), apparently on the ground that they are not agglutinative; -but as the Chinese appears to be connected radically with the Burmese. (Humboldt, Verschied. p. 368), with the Thibetan (Philippians of Hist. 1, 393-395), and with the Ural-Altaian languages (Schott, in Abh. Ab. Berl. 1861, p. 172), it seems to have a good title to be placed in the Turanian family. With regard to the American and the bulk of the African languages, we are unable to say whether they can be brought under any of the heads already mentioned, or whether they stand by themselves as distinct families. The former are referred by writers of high eminence to an Asiatic or Turanian origin (Bunsen, Philippians of Hist. 2, 111; Latham, Man and his Migrat. p. 186); the latter to the Shemitic family (Latham, p. 148).

The problem that awaits solution is whether the several families above specified can be reduced to a single family by demonstrating their radical identity. It would be unreasonable to expect that this identity should be coextensive with the vocabularies of the various languages; it would naturally be confined to such ideas and objects as are common to mankind generally. Even within this circle the difficulty of proving the identity may be infinitely enhanced by the absence of materials. There are, indeed, but two families in which these materials are found in anything like sufficiency, viz. the Indo-European and the Shemitic, and even these furnish us with no historical evidence as to the earlier stages of their growth. We find each, at the most remote literary period, already exhibiting its distinctive character of stem and word-formation, leaving us to infer, as we best may, from these phenomena the processes, by which they had reached that point. Hence there arises abundance of room for difference of opinion, and the extent of the radical identity will depend very much on the view adopted as to these earlier processes. If we could accept in its entirety the system of etymology propounded by the analytical school of Hebrew scholars, it would not be difficult to establish a very large amount of radical identity; but we cannot regard as established the prepositional force of the initial letters, as stated by Delitzsch in his Jeshurun (p. 166,173, note), still less the correspondence between these and the initial letters of Greek and Latin words (p. 170-172). The striking uniformity of bisyllabism in the verbal stems is explicable only on the assumption that a single principle underlies the whole; and the existence of groups of words differing slightly in form,  and having the same radical sense, leads to the presumption that this principle was one not of composition, but of euphonisri and practical convenience. This presumption is still further favored by an analysis of the letters forming the stems, showing that the third-letter is in many instances a reduplication, and in others a liquid, a nasal, or a sibilant, introduced either as the initial, the medial, or the final letter. The Hebrew alphabet admits of a classification based on the radical character of the letter according to its position in the stem. The effect of composition would have been to produce, in the first place, a greater inequality in the length of the words, and, in the second place, a greater equality in the use of the various organic sounds.

Many supposed instances of etymological correspondence have been falsely based on the analytical tenets; but there still exists a considerable amount of radical identity, which appears to be above suspicion. Under SEE PHILOLOGY, SEE COMPARATIVE, we have given a list of terms in which that identity is manifested. After deducting whatever may be due to fanciful or accidental agreement, there still remain many instances which cannot possibly be explained on the principle of onomatopoeia and which would therefore seem to be the common inheritance of the Indo-European and Shemitic families. Whether this agreement is, as Renan suggests, the result of a keen susceptibility of the onomatopoetic faculty in the original framers of the words (Hist. Genesis 1, 465) is a point that can neither be proved nor disproved. But even if it were so, it does not follow that the words. were not framed before the separation of the families. Our list of comparative words might have been much enlarged if we had included comparisons based on the reduction of Shemitic roots to a bisyllabic form. A list of such words may be found in Delitzsch, Jeshurun, p. 177-180. In regard to pronouns and numerals, the identity is but partial. We may detect the t sound, which forms the distinctive sound of the second personal pronoun in the Indo-European languages, in the Hebrew attah, and in the personal terminations of the perfect tense; but the m7, which is the prevailing -sound of the first personal pronoun in the former, is supplanted by an n in the latter. The numerals shesh and sheba, for “six” and ‘“seven,” accord with the Indo-European forms: those representing the numbers from “one” to “five” are possibly, though not evidently, identical. With regard to the other language families, it will not be expected, after the observations already made, that we should attempt the proof of their radical identity. The Ural-Altaian languages have been extensively studied,  but are hardly ripe for comparison. Occasional resemblances have been detected in grammatical forms and in the vocabularies; but the value of these remains to be proved, and we must await the results of a more extended research into this and other regions of the world of language.

(B.) We pass on to the second, point proposed for consideration, viz. the ethnological views expressed in the Bible, and more particularly in ch. 10 of Genesis, which records the dispersion of nations consequent on the confusion of tongues.

(I.) The Mosaic table does not profess to describe the process of the dispersion; but, assuming that dispersion as a fait accompli, it records the ethnic relations existing between the various nations affected by it. These relations, are expressed under the guise of a genealogy; the ethnological character of the document is, however, clear both from the names, some of which are gentilic in form, as Ludim, Jebusite, etc., others geographical or local, as Mizraim, Sidon, etc., and, again, from the formulary which concludes each section of the subject, “after their families, after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations” (ver. 5, 20, 31). Incidentally, the table is geographical as well as ethnological; but this arises out of the practice of designating nations by the countries they occupy. It has, indeed, been frequently surmised that the arrangement of the table is purely geographical, and this idea is, to a certain extent, favored by the possibility of explaining the names Shem, Ham, and Japheth on this principle, the first signifying the “high” lands, the second the “hot” or “low” lands, and the third the “broad,” undefined regions of the north. The three families may have been so located, and such a circumstance could not have been unknown to the writer of the table. But neither internal: nor external evidence satisfactorily proves such to have been the leading idea or principle embodied in it, for the Japhethites are mainly assigned to the “isles” or maritime districts of the west and north-west, while the Shemites press down into the plain of Mesopotamia, and the Hamites, on the other hand, occupy the high lands of Canaan and Lebanon. We hold, therefore, the geographical as subordinate to the ethnographical element, and avail ourselves of the former only as an instrument for the discovery of the latter.

The general arrangement of the table is as follows: The whole human race is referred back to Noah's three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The Shemites are described last, apparently that the continuity of the narrative  may not be further disturbed; and the Hamites stand next to the Shemites, in order to show that these were more closely related to each other than to the Japhethites. The comparative degrees of affinity are expressed, partly by coupling the names together, as in the cases of Elishah and Tarshish. Kittim and Dodanim (ver. 4), and partly by representing a genealogical descent, as when the nations just mentioned are said to be “sons of Javan.” An inequality may be observed in the length of the genealogical lines, which, in the case of Japheth, extends only to one, in Ham to two, in Shem to three, and even four degrees. This inequality clearly arises out of the varying interest taken in the several lines by the author of the table, and by those for whose use it was designed. We may lastly observe that the occurrence of the same name in two of the lists, as in the cases of Lud (ver. 13, 22) and Sheba (ver. 7, 28), possibly indicates a fusion of the races.

a. The identification of the Biblical with the historical or classical names of nations is by no means an easy task, particularly where the names are not subsequently noticed in the Bible. In these cases, comparisons with ancient or modern designations are the only resource, and where the designation is one of a purely geographical character, as in the case of Riphath compared with Ripaei Montes, or Mash compared with Masius Mons, great doubt must exist as to the ethnic force of the title, inasmuch as several nations may have successively, occupied the same district. Equal doubt arises where names admit of being treated as appellatives, and so of being transferred from one district to another. Recent research into Assyrian and Egyptian records has, in many instances, thrown light on the Biblical titles. In the former we find Meshech and Tubal noticed under the forms Juskaiand Tuplai, while Javan appears as the appellation of Cyprus, where the Assyrians first met with Greek civilization. In the latter the name Phut appears under the form of Pount, Hittite as Khita, Cush as Keesh, Canaan as Kannaa, etc.

1. The list of Japhethites contains fourteen names, of which seven represent independent and the remainder affiliated nations, as follows:

(i.) Gomer, connected ethnically with the Cimmerii, Cimbri (?), and Cymrn; and geographically with Crinlea. Associated with Gomer are the three following:

(a.) Ashkenaz, generally compared with Lamke Ascanius Bithynia, but by Knobel with the tribe Asci, As, or Ossetes in the Caucasian district. On the  whole, we prefer, Hasse's suggestion of a connection between this name and that of the Axenus, later the Euxinus Pontus.

(b.) Riphath, the lipcei Mointes, which Knobel connects etymologically and geographically with Carpates Mons.

(c.) Togarmah, undoubtedly Armenia, or a portion of it.

(ii.) Magog, the Scythians.

(iii.) Madai, Media.

(iv.) Javan, the Ionians, as a general appellation for the Hellenic race, with whom are associated the four following:

(a.) Elishah, the Eolians, less probably identified with the district Elis.

(b.) Tarshish, at a later period of Biblical history certainly identical with Tartessts in Spain, to which, however, there are objections as regards the table, partly from the too extended area thus given to the Mosaic world, and partly because Tartessus was a Phoenician, and consequently not a Japhetic, settlement. Knobel compares the Tyrseni, Tyrrhe-ni, and Tusci-of Italy; but this is precarious.

(c.) Kittim, the town Citium in Cylrus. (d.) Dodanim, the Dardani of Illyria and Mysia; Dodona is sometimes compared.

(v.) Tubal, the Tibareni in Pontus.

(vi.) Meshech, the Moschi in the north-western part of Armenia.

(vii.) Tiras, perhaps Thracia.

2. The Hamitic list contains thirty names, of which three represent independent and the remainder affiliated nations, as follows:

(i.) Cush, in two branches, the western or African representing Ethiopia, the Keesh of the old Egyptian, and the eastern or Asiatic being connected with the unamles of the tribe Cosscei, the district Cissia, and the province Susiana or Khuzistanl. With Cnuh are associated:

(a.) Seba, the Sabcei of Yemen in South Arabia.

(b.) Havilah, the district Khauldn in the same part of the peninsula.

(c.) Sabtah, the town Sabatha in Hadramaurt.

(d.) Ramah, the town Rhegma on the south-eastern coast of Arabia, with whom are associated:

(a.) Sheba, a tribe probably connected ethnically or commercially with the one of the same name already mentioned, but located on the west coast of the Persian Gulf.

(b.) Dedanm, also on the west coast of the Persian Gulf, where the name perhaps still survives in the island Dadan.

(e.) Sabtechah, perhaps the town Samydace on the coast of the Indian Ocean eastward of the Persian Gulf.

(f.) Nimrod, a personal and not a geographical name, the representative of the Eastern Cushites.

(ii.) Mizraim, the two Misrs, ie. Upper and Lower Egypt, with whom the following seven are connected:

(a.) Ludim, according to Knobel, a tribe allied to the Shemitic Lud, but settled in Egypt; others compare the river Laud (Pliny, 5, 2), and the Lewdtah, a Berber tribe on the Syrtes.

(b.) Anamim, according to Knobel, the inhabitants of the Delta, which would be described in Egyptian by the term sanemhit or tsanemhit, “northern district,” converted by the Hebrews into Anamiim.

(c.) Naphtuhim, variously explained as the people of Nephthys, i.e. the northern coast ‘district (Bochalt), and as the worshippers of Phthah, meaning the inhabitants of Memphis.

(d.) Pathrusim, Uppler Ezypt, the name being exsplained as nmeanilng in the Egyptian “the south” (Knlobel).;

(e.) Casluhim, Casius Mons, Cassiotis, and Cassium, eastward of the Delta (Knobel) the Colchians, according to Bochart, but this is unlikely.

(f.) Caphtorim, most probably the district about Coptos in Upper Egypt SEE CAPHTOR; the island of Crete according to many modern critics, Cappadocia according to the older interpreters.

(g.) Phut, the Pûnt of the Egyptian inscriptions, meaning the Libyans.

(3.) Canaan, the geographical position of which calls for no remark in this place. The name has been variously explained as meaning the “low” land of the coast district, or the “subjection” threatened to Canaan personally (Gen 9:25). To Canaan belong the following eleven:

(a.) Sidon, the well-known town of that name in Phoenicia.

(b.) Heth, or the Hittites of Biblical history.

(c.) The Jebusite, of Jebus or Jerusalem.

(d.) The Amorite, frequently mentioned in Biblical history.

(e.) The Girgasite, the same as the Girgashites.

(f.) The Hivite, variously explained to mean the occupants of the “interior” (Ewald), or the dwellers in “villages” (Geselnius).

(g.) The Atkite, of Area, north of Tripolis, at the foot of Lebanon.

(h.) The Sinite, of Sin or Sinna, places in the Lebanon district.

(i.) The Arvadite, of Aradus on the coast of Phoenicia.

(j.) The Zemarite, of Simyra on the Eleutherus.

(k.) The Hamathite, of Hamath, the classical Epiphania, on the Orontes.

3. The Shemitic list contains twenty-six names, of which five refer to independent and the remainder to affiliated tribes, as follows:

(i.) Elam, the tribe Elyncei and the district Elyntais in Susiana.:

(ii.) Asshur, Assyria between the Tigris and the range of Zagtrus.

(iii.) Arphaxad, Arrapachitis, in Northern Assyria, with whom are associated:

(a.) Salah, a personal and also a geographical title, indicating a migration of the people represented by him; Salah's son.

(b.) Eber, representing geographically the district across (i.e. eastward of) the Euphrates; and Eber's two sons.

(c.) Peleg, a personal name indicating a “division” of this branch of the She mi tic family, and

(d.) Joktan, representing generally the inhabitants of Arabia, with the following thirteen sons of Joktan, viz.:

(a.) Almodad, probably representing the tribe of Juirhum near Mecca, whose leader was named Modad.

(b.) Sheleph, the Salapeni in Yemen.

(c.) Hazarmaveth, Hadramaut in Southern Arabia.

(d.) Jerah.

(e.) Hadoram, the Adramitae on the southern coast, in a-district of Hadrama-it.

(f.) Uzal, supposed to represent the town Sanaa in South Arabia, as having been founded by Asal.

(g.) Diklah.

(h.) Obal, or, as in 1Ch 1:22, Ebal, which latter is identified by Knobel with the Gebanitoe in the south-west.

(i.) Abimael, doubtfully connected with the district Mahra, eastward of Hadramauot, and with the towns Mara and Mali.

(j.) Sheba, the Saboei of South-western Arabia, about Mariaba.

(k.) Ophir, probably Adane, on the southern const, but see article.

(1.) Havilah, the district Khaucldn in the northwest of Yemen.

(m.) Jobab, possibly the Jobaritae of Ptolemy (6, 7, 24), for which Jobabitae may originally have stood.

(iv.) Lud, generally compared with Lydia, but explained by Knobel as referring to the various aboriginal tribes in and about Palestine, such as the Amalekites, Rephaites, Emim, etc. We cannot consider either of these views as well established. Lydia itself lay beyond the horizon of the Mosaic table; as to the Shemitic origin of its population, conflicting opinions are entertained, to which we shall have occasion to advert hereafter. Knobel's view has in its favor the probability that the tribes referred to would be represented in the table; it is, however, wholly devoid of historical confirmation, with the exception of an Arabian tradition that Amlik was one of the sons of Laud or Lawad, the son of Shem.

(5.) Aram, the general name for Syria and Northern Mesopotamia, with whom the following fare associated:

(a.) Uz, probably the Esitce of Ptolemy.

(b.) Hul, doubtful, but best connected with the name Huleth, attaching to a district north of Lake Meroli.

(c.) Gether, not identified.

(d.) Mash, Masius Mons, in the north of Mesopotamia.

There is yet one name noticed in the table, viz. Philistim, which occurs in the Hamitic division, but without any direct assertion of Harnitic descent. The terms used in the A. V.,” out of whom (Casluhim) came Philistim” (1Ch 1:14), would naturally imply descent, but the Hebrew text only warrants the conclusion that the Philistines sojourned in the land of the Casluhim. Notwithstanding this, we believe the intention of the author of the table to have been to affirm the Hamitic origin of the Philistines, leaving undecided the particular branch whether Casluhim or Caphtorim, with which it was more immediately connected.

The total number of names noticed in the table, including Philistim, would thus amount to seventy-one, which was raised by patristic writers to seventy-two. These totals afforded scope for numerical comparisons, and also for an estimate of the number of nations and languages to be found on the earth's surface. It is needless to say that the Bible itself furnishes no ground for such calculations, inasmuch as it does not, in any case; specify the numbers.

b. Before proceeding further, it would be well to discuss a question materially affecting the historical value of the Mosaic table, viz. the period to which it refers. On this point very various opinions are entertained; Knobel, conceiving it to represent the commercial geography of the Phoenicians, assigns it to about B.C. 1200 (Volkert. p. 4-9), and Renan supports this view (Hist. Genesis 1, 40), while others allow it no higher an antiquity than the period of the Babylonian captivity (Von Bohlen, Genesis 2, 207; Winer, Realw. 2, 665). Internal evidence leads us to refer it back to the age of Abraham on the following grounds;

(1.) The Canaanites were as yet in undisputed possession of Palestine.

(2.) The Philistines had not concluded their migration.

(3.) Tyre is wholly unnoticed, an omission which cannot be satisfactorily accounted for on the ground that it is included under the name either of Heth (Knobel, p. 323) or of Sidon (Von Bohlen, 2, 241).

(4.) Various places, such as Simyra, Sinna, and Area, are noticed which had fallen into insignificance in later times.

(5.) Kittim, which in the age of Solomon was under Phoenician dominion, is assigned to Japheth, and the same may be said of Tarshish, which in that age undoubtedly referred to the Phoenician emporium of Tartessus, whatever may have been its earlier significance.

The chief objection to so early a date as we have ventured to propose is the notice of the Medes under the name Madai. The Aryan nation which bears this name in history appears not to have reached its final settlement until about B.C. 900 (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 404). But, on the other hand, the name Media may well have belonged to the district before the arrival of the Aryan Medes, whether it were occupied by a tribe of kindred origin to them or by Turanians; and this probability is, to a certain extent, confirmed by the notice of a Median dynasty in Babylon, as reported by Berosus, so early as the 25th century B.C. (ibid. 1, 434). Little difficulty would be found in assigning so early a date to the Medes if the Aryan origin of the allied kings mentioned in Gen 14:1 were thoroughly established, in accordance with Renan's view (Hist. Gén. 1, 61): on this point, however, we have our doubts. SEE GENESIS.

c. The Mosaic table is supplemented by ethnological notices relating to the various divisions of the Terachite family. These belonged to the Shemitic division, being descended from Arphaxad through Peleg, with whom the line terminates in the table. Reu, Serug, and Nahor form the intermediate links between Peleg and Terah (Gen 11:18-25), with whom began the movement that terminated in the occupation of Canaan and the adjacent districts by certain branches of the family. The original seat of Terah was Ur of the Chaldees (Gen 11:28); thence he migrated to Haran (Gen 11:31), where a section of his descendants, the representatives of Nahor, remained (Gen 24:10; Gen 27:43; Gen 29:4 sq.), while the two branches, represented by Abraham and Lot, the son of Haran, crossed the Euphrates and settled in Canaan and the adjacent districts (Gen 12:5). From Lot sprang the Moabites and Ammonites (Gen 19:30-38); from Abraham the  Ishmaelites through his son Ishmael (Gen 25:12), the Israelites through Isaac and Jacob, the Edomites through Isaac and Esau (ch. 36), and certain Arab tribes, of whom the Midianites are the most conspicuous, through the sons of his concubine Keturah (Gen 20:1; Gen 20:1-4).

The most important geographical question in connection with the Terachites concerns their original settlement. The presence of the, Chaldees in Babylonia at a subsequent period of scriptural history has led. to a supposition that they were a Hamitic people, originally belonging to Babylonia, and thence transplanted in the 7th and 8th centuries to Northern Assyria (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 319). Others think it more consistent with the general direction of the Terachite movement to look for Ur in Northern Mesopotamia, to the east of Haran. That the Chaldees, or, according to the Hebrew nomenclature, the Kasdim, were found in that neighborhood is indicated by the name Chesed as one of the sons of Nahor (Gen 22:22), and possibly by the name Arphaxad itself, which, according to Ewald (Gesch. 1, 378), means “fortress of the Chaldees.” In classical times we find the Kasdim still occupying the mountains adjacent to Arrapachitis, the Biblical Arpachsad, under the names Chaldaei (Xenoph. Anab. 4:3, 1- 4) and Gordymei or Carduchi (Strabo, 16:747), and here the name still has a vital existence under the form of Kurd. The name Kasdim is explained by Oppert as meaning” “two rivers,” ‘and thus as equivalent to the Hebrew Naharain and the classical Mesopotamia (Zeit. d. morg. Ges. 11:137). We receive this explanation with reserve; but, so far as it goes, it favors the northern locality. The evidence for the antiquity of the southern settlement is lessened if the term Kaldai does not occur in the Assyrian inscriptions until the 9th century B.C. (Rawlinson, 1, 449). But whether we conceive the original seat of the Chaldees to have been in the north or in the south, they moved along the course of the Tigris until they reached Babylon, where we find them dominant in the 7th century B.C. Whether they first entered this country as mercenaries, and then conquered their employers, as suggested by Renan (Hist. Genesis 1, 68), must remain uncertain, but we think the suggestion supported by the circumstance that the name was afterwards transferred to the whole Babylonian population. The sacerdotal character of the Chaldees is certainly difficult to reconcile with this or any other hypothesis on the subject.

Returning to the Terachites, we find it impossible to define the geographical limits of their settlements with precision. They intermingled with the previously existing inhabitants of the countries intervening  between the Red Sea and the Euphrates, and hence we find an Aram, an Uz, and a Chesed among the descendants of Nahor (Gen 22:21-22), a Dedan and a Sheba among those of Abraham by Ketlirah (Gen 25:3), and an Amalek among the descendants of Esau (Gen 36:12). Few of the numerous tribes which sprang from this stock attained historical celebrity. The Israelites must of course be excepted from this description; so, also, the Nabathaeans, if they are to be regarded as represented by the Nebaioth of the Bible, as to which there is some doubt (Quatremere, Mélanges, p. 59). Of the rest, the Moabites, Ammonites, Midianites, and Edomites are chiefly known for their hostilities with the Israelites, to whom they were close neighbors. The memory of the westerly migration of the Israelites was perpetuated in the name Hebrew, as referring to their residence beyond the river Euphrates (Jos 24:3).

d. Besides the nations whose origin is accounted for in the Bible, we find other early populations” mentioned in the course of the history without any notice of their ethnology. In this category we may place the Horim, who occupied Edom before the descendants of Esau (Deu 2:12; Deu 2:22); the Amalekites of the Sinaitic peninsula; the Zuzim and Zamzummim of Perea (Gen 14:5; Deuteronomy 2 20); the Rephaim of Bashan, and of the valley near Jerusalem named after them (Gen 14:5; 2 Samuel 5, 18); the Emim eastward of the Dead Sea (Gen 14:5) 1 the Avim of the southern Philistine plain (Deu 2:23); and the Anakim of Southern Palestine (Jos 11:21). The question arises whether these tribes were Hamites, or whether they represented an earlier population which preceded the entrance of the Hamites. The latter view is supported by Knobel, who regards the majority of these tribes as Shemites; who preceded the Canaanites, and communicated to them the Shemitic tongue (Völkert. p. 204, 315). No evidence can be adduced in support of this theory, which was probably suggested by the double difficulty of accounting for the name of Lud and of explaining the apparent anomaly of the Hamites and Terachites speaking the same language. Still less evidence is there in favor of the Turanian origin, which would, we presume, be assigned to these tribes in common with the Canaanites proper, in accordance with a current theory that the first wave of population which overspread Western Asia belonged to that branch of the human race (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 645, note). To this theory we shall presently advert; meanwhile, we can only observe, in reference to these fragmentary populations, that, as they intermingled with the Canaanites, they probably  belonged to the same stock (comp. Num 13:22; Jdg 1:10). They may, perchance, have belonged to an earlier migration than the Canaanitish, and may have been subdued by the later comers; but this would not necessitate a different origin. The names of these tribes and of their abodes, as instanced in Gen 14:5; Deuteronomy 2, 23; Num 13:22, bear a Shemitic character (Ewald. Gesch. 1, 311), and the only objection to their Canaanitish origin arising out of these names would be in connection with Zamzummim, which, according to Renan (Hist. Gén. p. 35, note), is formed on the same principle as the Greek βάρβαρος, and in this case implies, at all events, a dialectical difference.

(II.) Having thus surveyed the ethnological statements contained in the Bible, it remains for ins to inquire how far they are based on, or accord with, physiological or linguistic principles. Knobel maintains that the threefold division of the Mosaic table is founded on the physiological principle of color, Shem, Ham, and Japheth representing respectively the red, black, and white complexions prevalent in the different regions of the then known world (Völkert. p. 11-13). He claims etymological support for this view in respect to Ham (=“dark”) and Japheth (=“fair”), but not in respect to Shem; and he adduces testimony to the fact that such differences of color were noted in ancient times. . The etymological argument weakens rather than sustains his view; for it is difficult to conceive that the principle of classification would be embodied in two of the names, and not also in the third, the force of such evidence is wholly dependent upon its uniformity. With regard to the actual prevalence of the hues, it is quite consistent with the physical character of the districts that the Hamites of the south should be dark, and the Japhethites of the north fair, and, further, that the Shemites should hold an intermediate place in color as in geographical position. But we have no evidence that this distinction was strongly marked, The “redness” expressed in the name Edom probably referred to the soil (Stanley, Sin. and Pal. p. 87) the Erythrcum Mare was so called from a peculiarity in its own tint, arising from the presence of some vegetable substance, and not because the red Shemites bordered on it, the black Cushites being equally numerous on its shores; the name Adam, as applied to the Shemitic man, is ambiguous, from its reference to soil as-well as color. On the other hand, the Phoenicians (assuming them to have reached the Mediterranean seaboard before the table was compiled) were so called from their red hue, and yet are placed in the table among the Hamites. The argument drawn from the red hue of the Egyptian deity  Typhon is of little value until it can be decisively proved that the deity in question represented the Shemites. This is asserted by Renan (Hist. Genesis 1, 38), who endorses Knobel's view so far as the Shemites are concerned, though he does not accept his general theory.

The linguistic difficulties connected with the Mosaic table are very considerable, and we cannot pretend to unravel the tangled skein of conflicting opinions on the subject. The primary difficulty arises out of the Biblical narrative itself, and is consequently of old standing the difficulty, namely, of accounting for the evident identity of language spoken by the Shemitic Terachites and the Hamitic Canaanites. Modern linguistic research has rather enhanced than removed this difficulty. The alternatives hitherto offered as satisfactory solutions namely, that the Terachites adopted their language of the Canaanites, or the Canaanites that of the Terachites are both inconsistent with the enlarged area which the language is found to cover on each side. Setting aside the question of the high improbability that a wandering nomadic tribe, such as the Terachites, would be able to impose its language on a settled and powerful nation like the Canaanites, it would still remain to be explained how the Cushites and other Hamitic tribes, who did not come into contact with the Terachites, acquired the same general type of language. On, the other hand, assuming that what are called Shemitic languages were really Hamitic, we have to explain the extension of the Hamitic, area over. Mesopotamia and Assyria, which, according to the table and the general opinion of ethnologists, belonged wholly to a non-Hamitic population. A further question, moreover, arises out of this explanation, viz., What was the language of the Terachites before they assumed this Hamitic tongue? This question is answered by J. Miller, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 14:238, to the effect that the Shemites originally spoke an Indo-European language — a view which we do not expect to see generally adopted.

Restricting ourselves, for the present, to the linguistic question, we must draw attention to the fact that there is a well-defined Hamitic as well as a Shemitic class of languages, and that any theory which obliterates this distinction must fall to the ground. The Hamitic type is most highly developed, as we might expect, in the country which was, par excellence, the land of Ham, viz. Egypt; and whatever elements of original unity with the Shemitic type may be detected by philologists, practically the two were as distinct from each other in historical times as any two languages could possibly. be. We are not therefore prepared at once to throw overboard the  linguistic element of the Mosaic table. At the same time, we recognize the extreme difficulty of explaining the anomaly of Hamitic tribes speaking a Shemitic tongue. It will lot suffice to say, in answer to this, that these tribes were Shemites; for again the correctness of the Mosaic table is vindicated by the differences of social and artistic culture which distinguish the Shemites proper from the Phoenicians and Cushites using a Shemitic tongue. The former are characterized by habits of simplicity, isolation, and adherence to patriarchal ways of living and thinking; the Phoenicians, on the other hand, were eminently a commercial people; and the Cushites are identified with the massive architectural erections of Babylonia and South Arabia, and with equally extended ideas of empire and social progress.

The real question at issue concerns the language, not of the whole Hamitic family, but of the Canaanites and Cushites. With regard to the former, various explanations have been offered such as Knobel's, that they acquired a Shemitic language from a prior population, represented by the Rephaim, Zulzim, Zamzummim, etc. (Völkert-t. p. 315); or Bunsen's, that they were a Shemitic race who had long sojourned in Egypt (Philippians of list. 1, 191) -neither of which is satisfactory. With regard to the latter, the only explanation to be offered is that a Joktanid immigration supervened on the original Hamitic population, the result being a combination of Cushitic civilization with a Shemitic language (Renan, Hist. Géneralé 1, 322). Nor is it unimportant to mention that peculiarities have been discovered in the Cushite-Shemitic of Southern Arabia which suggest a close affinity with the Phoenician forms (ibid. 1,318). We are not, however, without expectation that time and research will clear up much of the mystery that now enwraps the subject. There are two directions to which we may hopefully turn for light, namely, Egypt and Babylonia, with regard to each of which we make a few remarks.

1. That the Egyptian language exhibits many striking points of resemblance to the Shemitic type is acknowledged on all sides. It is also allowed that the resemblances are of a valuable character, being observable in the pronouns, numerals, in agglutinative forms, in the treatment of vowels, and other such points (Renan, Hist. Géneralé 1, 84, 85). There is not, however, an equal degree of agreement among scholars as to the deductions to be drawn from these resemblances. While many recognize in them the proofs of a substantial identity, and hence regard Hamitism as an early stage of Shemitism, others deny, either on general or on special grounds, the probability of such a connection. When we find such high authorities as  Bunsen on the former side (Philippians of Hist. 1, 186-189; 2, 3), and Renan (Hist. Gén. 1, 86) on the other, not to mention a long array of scholars who have adopted each view, it would be presumption dogmatically to assert the correctness or incorrectness of either. We can only point to the possibility of the identity being established, and to the further possibility that connecting links may be discovered between the two extremes, which may serve to bridge over the gulf, and to render the use of a Shemitic language by a Hamitic race less of an anomaly than it at present appears to be.

2. Turning eastward to the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, and the adjacent countries, we find ample materials for research in the inscriptions recently discovered, the examination of which has not yet yielded undisputed results. The Mosaic table places a Shemitic population in Assyria and Elam, and a Cushitic one in Babylon. The probability of this being ethnically (as opposed to geographically) true depends partly on the age assigned to the table. There can be no question that at a late period Assyria and Elam were held by non-Shemitic, probably Aryan, conquerors. But if we carry the table back to the age of Abraham, the case may have been different; for though Elam is regarded as etymologically identical with Iran (Renan, Hist. Géneralé 1, 41), this is not conclusive as to the Iranian character of the language in early times. Sufficient evidence is afforded by language that the basis of the population in Assyria was Shemitic (ibid. 1, 70; Knobel, p. 154-156); and it is by no means improbable that the inscriptions belonging more especially to the neighborhood of Susa may ultimately establish the fact of a Shemitic population in Elam. The presence of a Cushitic population in Babylon is an opinion very generally held on linguistic grounds; and a close identity is said to exist between the old Babylonian and the Mahri language, a Shemitic tongue of an ancient type still living in a district of Hadramaut, in Southern Arabia (Renan, Hist. Genesis 1, 60).

In addition to the Cushitic and Shermitic elements in the population of Babylonia and the adjacent districts, the presence of a Turanian element has been inferred from the linguistic character of the early inscriptions. We must here express our conviction that the ethnology of the countries in question is considerably clouded by the undefined use of the terms Turanian, Scythic, and the like. It is frequently difficult to decide whether these terms are used in a linguistic sense, as equivalent to agglutinative, or in an ethnic sense. The presence of a certain amount of. Turanianism in the former does not involve; its presence in the latter sense.  The old Babylonian and Susianian inscriptions maybe more agglutinative than the later ones, but this is only a proof of their belonging to an earlier stage of the language, and does not of itself indicate a foreign population; and if these early Babylonian inscriptions graduate into the Shemitic, as is asserted even by the advocates of the Turanian theory (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 442, 445), the presence of an ethnic Turanianism cannot possibly be inferred. Added to this, it is inexplicable how the presence of a large Scythic population in the Achaemenian period, to which many of the Susianian inscriptions belong, could escape the notice of historians. The only Scythic tribes noticed by Herodotus in his review of the Persian empire are the Parthians and the Sacoe, the former of whom are known to have lived in the north, while the latter probably lived in the extreme east, where a memorial of them is still supposed to exist in the name Seistcan, representing the ancient Sacastene. Even with regard to these, Scythic may not mean Turanian: for they may have belonged to the Scythians of history (the Skolots), for whom an Indo-European origin is claimed (ibid. 3, 197). The impression conveyed by the supposed detection of so many heterogeneous elements in the old Babylonian tongue (ibid. 1, 442, 444, 646, notes) is not favorable to the general results of the researches.

With regard to Arabia, it may safely be asserted that the Mosaic table is confirmed by modern research. The Cushitic element has left memorials of its presence in the south in the vast ruins of Mareh and Sana (Renan, Hist. Gén. 1, 318), as well as in the influence it has exercised on the Himyaritic and Mahri languages, as compared with the Hebrew. The Joktanid element forms the basis of the Arabian population, the Shemitic character of whose language needs no proof. With regard to the Ishmaelite element in the north, we are not aware of any linguistic proof of its existence, but it is confirmed by the traditions of the Arabians themselves.

It remains to be inquired how far the Japhetic stock represents the linguistic characteristics of the Indo-European and Turanian families. Adopting the twofold division of the former, suggested by the name itself, into the eastern and western; and subdividing the eastern into the Indian and Iranian, and the western into the Celtic, Hellenic, Illyrian, Italian, Teutonic; Slavonian, and Lithuanian classes, we are able to assign Madai (Media) and Togarmah (Armenia) to the Iranian class; Javan (Ionian) and Elishah (Eolian) to the Hellenic; Gomer conjecturally to the Celtic; and Dodanim, also conjecturally, to the Illyrian. According to the old interpreters, Ashkenaz represents the Teutonic class, while, according to  Knobel, the Italian would be represented by Tarshish, whom he identifies with the Etruscans; the Slavonian by Magog; and the Lithuanian possibly by Tiras (Völkert. p. 68, 90. 130). The same writer also identifies Riphath with the Gauls, as distinct from the Cymry or Gomer (p. 45); while Kittim is referred by him not improbably to the Carians, who at; one period were predominant on the islands adjacent to Asia Minor (p. 98). The evidence for these identifications varies in strength, but: in no instance approaches to demonstration. Beyond the general probability that the main branches of the human family would be represented in the Mosaic table, we regard much that has been advanced on this subject as highly precarious. At the same time, it must be conceded that the subject is an open one; and that as there is no possibility of proving, so, also, there is none of disproving, the correctness of these conjectures, Whether the Turanian family is fairly represented in the Mosaic table may be doubted. Those who advocate the Mongolian origin of the Scythians would naturally regard Magog as the representative of this family; and even those who dissent from the Mongolian theory may still not unreasonably conceive that the title Magog applied broadly to all the nomad tribes of Northern Asia, whether Indo- European or Turanian. Tubal and Meshech remain to be considered; Knobel identifies these respectively with the Iberians and the Ligurians (p. 111, 119); and if the Finnish character of the Basque language were established, he would regard the Iberians as certainly, and the Ligurians as probably, Turanians the relics of the first wave of population which is supposed to have once overspread the whole of the European continent, and of which the Finns in the north, and the Basques in the south, are the sole surviving representatives. The Turanian character of the two Biblical races above mentioned has been otherwise maintained on the ground of the identity of the names Meshech and Muscovite (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 652).

(III.) Having thus reviewed the ethnic relations of the nations who fell within the circle of the Mosaic table, we propose to cast a glance beyond its limits, and inquire how far the present results of ethnological science support the general idea of the unity of the human race, which underlies the Mosaic system. The chief and in many instances the only instrument at our command for ascertaining the relationship of nations is language. In its general results this instrument is thoroughly trustworthy, and in each individual case to which it is applied it furnishes a strong prima facie evidence; but its evidence, if unsupported by collateral proofs is not unimpeachable, in consequence of the numerous instances of adopted  languages which have occurred within historical times. This drawback to the value of the evidence of language will not materially affect our present inquiry, inasmuch as we shall confine ourselves as much as possible to the general results.

The nomenclature of modern ethnology is not identical with that of the Bible, partly from the enlargement of the area, and partly from the general adoption of language as the basis of classification. The term Shemitic is indeed retained, not, however, to indicate a descent from Shem, but the use of languages allied to that which was current among the Israelites in historical times. Hamitic also finds a place in modern ethnology; but as subordinate to, or coordinate with, Shemitic. Japhetic is superseded mainly by, Indo-European or Aryan. The various nations, or families of nations, which find no place under the Biblical titles are classed by certain ethnologists under the broad title of Turanian, while by others they are broken up into divisions more or less numerous.

1. The first branch of our subject will be to trace the extension of the Shemitic family beyond the limits assigned to it in the Bible. The most marked characteristic of this family, as compared with the Indo-European or Turanian, is its inelasticity. Hemmed in both by natural barriers and by the superior energy and expansiveness of the Aryan and Turanian races, it retains to the present day the status quo of early times. The only direction in which it has exhibited; any tendency to expand has been about the shores of the Mediterranean, and even here its activity was of a sporadic character, limited to a single branch of the family, viz. the Phoenicians, and to a single phase of expansion, viz. commercial colonies. In Asia Minor we find tokens of Shemitic presence in Cilicia, which was connected with Phoenicia both by tradition (Herod. 8, 91) and by language, as attested by existing coins (Gesenius, Mon. Phon. 3, 2); in Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycia, parts of which were occupied by the Solymi (Pliny, 5, 24; Herod. 1, 173), whose name bears a Shemitic character, and who are reported to have spoken a Shemitic tongue (Eusebius, Praep. Ev. 9:9), a statement confirmed by the occurrence of other Shemitic names, such as Phoenix and Cabalia, though the subsequent predominance of an Aryan population in these same districts is attested by the existing Lycian inscriptions again in Caria, though the evidence arising out of the supposed identity of the names of the gods Osogo ani Chrysaoreus with the Οὔσωος and Χρυσώρ of Sanchoniathon is called in question (Renan, Hist. Genesis 1, 49); and, lastly, in Lydia, where the descendants of Lud are located by many  authorities, and where the prevalence of a Shemitic language is asserted by scholars of the highest standing, among whom we may specify Bunsen and Lasen, in spite of tokens of the contemporaneous presence of the Aryan element, as instanced in the name Sardis, and in spite, also, of the historical notices of an ethnical connection with Mysia (Herod. 1, 171).

Whether the Shemites ever occupied any portion of the plateau of Asia Minor may be doubted. In the opinion of the ancients the later occupants of Cappadocia were Syrians, distinguished from the mass of their race by a lighter hue, and hence termed Leucosyri (Strabo, 12:542); but this statement is traversed by the evidences of Aryanism afforded by the names of the kings and deities, as well as by the Persian character of the religion (ibid. 15:733). If, therefore, the Shemites ever occupied this district, they must soon have been brought under the dominion of Aryan conquerors (Diefenbach, Orig. Europ. p. 44). The Phoenicians were ubiquitous on the islands and shores of the Mediterranean: in Cyprus, where they have left tokens of their presence at Citium and other places; in Crete; in Malta, where they were the original settlers (Diod. Sic. 5, 12); on the mainland of Greece, where their presence is betokened by the name Cadmus; in Samos, Same, and Samothrace, which bear Shemitic names; in Ios and Tenedos, once known by the name of Phoenice; in Sicily, where Panormus, Motya, and Soloeis were Shemitic settlements; in Sardinia (ibid. 5, 35); on the eastern and southern coasts of Spain; and on the north coast of Africa, which was lined with Phoenician colonies from the Syrtis Major to the Pillars of Hercules. They, must also have penetrated deeply into the interior, to judge from Strabo's statement of the destruction of three hundred towns by the Pharusians and Nigritians (Strabo, 17, 826). Still, in none of the countries we have mentioned did they supplant the original population; they were conquerors and settlers, but no more than this.

The bulk of the North African languages, both in ancient and modern times, though not Shemitic in the proper sense of the term, so far resemble that type as to have obtained the title of sub-Shemitic. In the north the old Numidian language appears, from the prevalence of the syllable Mas in the name Massylii, etc., to be allied to the modern Berber; and the same conclusion has been drawn with regard to the Libyan tongue. The Berber, in turn, together with the Touarick and the great body of the North African dialects, is closely allied to the Coptic of Egypt, and therefore falls under the title of Hamitic, or, according to the more usual nomenclature, sub- Shemitic (Renan, Hist. Gén. 1, 201, 202). Southward of Egypt the  Shemitic type is reproduced in the majority of the Abyssinian languages, particularly in the Gheez, and in a less marked degree in the Amharic, the Saho, and the Galla; and Shemitic influence may be traced along the whole east coast of Africa as far as Mozambique (ibid. 1, 336-340). As to the languages of the interior and of the south, there appears to be a conflict of opinions, the writer from whom we have just quoted denying any trace of resemblance to the Shemitic type, while Dr. Latham asserts very confidently that connecting-links exist between the sub-Shemitic languages of the north, the Negro languages in the center, and the Caffre languages of the south; and that even the Hottentot language is not so isolated as has generally been supposed (Man and his Migrat. p. 134-148). Bunsen supports this view so far as the languages north of the equator are concerned, but regards the southern as rather approximating to the Turanian type (Philippians of Hist. 1, 178; 2, 20). It is impossible as yet to form a decided opinion on this large subject.

A question of considerable interest remains yet to be noticed, namely, whether we can trace the Shemitic family back to its original cradle. In. the case of the Indo-European family this can be done with a high degree of probability; and if an original unity existed between these stocks, the domicile of the one would necessarily be that of the other. A certain community of ideas and traditions favors this assumption, and possibly the frequent allusions to the east in the early chapters of Genesis may contain a reminiscence of the direction in which the primeval abodelay (Renan, Hist. Gen. 1, 476). The position of this abode we shall describe presently.

2. The Indo-European family of languages, as at present constituted, consists of the following nine classes: Indian, Iranian, Celtic, Italian, Albanian, Greek, Teutonic, Lithuanian, and Slavonian. Geographically, these classes may be grouped together in two divisions, Eastern and Western; the former comprising the first two, the latter the seven remaining classes. Schleicher divides what we have termed the Western into two, the South-west European and the North European; in the former of which he places the Greek, Albanian, Italian, and Celtic; in the latter, the Slavonian, Lithuanian, and Teutonic (Compend. 1, 5). Prof. M. Muller combines the Slavonian and Lithuanian classes in the Windic, thus reducing the number to eight. These classes exhibit various degrees of affinity to each other, which are described by Schleicher in the following manner: The earliest deviation from the common language of the family was effected by the Slavono-Teutonic branch. After another interval a second bifurcation  occurred, which separated what we may term the Graeco-Italo-Celtic branch from the Aryan. The former held together for a while, and then threw off the Greek (including probably the Albanian), leaving the Celtic and Italian still connected: the final division of the latter two took place after another considerable interval. The first mentioned branch the Slavono Teutonic remained intact for a period somewhat longer than that which witnessed the second bifurcation of the original stock, and then divided into the Teutonic and Slavono-Lithuanian, which latter finally broke up into its two component elements. The Aryan branch similarly held together for a lengthened period, and then bifurcated into the Indian and Iranian. The conclusion Schleicher draws from these linguistic affinities is that the more easterly of the European nations, the Slavonians and Teutons, were the first to leave the common home of the Indo-European race; that they were followed by the Celts, Italians, and Greeks; and that the Indian and Iranian branches were the last to commence their migrations. We feel unable to accept this conclusion, which appears to us to be based on the assumption that the antiquity of a language is to be measured by its approximation to Sanskrit. Looking at the geographical position of the representatives of the different language classes, we should infer that the most westerly were the earliest immigrants into Europe, and therefore probably the earliest emigrants from the primeval seat of the race; and we believe this to be confirmed by linguistic proofs of the high antiquity of the Celtic as compared with the other branches of the Indo-European family (Bunsen, Philippians of Hist. 1, 168).

The original seat of the Indo-European race was on the plateau of Central Asia, probably to the westward of the Bolor and Mustagh ranges. The Indian branch can be traced back to the slopes of Himalaya by the geographical allusions in the Vedic hymns (Miller, Lectures, p. 201); in confirmation of which we may adduce the circumstance that the sole tree for which the Indians have an appellation in common with the western nations is one which in India is found only on the southern slope of that range (Pott, Etym. Forsch. 1, 110). The westward progress of the Iranian tribes is a matter of history, and though we cannot trace this progress back to its fountain-head, the locality above mentioned best accords with the traditional belief of the Asiatic Aryans and with the physical and geographical requirements of the case (Renan, Hist. Géneralé 1, 481).

The routes by which the various western branches reached their respective localities can only be conjectured. We may suppose them to have  successively crossed the plateau of Iran until they reached Armenia, whence they might follow either a northerly course across Caucasus, and by the shore of the Black Sea, or a direct westerly one along the plateau of Asia Minor, which seems destined by nature to be the bridge between the two continents of Europe and Asia. A third route has been surmised for a portion of the Celtic stock, viz. along the north coast of Africa, and across the Straits of Gibraltar into Spain (Bunsen, Philippians of Hist., 1, 148); but we see little confirmation of this opinion beyond the fact of the early presence of the Celtae in that peninsula, which is certainly difficult to account for.

The eras of the several migrations are again very much a matter of conjecture. The original movements belong, for the most part, to the ante- historical age, and we can do no more than note the period at which we first encounter the several nations.; That the Indian Aryans had reached the mouth of the Indus at all events before B.C. 1000 appears from the Sanskrit names of the articles which Solomon imported from that country. SEE INDIA.

The presence of Aryans on the Shemitic frontier is as old as the composition of the Mosaic table; and, according to some authorities, is proved by the names of the confederate kings in the age of Abraham (Genesis 14, 1; Renan, Hist. Gen. 1, 61). The Aryan Medes are mentioned in the Assyrian annals about B.C. 900. The Greeks were settled on the peninsula named after them, as well as on the islands of the 2Egean, long before the dawn of history, and the Italians had reached their quarters at a yet earlier period. The Celtae had reached the west of Europe at all events before, probably very long before, the age of Hecataeus (B.C. 500); the latest branch of this stock arrived there about that period, according to Bunsen's conjecture (Philippians of Hist. 1, 152). The Teutonic migration followed at a long interval after the Celtic: Pytheas found them already seated on the shores of the Baltic in the age of Alexander the Great (Pliny,'37:11), and the term glesum itself, by which amber was described in that district, belongs to them (Diefenbach, Orig. Europ. p. 359). The earliest historical notice of them depends on the view taken of the nationality of the Teutones, who accompanied the Cimbri on their southern expedition in B.C. 113-102. If these were Celtic, as is not uncommonly thought, then we must look to Cassar and Tacitus for the earliest definite notices of the Teutonic tribes. The Slavonian immigration was nearly contemporaneous with the Teutonic (Bunsen, Philippians of Hist. 1, 72): this stock can be traced back to the Veneti or Venedae of Northern Germany, first  mentioned by. Tacitus (Germ. 46), from whom the name Wend is probably descended. The designation of Slavi or Sclavi is of comparatively late date, and applied specially to the western branch of the Slavonian stock. The Lithuanians are probably represented by the Galindae and Sudeni of Ptolemy (3, 5, 21), the names of which tribes have been preserved in all ages in the Lithuanian district (Diefenbach, p. 202). They are frequently identified with the AEstui, and it is not impossible that they may have adopted the title, which was a geographical one (the east men) the-Estui of Tacitus, however, were Germans. In the above statements we have omitted the problematical identifications of the Northern stocks with the earlier nations of history; we may here mention that the Slavanians are not infrequently regarded as the representatives of the Scythians (Skolots) and the Sarmatians (Knobel Vgilkert. p. 69). The writer whom we have just cited also endeavors to conllect the Lithuanians with the Agathyrisi (p. 130). So, again, Grimm traced the Teutonic stock to the Getae, whom he identified with the Goths (Gesch. d. deutsch. Spr. 1, 178).

It may be asked whether the Aryan race were the first-comers in the lands which they occupied ill historical times, or whether they superseded an earlier population. With regard to the Indian branch this question, can be answered decisively; the vestiges of an aboriginal population, which once covered the plains of Hindostan, still exist in the southern extremity of the peninsula, as well as in isolated localities elsewhere, as instanced in the case of the Brahus of the North. Not only this, but the Indian class of languages possesses a peculiarity of sound (the lingual or cerebral consonants), which is supposed to have been derived from this population and to betoken a fusion of the conquerors and the conquered (Schleicher, Compenad. 1, 141). The languages of this early population are classed as Turanian (Miller, Lect. p. 399). We are unable to find decided traces of Turanians on the plateau of Iran. The Sacoe, of whom we have already spoken, were Scythians, and so were the Parthians, both by reputed descent (Justin, 41, 1) and by habits of life (Strabo, 11:515); but we cannot positively assert that they were Turanians, inasmuch as the term Scythian was also applied, as in the case of the Skolots, to Indo-Europeans. In the Caucasian district the Iberians and others may have been Turanian in early as in later times; but it is difficult to unravel the entanglement of races and languages in that district. In Europe there exists in the present day an undoubted Turanian population eastward of the Baltic, viz. the Finns, who have been located there certainly since the time of Tacitus (Germ. 46), and  who probably at an earlier period had spread more to the southward, but had been gradually thrust back by the advance of the Teutonic and Slavonian nations (Diefenbach, Orig. Europ. p. 209). There exists, again, in the South a population whose language (the Basque, or, as it is entitled in its own land, the Euskara) presents numerous points of affinity to the Finnish in grammar, though its vocabulary is wholly distinct. We cannot consider the Turanian character of this language as fully established, and we are therefore unable to divine the ethnic affinities of the early Iberians, who are generally regarded as the progenitors of the Basques. We have already adverted to the theory that the Finns in the North and the Basques in the South are the surviving monuments of a Turanian population, which overspread the whole of Europe before the arrival of the Indo-Europeans. This is a mere theory which can neither be proved nor disproved.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to assign to the various subdivisions of the Indo European stock their respective areas, or, where admixture has taken place, their relative proportions. Language and race are, as already observed, by no means coextensive. The Celtic race, for instance, which occupied Gaul, Northern Italy, large portions of Spain and Germany, and- even penetrated across the Hellespont into Asia Minor, where it gave name to the province of Galatia, is now represented linguistically by the insignificant populations among whom the Welsh and the Gaelic or Erse languages retain a lingering existence.

The Italian race, on the other hand, which must have been well nigh annihilated by or absorbed in, the overwhelming masses of the Northern hordes, has imposed its language outside the bounds of Italy over the peninsula of Spain, France, and Wallachia. But, while the races have so intermingled as in many instances to lose all trace of, their original individuality, the broad fact of their descent from one or other of the branches of the Indo-European family remains unaffected. It is, indeed, impossible to affiliate all the nations whose names appear on the roll of history to the existing divisions of that family, in consequence of the absence or the obscurity of ethnological criteria. Where, for instance, shall we place the languages of Asia Minor and the adjacent districts? The Phrygian approximates perhaps to the Greek, and yet it differs from it materially both in form and vocabulary (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 666); still more is this the case with the Lycian, which appears to possess a vocabulary wholly distinct from its kindred languages (ibid. 1, 669,677-679). The Armenian is ranged under the Iranian division; yet this, as well as the language of the Caucasian Ossetes,  whose indigenous name of Ir or Iron seems to vindicate for them the same relationship, is so distinctive in its features as to render the connection dubious. The languages prevalent in the mountainous district answering to the ancient Pontus are equally peculiar (Diefenbach, Orig. Europ. p. 51).

Passing to the westward, we encounter the Thracians, reputed by Herodotus (5, 3) the most powerful nation in the world, tie Indians excepted; yet but one word of their language (bria =“town” ) has survived, and all historical traces of the people have been obliterated. It is true that they are represented in later times by the Getae, and these in turn by the Daci; but neither of these can be tracked either by history or language, unless we accept Grimm's more than doubtful identification which would connect them with the Teutonic branch. The remains of the Scythian language are sufficient to establish the Indo-European affinities of that nation (Rawlinson, Herod. 3, 196-203), but insufficient to assign to it a definite place in: the family, The Scythians, as well as most of the nomad tribes associated with them, are lost to the eye of the ethnologist, having been either absorbed into other nationalities or swept away by the ravages of war. The Sarmatae can be traced down to the Iazyges of Hungary and Podlachia, in which latter district they survived until the 10th century of our era (Smith, Dict. of Geog. 2, 8), and then they also vanish. The Allanian language presents a problem of a different kind: materials for research are not wanting in this case, but no definite conclusions have as yet been drawn from them. The people who use this tongue (the Skipetares, as they call themselves) are generally regarded as the representatives of the old Illyrians, who in turn appear to have been closely connected with the Thracians (Strabo, 7:315; Justin, 11:1), the name Dardani being, found both in Illyria and on the shores of the Hellespont; it is not, therefore, improbable that the Albanian may contain whatever vestiges of the old Thracian tongue still survive (Diefenbach, Orig. Europ. p. 68). In the Italic peninsula the Etruscan tongue remains as great an enigma as ever its Indo-European character is supposed to be established, together with the probability of its being a mixed language (Bunsen, Philippians of Hist. 1, 85-88). The result of researches into the Umbrian language, as represented in the Eugubine tablets, the earliest of which date from about B.C. 400; into the Sabellian, as represented in the tablets of Velletri and Antino; and into the Oscan, of which the remains are numerous, have decided their position as members of the Italic class (ibid. 1, 90-94).

The same cannot be asserted of the Mesapian or Iapygian language, which stands apart from all neighboring dialects. Its Indo-  European character is affirmed, but no ethnological conclusion can as yet be drawn from the scanty information afforded us (ibid. 1, 94). Lastly, within the Celtic area there are ethnological problems which we cannot pretend to solve. The Ligurians, for instance, present one of these problems: were they Celts, but belonging to an earlier migration than the Celts of history? Their name has been referred to a Welsh original, but on. this no great reliance can be placed, as it would be in this case a local (coast men) and not an ethnical title, and might have been imposed on them by the Celts. They evidently hold a posterior place to the Iberians, inasmuch as they are said to have driven a section of this people across the Alps into Italy. That they were distinct from the Celts is asserted by Strabo (2, 128), but the distinction may have been no greater than exists between the British and the Gaelic branches of that race. The admixture of the Celts and Iberians in the Spanish peninsula is again a somewhat intricate question, which Dr. Latham attempts to explain on the ground that the term Celt (Κέλται) really meant Iberian (Ethn. of Eur. p. 35). That such questions as these should arise: on a subject which carries us back to times of hoar antiquity forms no ground for doubting the general conclusion that we can account ethnologically for the population of the European continent.

3. The Shemitic and Indo-European families cover, after all, but an insignificant portion of the earth's surface the large areas of Northern and Eastern Asia, the numerous groups of islands that line its coast and stud the Pacific in the direction of South America, and, again, the immense continent of America itself, stretching well nigh from pole to pole, remain to be accounted for. Historical aid is almost wholly denied to the ethnologist in his researches in these quarters; physiology and language are his only guides. It can hardly, therefore, be matter of surprise if we are unable to obtain certainty, or even a reasonable degree of probability, on this part of our subject. Much has been done; but far more remains to be done before the data for forming a conclusive opinion can be obtained. In Asia the languages fall into two large classes the monosyllabic and the agglutinative. The former are represented ethnologically by the Chinese, the latter by the various nations classed together by Prof. M. Muller under the common head of Turanian. It is unnecessary for us to discuss the correctness of his view in regarding all these nations as members of one and the same family. Whether we accept or reject his theory, the fact of a gradation of linguistic types and of connecting links between the various  branches remains unaffected, and for our present purpose the question is of comparatively little moment. The monosyllabic type apparently betokens the earliest movement from the common home of the human race, and we should therefore assign a chronological priority to the settlement of the Chinese in the east and southeast of the continent. The agglutinative languages fall geographically into two divisions, a Northern and Southern. The Northern consists of a well-defined group, or family, designated by German ethnologists the Ural-Altaian. It consists of the following five branches:

(1.) The Tungusian, covering large area east of the river Yenisei, between Lake Baikal and the Tunguska.

(2.) The Mongolian, which prevails over the Great Desert of Gobi, and among the Kalmucks, wherever their nomad habits lead them on the steppes either of Asia or Europe, in the latter of which they are found about the lower course of the Volga.

(3.) The Turkish, covering an immense area from the Mediterranean in the south-west to the river Lena in the north-east; in Europe spoken by the Osmanli, who form the governing class in Turkey; by the Nogai, between the Caspian and the Sea of Azof; and by various Caucasian tribes.

(4.) The Samoiedic, on the coast of the Arctic Ocean, between the White Sea in the west and the river Anabara in the east.

(5.) The Finnish, which is spoken by the Finns and Lapps; by the inhabitants of Esthonia and Livonia to the south of the Gulf of Finland; by various tribes about the Volga (the Tcheremissians and Mordvinians) and the Kama (the Votiakes and Permians); and, lastly, by the Magyars of Hungary.

The Southern branch is subdivided into the following four classes: —

(1.) The Tamulian, of the south of Ilindostan.

(2.) The Bhotlya, of Thibet, the sub-Himalayan district (Nepaul and Bhotan), and the Lohitic languages east of the Brahmapootra.

(3.) The Tai, in Siam, Laos, Anam, and Pegu.

(4.) The Malay, of the Malay peninsula, and the adjacent islands; the latter being the original settlement of the Malay race, whence they spread in comparatively modern times to the mainland.

The early movements of the races representing these several divisions can only be: divined by linguistic tokens. Prof. M. Miller assigns to the Northern tribes the following chronological order: Tungusian, Mongolian, Turkish, and Finnish; and to the Southern division the following: Tai, Malay, Bhotiya, and Tamulian (Philippians of Hist. 1, 481). Geographically it appears more likely that the Malay preceded the Tai, inasmuch as they occupied a more southerly district. The later movements of the European branches of the Northern division can be traced historically. The Turkish race commenced their Westerly migration from the neighborhood of the Altai range in the 1st century of our era; in the 6th they had reached the Caspian ‘and the Volga; in the 11th and 12th the Turcomans took possession of their present quarters south of Caucasus; in the 13th the Osmanli made their first appearance in Western Asia; about the middle of the 14th they crossed from Asia Minor into Europe; and in the middle of the 15th they had established themselves at Constantinople. The Finnish race is supposed to have been originally settled about the Ural range, and thence to have migrated westward to the shores of the Baltic, which they had reached at a period anterior to the Christian era; in the 7th century a branch pressed southward to the Danube, and founded the kingdom of Bulgaria, where, however, they have long ceased to-have any national existence.

The Ugrian tribes, who are the early representatives of the Hungarian Magyars, approached Europe from Asia in the 5th and settled in Hungary in the 9th century of our era. The central point from which the various branches of the Turaniania family radiated would appear to be about Lake Baikal. With regard to the ethnology of Oceania and America we can say but little. The languages of the former are generally supposed to be connected with the Malay class (Bunsen, Philippians of Hist. 2, 114); but the relations, both linguistic and ethnological, existing between the Malay and the black or Negrito, population, which is found on many of the groups of islands, are not well defined. The approximation in language is far greater than in physiology (Latham, Essays, p. 213, 218; Garnett, Essays, p. 310), and in certain cases amounts to identity (Kennedy, Essays, p. 85); but the whole subject is at present involved in obscurity.: The polysynthetic languages of North America are regarded as emanating from the Mongolian stock (Bunsen, Philippians of Hist. 2, 111),  and a close affinity is said to exist between the North American and the Kamtchadale and Corean languages on the opposite coast of Asia (Latham, Man and his Migrat. p. 185). The conclusion drawn from this would be that the population of America entered by way of Behring's Strait. Other theories have, however, been broached on this subject. It has been conjectured that the chain of islands which stretches across the Pacific may have conducted a Malay population to South America; and, again, an African origin has been claimed for the Caribs of Central America (Kennedy-, Essays, p. 100-123). In conclusion, we may safely assert the tendency of all ethnological and linguistic researches to discover the elements of unity amid the most striking external varieties. Already the myriads of the human race are massed together into a few large groups. Whether it will ever be possible to go beyond this, and to show the historical unity of these groups, is more than we can undertake to say. But we entertain the firm persuasion that in their broad results these sciences will yield an increasing testimony to the truth of the Bible.

III. The authorities referred to in the foregoing article are, Miller, Lectures on the Science of Language (1862); Bunsen, Philosophy of History (1854, 2 vols.); Renan, Histoire Géneralé des Langues Semitiques (3rd ed. 1863); Knobel, Volkertafel der Genesis (1850); Humboldt [W. von], Ueber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen SpTachba.ues (1836); Delitzsch, Jeshurun (1858); Transactions of the Philological Society; Rawlinson, lierodotus (1858, 4 vols.); Pott, Etymologische Forschungen (1833); Garnett, Essays (1859); Schleicher, Compendium der vergleichenden Grammatik (i861); Diefenbach, Origines Europae (eod.); Ewald, Sprachwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen (1862). SEE ETHNOLOGY.

## Tongues, Gift Of[[@Headword:Tongues, Gift Of]]

             This was an endowment first imparted to the apostles, anti apparently to all the assembled disciples, on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards continued to the Christians during the apostolic age. John the Baptist, himself a burning and a shining light. had testified of Christ, “He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” After Jesus had been crucified, and before he ascended, he breathed on his disciples and said, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” The influence so communicated must have been precious, but it was only the earnest of the inheritance, and not the entire fulfillment of John's prediction. By their secular views of the Messiah's sovereignty the disciples showed that they had not yet been favored with the full baptism of the Spirit. “When they were come together, they asked of him, saying, Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” This question implied entire confidence in the power of Christ, but it evinced no clear conceptions of the spirituality of his reign. Fifty days after the crucifixion the promise of the Father had its accomplishment, and the disciples received a special power when the Holy Ghost came upon them. Why was hope so long deferred? There was wisdom in this delay, as indicating divine presidency and direction in the ordering of the event. If the apostles were to be excited and bestirred merely by the dire experience they had passed through, the effect on natural principles should have been speedily consequent on the cause. Procrastination was calculated to sober tumultuous passion, and to restrain imperiling enterprise. In this view the descent of the Spirit received confirmation from occurring after a considerable interval of tranquility and inaction. The specific day had also its significance.

Pentecost was the feast of first-fruits, the commencement and the consecration of the harvest: and it formed, therefore, the fitting moment for the formal introduction of that work of the Spirit by which was to be secured the spiritual harvest of Christ's finished work. It had also come to be regarded as commemorative of the giving of the law from  Sinai-the magnificent initiation of the Mosaic economy — and the period of the latter event must certainly have coincided very nearly, if not absolutely, with that of the other (Exo 19:11). Then God spake, and the mountain burned with fire. The season so regarded was suitable for the introduction of another and related era, the inauguration of the Gospel economy and anew God reveals himself by analogous manifestations. “Suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.” This sound resembled the roar of the tempest; but instead of proceeding from any point of the compass, it descended from heaven. Here, as in the wilderness, was the voice of God, a voice full of majesty. “And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.” Here we have the fiery attribute of Sinai. But now it takes the form of tongues, to denote that God while speaking was endowing with speech, and that his voice like echoing thunder would multiply itself through the reverberating media on which it fell. The tongues were cloven, but into what number of divisions we are not informed. As happens with the variable flames of a furnace, the gleaming points may have been unequally numerous. No one had all tongues in his gift; perhaps no two the same tongues, but in every case there was a plurality. The general subject has already been considered under SEE HOLY SPIRIT, BAPTISM OF, and certain aspects of it under the foregoing heading, and under SEE SPIRITUAL GIFTS. We here give (in addition to particulars elsewhere treated) a more detailed view of the linguistic phenomenon involved.

I. Philological Interpretations of the Term. — Γλῶττα, or γλῶσσα, the word employed throughout the, New Test. for the gift now under consideration, is used in three senses, SEE TONGUE, each of which might be the starting-point for the application of the word to the gift of tongues, and each accordingly has found those who have maintained that it is so.

1. It primarily and literally signifies the bodily organ of speech. Eichhorn and Bardili (cited by Bleek, Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 8 sq.), and to some extent Bunsen (Hyppolytus, 1, 9), starting from this signification, see in the so-called gift an inarticulate utterance, the cry as of a brute creature, in which the tongue moves while the lips refuse their office in making the sounds definite and distinct.  This interpretation, it is believed, does not meet the condition of answering any of the facts of the New Test., and errs in ignoring the more prominent meaning of the word in later Greek.

2. The term γλῶσσα may stand for the use of foreign words, imported and half naturalized in Greek (Aristotle, Rhet. 3, 2, 14), a meaning which the words “gloss” and “glossary” preserve for us. Bleek himself (ut sup. p. 33) adopts this second meaning, and gives an interesting collection of passages to prove that it was, in the time of the New Test., the received sense. He infers from this that to speak in tongues was to use unusual, poetic language; that the speakers were in a high-wrought excitement which showed itself in mystic, figurative terms.: In this view he had been preceded by Ernesti (Opusc. Theolog.; see Morning Watch, 4:101) and Herdelr (Die Gabe der Spirache, p. 47, 70), the latter of whom extends the meaning to special mystical interpretations-of the Old Test.

This interpretation, however, though true in some of its conclusions, and able, so far as they are concerned, to support itself by the authority of Augustine (comp. De Genesis ad lit. 12:8, “Linguam esse cum quis loquatur obscuras et mysticas significationes”) appears faulty, as failing (1) to recognize the fact that the sense of the word in the New Test. was more likely to be determined by that which it bore in the Sept. than by its meaning in Greek historians or rhetoricians and (2) to meet the phenomena of Acts 2.

3. The word γλῶσσα, in Hellenistic Greek, after the pattern of the corresponding Hebrew word (לָשׁוֹן), stands for “speech” or “language” (Gen 10:5; Dan 1:4, etc.). The received traditional view starts from this meaning, and sees in the gift of tongues a distinctly linguistic power. It commends itself, as in this respect starting at least from the right point, and likely to lead us to the truth (comp. Olshausen, Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 538). Variations as well as objections and difficulties arising from this interpretation will be considered below.

II. History and Explanation of the Biblical Occurrences. —The principal passages from which we have to draw our conclusion as to the nature and purpose of the gift in question are (1) Mar 16:17; (2) Act 2:1-13; Act 10:46; Act 19:6; (3) 1Co 12:14. Besides these, we may derive some light from later allusions incidentally made to these phenomena. We  here consider them in their chronological order, with such inferences as are suggested by them.

1. The promise of a new power coming from the Divine Spirit, giving not only comfort and insight into truth, but fresh powers of utterance of some kind, appears once and again in our Lord's teaching. The disciples are to take no thought what they shall speak, for the Spirit of their Father shall speak in them (Mat 10:19-20; Mar 13:11). The lips of Galilaean peasants are to speak freely and boldly before kings. The only condition is that they are “not to premeditate” to yield themselves altogether to the power that works on them. Thus they shall have given to them “a mouth and wisdom” which no adversary shall be able “to gainsay or resist.” In Mar 16:17 we have a more definite term employed: “They shall speak with new tongues” (καιναῖς γλώσσαις). It can hardly be questioned that the obvious meaning of the promise, is that the disciples should speak in new languages which they had not learned as other men learn them. The promise itself, however, determines little definite as to the nature of the gift or the purpose for which it was to be employed. It was to be a “sign.” It was not to belong to a chosen few only — to apostles and evangelists. It was to “follow them that believed” to be among the fruits of the living intense faith which raised men above the common level of their lives, and brought them within the kingdom of God.

2. The wonder of the day of Pentecost (Act 2:1-13) is, in its broad features, familiar enough to us. The days since the ascension had been spent as in a ceaseless ecstasy of worship (Luk 24:53). The one hundred and twenty disciples were gathered together, waiting with eager expectation for the coming of power from on high of the Spirit that was to give them new gifts of utterance. The day of Pentecost had come, which they, like all other Israelites, looked upon as the witness of the revelation of the Divine Will given on Sinai. Suddenly there swept over them “the sound as of a rushing mighty wind,” such as Ezekiel had heard in the visions of God by Chebar (Eze 1:24; Eze 43:2), at all times the recognized symbol of a spiritual creative power (comp. 37:1-14; Gen 1:2; 1Ki 19:11; 2Ch 5:14; Psa 104:3-4). With this there was another sign associated even more closely with their thoughts of the day of Pentecost. There appeared unto them “tongues like as of fire.” Of old the brightness had been seen gleaming through the “thick cloud” (Exo 19:18) or “enfolding” the divine glory (Eze 1:4). Now the tongues were distributed (διαμεριζομεναι), lighting upon each  of them. The outward symbol was accompanied by an inward change. They were “filled with the Holy Spirit,” as the Baptist and their Lord had been (Luk 1:15; Luk 4:1), though they themselves had as yet no experience of a like kind. “They began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.” The narrative that follows leaves hardly any room for doubt that the writer meant to convey the, impression that the disciples were heard to speak in languages of which they had no colloquial knowledge previously. The direct statement, “They heard them speaking, each man in his own dialect,” the long list of nations, the words put into the lips of the hearers these can scarcely reconciled with the theories of Bleek, Herder, and Bunsen without a willful distortion of the evidence.

Having thus recited the facts in this case, we inquire, What view are we to take of a phenomenon so marvelous and exceptional? Let us first consider what views men have actually taken.

(1.) The prevalent belief of the Church has been that in the Pentecostal gift the disciples received a supernatural knowledge of all such languages, as they needed for their work as evangelists. The knowledge was permanent, and could be used at their own will, as if it had been acquired in the common order of things. With this they went forth to preach to the nations. Differences of opinion are found as to special points. Augustine thought that each disciple spoke in all languages (De Verb. Apost. 175, 3); Chrysostom that each had. a special language assigned to, him, and that this was the indication of the country which he was called to evangelize (Hom. in Acts 2). Some thought that the number of languages spoken was seventy or seventy-five, after, the number of the sons: of Noah (Genesis 10) or the sons of Jacob (ch. 46), or one hundred and twenty, after that of the disciples (comp. Baronius, Annul. 1, 97). Most were, agreed in seeing in the Pentecostal gift the antithesis to the confusion of tongues at Babel, the witness of a restored unity. “Poena linguarum dispersit homines, donunm linguarum dispersos in unum populum collegit” (Grotius, ad loc.).

We notice incidentally that parallels have been sought ill Israelitihhishtory. For example, there had been, it was said, tongues of fire on the original Pentecost (Schneckenburger, Beitrage, p. 8, referring to Buxtorf, De Synag., and Philo, De Decal.). The later rabbius were not without their legends of a like “baptism of fire.” Nicodemus ben-Gorion and Jochanan benZachai, men of great holiness and wisdom, went into an upper chamber  to expound the law, and the house began to be full of fire (Lightfoot, flari. 3, 14; Schöttgen, Hor. Heb. in Acts 2). Again, with regard to the more important phenomenon, it deserves notice that there are analogies in Jewish belief. Every word that went forth from the mouth of God on Sinai was said to have been divided into the seventy languages of the sons of men (Wettstein, On Acts 2); and the bath-kol, the echo of the voice of God, was heard by every man in his own tongue (Schneckenburger, Beitrige). So, as regards the power of speaking, there was a tradition that the great rabbins of the Sanhedrim could speak all the seventy languages of the world.

The following are some of the direct arguments urged in favor of a literal view of the Pentecostal endowment:

“(a) The power in question was virtually promised to the apostles by the very duty assigned them. They were enjoined to ‘go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. They were to be witnesses for Christ in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth.' But how could they instruct remote tribes whose phraseology was a Babel to them, unless they were divinely qualified for the work?

(b) This power was in keeping with the occasion., The old economy was characteristically ritualistic. It addressed the eye, and made an impression by its superb ceremonial. The Christian dispensation was to be simple, and its strength would lie in the preaching of the word. To speak with other tongues was indeed a new thing on the earth, but so was the exigency, which rendered it appropriate. Judaism was local made purposely restrictive to preclude amalgamation with the heathen. Now there was to be catholicity, and what could better symbolize it in Christian agency than a competence to instruct the whole world, to be mouth and wisdom to all its inhabitants?

(c) We never read of foreign tongues creating any impediment to the spread of the Gospel, or requiring laborious application for the acquisition of them. If we look into modern missionary reports, we meet with a great deal about learning the languages of natives. Why is there nothing of the kind in the New Test., unless because they were acquired supernaturally?

(d) The account in Acts 2 is explicit, and allows of no uncertainty or evasion. The speakers were Galileans, capable at most of expressing themselves in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew; and a multitude of foreigners  from a great many regions heard themselves accosted as in the land of their birth. If the apostles spoke just as they might have been expected to speak, and with no more compass of expression than suited their-condition and history, why should any astonishment have been produced by their attainments? But the multitudes were confounded, and they were all amazed and marveled, not merely at the doctrines propounded, but, specifically, because every man heard them speak in his own language. How came Galileans, they asked, to be such linguists? to be so familiar with languages alien to their annals? There is here an obviousness of meaning which no subtlety or sophistry can ever explain away.”

Widely diffused as this view of the Pentecostal gift has been, it has been thought-by some, in some points at least, that it goes beyond the data with which the New Test. supplies us. Each instance of the gift recorded in the Acts connects it, not so much with the work of teaching as with that of praise and adoration; not with the normal order of men's lives, but with exceptional epochs in them. (In the first instance, however, the gift certainly was largely instrumental in the conversion of hearers; and even among the Corinthians [1Co 14:16-17] the utterance, when properly interpreted, was a means of general edification.) It came and went as the Spirit gave men the power of utterance in this respect analogous to the other gift of prophecy with which it was so often associated (Act 2:16-17; Act 19:6) and was not possessed by them as a thing to be used this way or that, according as they chose. (It appears, however, that even the prophetic afflatus was amenable to the subject's will [1Co 14:32], and the gift in question was to be voluntarily exercised or forborne [ 1Co 14:28-30 ].) The speech of Peter which follows, like most other speeches addressed to a Jerusalem audience, was spoken apparently in Aramraic. (But this does not prove that Peter always spoke in that language.) When Paul, who “spake with tongues more than all,” was at Lystra, there is no ‘mention made of his using the language of Lycaonia. It is implied, however, that either he or Luke understood it (Act 14:11).

It is rarely implied in the discussion of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 12-14 that the gift was of this nature, or given for this purpose. The objection that if it had been, the apostle would surely have told those who possessed it to go and preach to the outlying nations of the heathen world, instead of disturbing the Church by what, on this hypothesis, would have been a needless and offensive ostentation (comp. Stanley, Corinthians [2nd ed.], p. 261), may readily be met by the consideration that Corinth, as a seaport,  was almost as much a polyglot community as Jerusalem. Without laying much stress on the tradition that Peter was followed in his work by Mark as an interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής) (Papias, in Eusebius, II. E. 3, 30), that even Paul was accompanied by Titus in the same character “Quia non potuit divinorum sensuum majestatem digno Graeci eloquii sermone explicare” (Jerome, quoted by Estius on 2 Corinthians 2) they must at least be received as testimonies that the age which was nearest to the phenomena did not take the same view of them as those have done who lived at a greater distance. The testimony of Irenaeus (Adv. alcer. 6:6), sometimes urged in support of the common view, in reality decides nothing, and, so far as it goes, tends against it (infra). It is also affirmed that within the limits assigned by the providence of God to the working of the apostolic Church such a gift was unnecessary. Aramaic, Greek, Latin, the three languages of the inscription on the cross, were media of intercourse throughout the empire. Greek alone sufficed, as the New Test. shows us, for the churches of the West, for Macedonia and Achaia, for Pontus, Asia, Phrygia. The conquests of Alexander and of Rome had made men diglottic to an extent, which has no parallel in history. But it is one thing to speak in a language imperfectly acquired by speaker and hearer, yet foreign to them both, and a very different thing and one, we may add, highly important for the personal influence requisite to Gospel conviction to be able to converse fluently in the native tongue of the congregation. The objection that we have no evidence of any actual use of the voluntary power of foreign languages by the apostles in propagating the Gospel is merely negative, and cannot stand in the light of the facts recorded in the case under consideration. Equally inconclusive is the objection against the psychological character of the miracle of a sudden importation of a language not learned; for it lies with quite as much force against the communication of the knowledge of a future event, and indeed it would forbid not only all prophecy, but all inspiration itself. It is a suspicious circumstance connected with all this class of objections that their essence seems to lie in a crypto-rationalistic spirit, which really opposes the miraculous altogether, and seeks on every occasion to explain Scripture prodigies by natural causes. SEE MIRACLE.

(2.) Accordingly, some interpreters have advanced another solution of the difficulty by changing the character of the miracle. It lay not in any new power bestowed on the speakers, but in the impression produced on the hearers. Words which the Galilean disciples uttered in their own tongue  were heard by those who listened as in their native speech. This view we find adopted by Gregory of Nyssa (De Spir. Sanct.), discussed, but not accepted, by Gregory of Nazianzum (Orat. c. 44), and reproduced by Erasmus (ad loc.). A modification of the same theory is presented by Schneckenburger (Beitrage), and in part adopted by Olshausen (loc. cit.) and Neander ( Pflanz. u. Leit. 1, 15). The phenomena of somnambulism, of the so-called mesmeric state, are referred to as analogous. The speaker was en rapport with his hearers; the latter shared the thoughts of the former, and so heard them, or seemed to hear them, in their own tongues. There are weighty reasons against this hypothesis.

(a) It is at variance with the distinct statement of Act 2:4, They began to speak with other tongues.”

(b) It at once multiplies the miracle and degrades its character. Not the one hundred and twenty-disciples, but the whole multitude of many thousands, are in this case the subjects of it. The gift no longer connects itself with the work of the Divine Spirit, following on intense faith and earnest prayer, but is a mere physical prodigy wrought upon men who are altogether wanting in the conditions of capacity for such a supernatural power (Mar 16:17).

(c) It involves an element of falsehood. The miracle, on this view, was wrought to make men believe what was not actually the fact.

(d) It is altogether inapplicable to the phenomena of Corinthians 14.

(3.) Critics of a negative school have, as might be expected, adopted the easier course of rejecting the narrative either altogether or in part. The statements do not come from an eye-witness, and may be an exaggerated report of what actually took place a legend with or without a historical foundation. Those who recognize such a groundwork see in “the rushing mighty wind,” the hurricane of a thunder-storm, the fresh breeze of morning; in the “tongues like as of fire,” the flashings of the electric fluid; in the “speaking with tongues,” the loud screams of men, not all Galileans, but coming from many lands, overpowered by strong excitement, speaking in mystical, figurative, abrupt exclamations. They see in this “the cry of the new-born Christendom” (Büsen, Hippolytus, 2, 12; Ewald, Gesch. Is. 6:110; Bleek, loc. cit.; Herder, loc. cit.). From the position occupied by these writers such a view was perhaps natural enough. It is out of place  here to discuss in detail a theory, which postulates the incredibility of any fact beyond the phenomenal laws of nature and the falsehood of Luke as a narrator.

(4.) What, then, we finally inquire under the case in question, are the facts actually brought before us? What inferences may be legitimately drawn from them?

(a) The utterance of words by the disciples in other languages than their own Galilean Aramaic is, as has been said, distinctly asserted.

(b) The words spoken appear to have been primarily determined, not by the will of the speakers, but by the Spirit, which “gave them utterance.” The outward tongue of flame was the symbol of the “burning fire” within, which, as in the case of the older prophets could not without internal violence be repressed (Jer 20:9).

(c) The word used, ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, not merely λαλεῖν, has in the Sept. a special, though not an exclusive association with the oracular speech of true or false prophets, and appears to imply some peculiar and probably impassioned style (comp. 1Ch 25:1; Eze 13:9; Trommii Concordant. s.v.; Grotius and Wettstein, ad loc.; Andrews, Whitsunday Sermons, vol. 1).

(d) The “tongues” were used as an instrument, not simply of teaching, but also of praise. At first, indeed, there were none present to be taught. The disciples were by themselves, all sharing equally in the Spirit's gifts. When they were heard by others, it was chiefly as proclaiming the praise, the mighty and great works of God (μεγαλεῖα). What they uttered was not so much a warning or reproof or exhortation as a doxology (Stanley, loc. cit.; Baumgarten, Apostelgesch. § 3). The assumption, however, appears unwarranted that when the work of teaching began it was in the language of the Jews, and that the utterance of tongues then ceased.

(e) Those who spoke them seemed to others to be under the influence of some strong excitement, “full of new wine.” They were not as other men, or as they themselves had been before. Some recognized, indeed, that they were in a higher state, but it was one, which, in some of its outward features, had a counterfeit likeness in the lower. When Paul uses in Eph 5:18-19 (πληροῦσθε πνεύματος) the all but self-same word which Luke uses here to describe the state of the disciples  (ἑπλήσθησαν πνεύματος ἁγίου) it is to contrast it with “being drunk with wine,” to associate it with “psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs.”

(f) Questions as to the mode of operation of a power above the common laws of bodily or mental life lead us to a region where our words should be “wary and few.” There is a risk of seeming to reduce to the known order of nature that which is by confession above and beyond it. In this and in other cases, however, it may be possible, without irreverence or doubt following the guidance which Scripture itself gives us to trace in what way the new power did its work, and brought about such wonderful results. It must be remembered, then, that in all likelihood similar words to those which they then uttered had been heard by the disciples before. At every feast which they had ever attended from their youth up, they must have been brought into contact with a crowd as varied as that which was present on the day of Pentecost, the pilgrims of each nation uttering their praises and doxologies. The difference was that, before, the Galilean peasants had stood in that crowd neither heeding nor understanding nor remembering what they heard, still less able to reproduce it; now, they had the power of speaking it clearly and freely.

(g) The gift of tongues, the ecstatic burst of praise, is definitely asserted to be a fulfillment of the prediction of Joe 2:28. The twice-repeated burden of that prediction is, “I will pour out my Spirit,” and the effect on those who receive it is that “they shall prophesy.” We may see, therefore, in this special gift that which is analogous to one element at least of the προφητεία of the Old Test.; but the element of teaching is, as we have seen, not prominent. In 1 Corinthians 14 the gift of tongues and προφητεία (in this the New-Test. sense of the word) are placed in direct contrast. We are led, therefore, to look for that which more peculiarly answers to the gift of tongues in the other element of prophecy which is included in the Old-Test. use of the word; and this is found in the ecstatic praise, the burst of song, which appears under that name in the two histories of Saul (1Sa 10:5-13; 1Sa 19:20-24), and in the services of the Temple (1Ch 25:3).

(h) The other instances in the Acts offer essentially the same phenomena. By implication in Act 14:15-19, by express statement in Act 10:47; Act 11:15; Act 11:17; Act 19:6, it belongs to special critical epochs, at which faith is at its highest, and the imposition of the apostles hands brought men into the same state, imparted to them the same gift, as they had themselves  experienced. In this case, too, the exercise of the gift is at once connected with, and distinguished from, “prophecy” in its New Test. sense.

3. The first epistle to the Corinthians supplies fuller data. The spiritual gifts are classified and compared, arranged, apparently, according to their worth, placed under regulation. This fact is in itself significant. Though recognized as coming from the one Divine Spirit, they are not therefore exempted from the control of man's reason and conscience. The Spirit acts through the calm judgment of the apostle or the Church, not less, but more, authoritatively than in the most rapturous and wonderful utterances. The facts which may be gathered in this case are briefly these:

(1.) The phenomena of the gift of tongues were not confined to one Church or section of a Church. If we find them at Jerusalem, Ephesus, Corinth, by implication at Thessalonica also (1Th 5:19),.we may well believe that they were frequently recurring wherever the spirits of men were passing through the same stages of experience.

(2.) The comparison of gifts in both the lists given by Paul (1Co 12:8-10; 1Co 12:28-30) places that of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues, lowest in the scale. They are not among the greater gifts, which men are to “covet earnestly” (1Co 12:31; 1Co 14:5). As signs of a life quickened into expression where before it had been dead and dumb, the apostle could wish that “they all spake with tongues” (ibid.), could rejoice that, he himself “spake with tongues more than they all” (1Co 12:18). It was good to have known the working of a power raising them above the common level of their consciousness. They belonged, however, to the childhood of the Christian life, not to its maturity (1Co 12:20). They brought with them the risk of disturbance (1Co 12:23). The only safe rule for the Church was not to “forbid them” (1Co 12:39) not to “quench them” (1Th 5:19), lest in so doing the spiritual life of which this was the first utterance should be crushed and extinguished too; but not in any way to covet or excite them.

(3.) The main characteristic of the “tongue” (now used, as it were, technically, without the epithet “new” or “other”) is that it is unintelligible unless “interpreted” (διερμηνεύομαι to translate in course). The man “speaks mysteries,” prays, blesses, gives thanks, in the tongue (ἐν πνεύματι as equivalent to ἐν γλώσσῃ, 1Co 14:15-16), but no one understands him (ἀκούει). He can hardly be said indeed, to understand himself. The πνεῦμα in him is acting without the co-operation  of the νοῦς (1Co 14:14). He speaks not to men, but to himself and to God (comp. Chrysost. Hom. 35, in 1 Col.). In spite of this, however the gift might, and did, contribute to the building-up of a man's own life (1Co 14:4). This might be the only way in which some natures could be roused out of the apathy of a sensual life or the dullness of a formal ritual. The ecstasy of adoration which seemed to men madness might be a refreshment unspeakable to one who was weary with the subtle questionings of the intellect, to whom all familiar and intelligible words were fraught with recollections of controversial bitterness or the wanderings of doubt (comp. a passage of wonderful power as to this use of the gift by Irving Morning Watch, 5, 78).

(4.) The peculiar nature of the gift leads the apostle into what appears at first a contradiction. “Tongues are for a sign,” not to believers, but to those who do not believe; yet the effect on unbelievers is not that of attracting, but repelling. A meeting in which the gift of tongues was exercised without restraint would seem to a heathen visitor, or even to the plain common-sense Christian (the ἰδιώτης, the man. without a χάρισμα), to be an assembly of madmen. The history of the day of Pentecost may help us to explain the paradox. The tongues are a sign. They witness that the daily experience of men is not the limit of their spiritual powers. They disturb, startle, awaken, are given εἰς τὸ ἐκπλήττεσθαι (Chrysost. Hom. 36, in 1 Cor.), but they are not, and cannot be, the grounds of conviction and belief (so Const. Apost. 8). They involve of necessity a disturbance of the equilibrium between the understanding and the feelings. Therefore it is that, for those who believe already, prophecy is the greater gift. Five clear words spoken from the mind of one man to the mind and conscience of another are better than ten thousand of these more startling and wonderful phenomena.

(5.) There remains the question whether these also were “tongues” in the sense of being languages, of which the speakers had little or no previous knowledge, or whether we are to admit here, though not in Acts 2, the theories which see in them only unusual forms of speech (Bleek), or inarticulate cries (Bunsen), or all but inaudible whisperings (Wiieseler, in, Olshausen, ad loc.). The question is not one for a dogmatic assertion but it is believed that there is a preponderance of evidence leading us to look on the phenomena of Pentecost as representative. It must have been from them that the word tongue derived its new and special meaning. The  companion of Paul and Pami; himself were likely to use the same word in the same sense. In the absence of a distinct notice to the contrary, it is probable that the gift would manifest itself in the same form at Corinth as at Jerusalem. The “divers kind of tongues” (1Co 12:28), the “tongues of men” (1Co 13:1), point to differences of some kind, and it is at least easier to conceive of these as differences of language than as belonging to utterances all equally wild and inarticulate. The position maintained by Lightfoot (Harm. of Gosp. on Acts 2), that the gift of tongues consisted in the power of speaking and understanding the true Hebrew of the Old Test., may appear somewhat extravagant, but there seems ground for believing that Hebrew and Aramaic words had over the minds of Greek converts at Corinth a power which they failed to exercise when translated, and that there the utterances of the tongues were probably, in whole or in part, in that language. Thus the “Maranatha” of 1Co 16:22, compared with 1Co 12:3, leads to the inference that the word had been spoken under a real or counterfeit inspiration, “It was the Spirit that led men to cry Abba as their recognition of the fatherhood of God (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6). If we are to attach any definite meaning to the tongues of angels” in 1Co 13:1, it must be by connecting it with the words surpassing human utterance which Paul heard as in Paradise (2Co 12:4), and these, again, with the great Hallelujah hymns of which we read in the Apocalypse (Rev 19:16; Stanley, loc. cit.; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 6:117). The retention of other words like Hosanna and Sabaoth in the worship of the Church, of the Greek formula of the Kyrie Eleison in that of the nations of the West, is an. exemplification of the same feeling operating in other ways after the special power had ceased.

(6.) Here also as in Acts 2, we have to think of some peculiar style of enunciation as frequently characterizing the exercise of the “tongues.” The analogies which suggest themselves to Paul's mind are those of the pipe, the harp the trumpet (1Co 14:7-8). In the case of one “singing in the spirit” (1Co 14:15), but not with the understanding also, the strain of ecstatic melody must have been all that the listeners could perceive. To “sing and make melody” is especially characteristic of those who are filled with the Spirit (Eph 5:19). Other forms of utterance less distinctly musical, yet not less mighty to stir the minds of men, we may trace in the “cry” (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6) and the “ineffable groanings” (Rom 8:26), which are distinctly ascribed to the work of the Divine  Spirit. To those who know the wonderful power of man's voice, as the organ of his spirit, the strange, unearthly charm which belongs to some of its less normal states, the influence even of individual words thus uttered, especially of words belonging to a language which is not that of our common life (comp. Hilar. Diac. Comm. in 1 Corinthians 14), it will not seem strange that, even in the absence of a distinct intellectual consciousness, the gift should take its place among the means by which a man “built up” his own life, and might contribute, if one were present: to expound his utterances, to “edify” others also. Neander (Pflanz. u. Leit. 1, 15) refers to the ‘effect produced by the preaching of St. Bernard upon hearers who did not understand one word of the Latin in which he preached (Opp. 2, 119, ed. Mabillon) as an instance of this.' Like phenomena are related of St. Anthony of Padua and St. Vincent Ferrer (Acta Sanctorum, June 24 and April 5), of which this is probably the explanation. (Comp. also Wolff, Curie Philolog. in Nov. Test., Acts 2.)

(7.) Connected with the “tongues,” there was, as the words just used remind us, the corresponding power of interpretation. “It might belong to any listener (1Co 14:27). It might belong' to the speaker himself when he returned to the ordinary level of conscious thought (1Co 14:13). Its function, according to the view that has been ‘here taken, must have been twofold. The interpreter had first to catch the foreign words, Aramaic or others, which had mingled, more or less largely; with what was uttered, and then to find a meaning and an order in what seemed at ‘first to be without either; to follow the loftiest fights and most intricate windings of the enraptured spirit; to trace the subtle associations Which linked together words and thoughts that seemed at first to have no point of contact. Under the action of one with this insight, the wild utterances of the “tongues” might become a treasure house of deep truths. Sometimes, it would appear, not even this was possible. The power might be simply that of sound. As the pipe or harp, played boldly, the hand struck at random over the strings, but with no διαστολή, no musical interval, wanted the condition of distinguishable melody, so the “tongues,” in their extremest form, passed beyond the limits of interpretation. There might be a strange awfulness, of a strange sweetness as of “the tongues of angels;” but what” it meant was known only to God (1Co 14:7; 1Co 14:11).

(8.) It is probable that, at this later period, and in the Corinthian Church (which appears, from other indications to have been a decidedly sensuous one), the gift in question had somewhat degenerated from its Pentecostal  purity into a demonstrative form, in which the human fancy and nervous susceptibility had given a looser rein to the external manifestations of what was essentially and truly a divine impulse. The history of modern religious excitements affords abundant illustration of this tendency.

4. As to other indications in early times we may remark:

(I.) Traces of the gift are found, as has been said, in the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, the Ephesians. From the Pastoral Epistles, from those of Peter and John, they are altogether absent, and this is in itself significant. The life of the apostle and of the Church has passed into a calmer, more normal state. Wide truths, abiding graces, these, are what he himself lives in and exhorts others to rest on, rather that exceptional χαρίσματα, however marvelous, the “tongues” are already “ceasing” (1Co 13:8), as a thing belonging to the past. Love, which even when “tongues” were mightiest, he had seen to be above all gifts, has became more and more, all in all, to him.

(2.) It is probable, however, that the disappearance of the “tongues” was gradual. As it would have been impossible to draw the precise line' of demarcation when the προφητεία of the apostolic age passed into the διδασκαλία that remained permanently in the Church, so there must have been a time when “tongues” were still heard, though less frequently, and with less striking results. The testimony of Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 5, 6) that there were brethren in his time “who had prophetic gifts, and spoke through the Spirit in all kinds of tongues,” though it does not prove, what it has sometimes been alleged to prove, the permanence of the gift in the individual, or its use in the work of evangelizing (Wordsworth, On Acts 2), must be admitted as evidence of the existence of phenomena like those which we have met with in the Church of Corinth. For the most part, however, the part which they had filled in the worship of the Church was supplied by the “hymns and spiritual songs” of the succeeding age. In the earliest of these, distinct in character from either the Hebrew psalms or the later hymns of the Church, marked by a strange mixture of mystic names and half coherent thoughts (such, e.g., as the hymn with which Clement of Alexandria ends his Παιδαγωγός, and the earliest Sibylline verses), some have seen the influence of the ecstatic utterances in which the strong feelings of adoration had originally shown themselves (Nitzsch, Christl. Lehre, 2, 268).  After this, within the Church we lose nearly all traces of them. ‘The mention of them by Eusebius (Comm. in Psalms 46) is vague and uncertain. The tone in which Chrysostom speaks of them (Comm. in 1 Corinthians 14) is that of one who feels the whole subject to be obscure, because there are no phenomena within his own experience at all answering to it. The whole tendency of the Church was to maintain reverence and order, and to repress all approaches to the ecstatic state. Those who yielded to it took refuge, as in the case of Tertullian (infra) insects outside the Church. Symptoms of what was then looked upon as an evil showed themselves in the 4th century at Constantinople wild, inarticulate cries, words passionate but of little meaning, almost convulsive gestures and were met by Chrysostom with the sternest possible reproof (Hom. in Isa 6:2 [ed. Migne, 6:100]).

It thus appears that the miraculous gifts of the first days bestowed upon the Church for a definite purpose were gradually but quickly withdrawn from men when the apostles and those who had learned Christ from their lips had fallen asleep. Among these supernatural powers we can well believe that the earliest withdrawn were those new tongues first head in their strange sweetness on that Pentecostal “morning, needing then no interpreter; those tongues which during the birth throes of Christianity gave utterance to the rapturous joy and thankfulness of the first believers. They were a power, however, which, if misused might lead men as history has subsequently shown into confusion, feverish dreams, and morbid imaginings, a condition of thought which would utterly unfit men and women for the stern and earnest duties of their several callings in a word, a life unreal and unhealthy. Therefore that chapter of sacred history which tells' of these communings of men with the unseen, that beautified with unearthly glory the lives of the brave witnesses who first gave up all for Christ, was closed up forever when the “tongues” had done their work (see De Wette, Apostelgesch. p. 23, 26).

III. Ancient and Modern Quasi Parallels. A wider question of deep interest presents itself. Can we find in the religious history of mankind any facts analogous to the manifestation of the “tongues?” Recognizing, as we do, the great gap which separates the work of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost from all others, both in its origin and its fruits, there is, it is believed, no reason for rejecting the thought that there might be like phenomena standing to it in the relation of foreshadowings,  approximations, counterfeits. Other χαρίσματα of the Spirit, wisdom, prophecy helps, governments, had, or have, analogies, in special states of men's spiritual life, at other times and under other conditions, and so may these. The three characteristic phenomena are, especially in its Corinthian phase, as has been seen (a) an ecstatic state of partial or entire unconsciousness, the human will being, as it were, swayed by a power above itself; (b) the utterance of words in tones startling and impressive, but often conveying no distinct meaning; (c) the use of languages which the speaker was of himself unable to converse in.

1. The history of the Old, Test. presents us with some instances in which the gift of prophecy has accompaniments of this nature. The word includes something more than the utterance, of a distinct message of God. Saul and his messengers come under the power of the Spirit, and he lies on the ground all night, stripped of his kingly armor, and joining in the wild chant of the company of prophets, or pouring out his own utterances to the sound of their music (1Sa 19:24; comp. Stanley, loc. cit.).

2. We cannot exclude the false prophets and diviners of Israel from the range of our inquiry. As they, in their work, dress, pretensions, were counterfeits of those who truly bore the name, so we may venture to trace in other things that which resembled, more or, less closely, what had accompanied the exercise of the divine gift. And here we have distinct records of strange, mysterious intonations. The ventriloquist wizards (οἱ ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, ο‰ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν) “peep and mutter” (Isa 8:19). The “voice of one who has a familiar spirit” comes low out of the ground (Isa 29:4. The false prophets simulate with their tongues (Sept. ἐκβάλλοντας προφητείας γλώσσης) the low voice with which the true prophets announced that the Lord had spoken (Jer 23:31; comp. Gesenius, Thesaur s.v. נָא).

3. The quotation by Paul (1Co 14:21) from Isa 28:11 (“With men of other tongues [ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις] and other lips will I speak unto this people”) has a significance of which we ought not to lose sight. The common interpretation sees in that passage only a declaration that, those who had refused to listen to the prophets should be taught a sharp lesson by the lips of alien conquerors. Ewald (Prophet. ad loc.), dissatisfied with this, sees in the new teaching the voice of thunder striking terror into men's minds. Paul, with the phenomena of the “tongues” present to his mind, saw in them the fulfillment of the prophet's words.  Those who turned aside from the true prophetic message should be left to the darker, “stammering,” more mysterious utterances, which were in the older what the “tongues” were in the later Ecclesia. A remarkable parallel to the text thus interpreted is found in Hos 9:7. There also the people are threatened with the withdrawal of the true prophetic insight, and in its stead there is to be the wild delirium, the ecstatic madness of the counterfeit (comp. especially the Sept., ὁ προφήτης ὁ παρεστηκώς, ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος).

4. The history of heathen oracles presents, it need hardly be said, examples of the orgiastic state, the condition of the μάντις as distinct from the προφήτης, in which the wisest. of Greek thinkers recognized the lower type of inspiration (Plato, Timceus, 72 b; Bleek, loc. cit.). The Pythoness and the Sibyl are as if possessed by a power which they cannot resist. They labor under the afflatus of the god. The wild, unearthly sounds (“nee mortale sonans”), often hardly coherent, burst from their lips. It remained for interpreters to collect the scattered utterances, and to give them shape and meaning (Virgil, AEn. 6:45, 98 sq.).

5. More distinct parallels are found in the accounts of the wilder, more excited sects which have, from time to time, appeared in the history of Christendom. Tertullian (De Ania. c. 9), as a Montanist, claims the “revelationum charismata” as given to a sister of that sect. They came to her “inter dominica solemnia;” she was, “per ecstasin, in spiritu,” conversing with angels, and with the Lord himself, seeing and hearing mysteries (“sacramenta”), reading the hearts of men, prescribing remedies for those who needed them. The movement of the mendicant orders in the 13th century, the prophesyings of the 16th in England, the early history of the disciples of George Fox, that of the Jansenists in France, the revivals under Wesley and Whitefield, those of a later date in Sweden, America, and Ireland, have, in like manner, been fruitful in ecstatic phenomena more. or less closely resembling those which we are now considering.

6. The history of the French prophets at the commencement of the 18th century presents some facts of special interest. The terrible sufferings caused by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes were pressing with intolerable severity on the Huguenots of the Cevennes. The persecuted flocks met together, with every feeling of faith and hope strung to its highest pitch. The accustomed order of worship was broken, and laboring men, children, and female servants spoke with rapturous eloquence as the  messengers of God.... Beginning in 1686, then crushed for a time bursting forth with fresh violence in. 1700, it soon became a matter of almost European celebrity. Refugees arrived in London in 1706 claiming the character of prophets (Lacy, Cry from the Desert; Peyrat, Pastors: in the Wilderness). An, Englishman, John Lacy, became first a convert and then a leader. The convulsive ecstatic utterances of the sect drew down the ridicule of Shaftesbury (On Enthusiasm). Calamy thought it necessary to enter the lists against their pretensions (Caveat against the New Prophets). They gained a distinguished proselyte in Sir R. Bulkley, a pupil of Bishop Fell's, with no inconsiderable learning, who occupied in their proceedings a position which reminds us of that of Henry Drummond among the followers of Irving (Bulkley, Defence of the Prophets), here, also, there was a strong contagious excitement. Nicholson, the Baxter of the sect, published a confession that he had found himself unable to resist it (Falsehood of the New Prophets), though he afterwards came to kook upon his companions as “enthusiastic impostors,” What is specially noticeable is that the gift of tongues was claimed by them. Sir R. Bulkley declares that he had heard Lacy repeat long sentences in Latin, and another speak Hebrew, though, when not in the Spirit, they were quite incapable of it (Narrative, p. 92). The characteristic thought of all the revelations was that they were the true children of God. Almost every oracle began with “My child!” as its characteristic word (Peyrat, 1, 235-313). It is remarkable that a strange revivalist movement was spreading nearly at the same time through Silesia, the chief feature of which was that boys and girls of tender age were almost the only subjects of it, and that they too spoke and prayed with a wonderful power (Lacy, Relation, etc., p. 31; Bulkley, Narrative, p. 46).

7. The so called Unknown Tongues, which manifested themselves first in the west of Scotland, and afterwards in the Caledonian Church: in Regent Square, present a more striking phenomenon, and the data for judging of its nature are more copious. Here, more than in most other cases, there were the conditions of long, eager expectation fixed brooding over one central thought, the mind strained to a preternatural tension. Suddenly, now from one, now from another, chiefly from women, devout but illiterate, mysterious sounds were heard. Voices which at other times were harsh and unpleasing became, when “singing in the Spirit,” perfectly harmonious (Cardale, Narrative, in Morning Watch, 2, 871, 872). See the independent testimony of archdeacon Stopford. He had listened to the  “unknown tongue,” and had found it “a sound such as I never heard before, unearthly and unaccountable.” He recognized precisely the same sounds in the Irish revivals of 1859 (Work and Counterwork, p. 11). Those who spoke, men of known devotion and acuteness, bore witness to their inability to control themselves (Baxter, Narrative, p. 5, 9, 12), to their being led, they knew not how, to speak in a “triumphant chant” (ibid. p. 46, 81). The man over whom they exercised so strange a power has left on record his testimony, that to him they seemed to embody a more than earthly music, leading to the belief that the “tongues” of the apostolic age had been as the archetypal melody of which all the Church's chants and hymns were but faint, poor echoes (Oliphant, Life of Irving, 2, 208). To those who were without, on the other hind, they seemed but an unintelligible gibberish, the yells and groans of madmen (newspapers of 1831; passim): Sometimes it was asserted that fragments of known languages Spanish, Italian, Greek, Hebrew were mingled together in the utterances of those who spoke in the power (Baxter, Narrative, p. 133,134). Sometimes it was but a jargon of mere sounds (ibid.). The speaker was commonly unable to interpret what he uttered; sometimes the office was undertaken by another. A clear and interesting summary of the history of the whole movement is given in Mrs. Oliphanlt's Life of Irving, vol. 2. Those who wish to trace it through all its stages must be referred to the seven volumes of the Morning Watch, and especially to Irving's series of papers on the Gifts of he Spirit in vols. 3, 4:and 6; Whatever other explanation may be given of the facts there exists no ground for imputing: a deliberate imposture to any of the persons who were most conspicuous in the movement.

8. In certain exceptional states of mind and body the powers of memory are known to receive a wonderful and abnormal strength. In the delirium of fever, in the ecstasy of a trance, men speak in their old age languages, which they have never heard or spoken since their earliest youth. The accent of their common speech is altered; Women, ignorant and untaught, repeat long sentences in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, which they had once heard, without in any degree understanding or intending to remember them; In all such cases the marvelous power is the accompaniment of disease, and passes away when the patient returns to his usual state, to the; healthy equilibrium and interdependence of the life of sensation and of thought (Abercrombie, Intellectual Powers, p. 140-143; Winslow, Obscure Diseases of the Brain, p; 337, 360, 374; Watson, Principles and Practice  of Physic, 1, 128). . The medieval belief that this power of speaking in tongues belonged to those who were possessed by evil spirits rests, obviously, upon like psychological phenomena (Peter Martyr, Loci Communes, 1, 10; Bayle, Dict. s.v. “Grandier”).

We refer to the above singular phenomena of modern times not as genuine samples of the scriptural glossolalia, but as illustrating some of the physical and mental symptoms with which they were accompanied. In many instances, no doubt, the Biblical facts have been merely imitated, and in others they have exercised unconsciously a reproductive power. See Wieseler. in the Stud. u. Krit. 1838, 3, 703; 1839, 2, 483; 3. 752; 1843, 3, 659 sq.; 1847, 1, 55; also the monographs cited by Volbelding, Index Programmatum, p. 73.

IV. This subject is not merely curious and interesting, but full of practical moment.

1. It shows how well the Gospel message was accredited in its first promulgation. It fixes attention on the high consequence of preaching the Gospel; of declaring its message with a glowing, burning earnestness, anti of obtaining the live coal which is to kindle the heart from off God's altar.

2. Inasmuch as the tongues of fire appear to have rested on private Christians as well as apostles, and on women as well as men for no distinction, no exception, is made in the narrative we are admonished that all are bound in the measure of their ability to speak for God, to let no corrupt communication proceed out of their mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.

3. At the same time we are warned that the tongue might be had in its integrity while the fire was wanting or feeble Paul himself; though avowing that he could speak with tongues more than they all, felt the need of being prayed for by saints, “with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, that utterance might be given him, that he might open his mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel.”

4. We learn, finally, from the apostle that faith, hope, and charity were better than this physical endowment, as having a more abiding character.

## Tonsure[[@Headword:Tonsure]]

             (Lat. tonsura shaving) is a name given to the distinguishing mark of the clergy of the Romish Church, formed by shaving off some of the hair. The custom is said to have been introduced at the end of the 5th century. At an earlier period it was censured as unbecoming spiritual perons, on the ground of its being among the tokens of penance. Albaspinaeus notes “It was customary to use shaving even to baldness, and sprinkling the head with ashes, as signs of sorrow and repentance; but the priests of God were not to be thus treated;” which shows that the ancients then knew nothing of this as a ceremony belonging to the ordination or life of the clergy. The ancient tonsure, therefore, was not a shaven crown, for Jerome, Ambrose, and others, equally inveigh against this as a ceremony of the priests of. Isis; it was only an obligation on the monks and clergy to wear decent and short hair, as is evident from all the canons that appoint it. The tonsure in early times was called corona clericalis, and the clergy coronati, not, however, from their shaven crowns, but from the form of the ancient tonsure, which was made in a circular figure by cutting away the hair a little from the crown of the head and leaving a circle hanging downwards. At first the lowest church servants wore their hair short as a mark of servitude, and the monks, out of humility, imitated them, and in the 6th century the clergy adopted the fashion.

The form of the tonsure varied in different churches, and the varieties of it are of some historical interest. That of the Roman Church, called the “Tonsure of Peter,” consisted of shaving the crown as well as the back, of the head, so that there remained a circular ring or crown of hair. This was the form in use in Italy, Gaul, and Spain; In, the Scottish (or Irish) tonsure, which was in use in Ireland, in North Britain, and those parts of Germany in which the Irish missionaries had preached, the entire front of the head was shaved, leaving it bare as far back as the line from ear to ear. This tonsure was called “the tonsure of James,” and sometimes of “Simon the Magician.” The Greeks and other Orientals shaved the whole head. The supposed derivation of the Irish form of tonsure from the apostolic tires led to its being held both in Ireland and Britain, as well as other churches of Irish foundation, to be of the most vital importance, insomuch that the introduction of the Roman form was almost the occasion of a schism.

As to the signification of the tonsure, the catechism of the Council of Trent says that it was intended to signify that the ministers of religion are in  all things so to comport themselves as to carry about them the figure and likeness of Christ. Anthony, archbishop of Florence, says, “The shaving on the upper part of the head signifies that they ought to have a mind free for the contemplation of divine things. The tonsure over the ears denotes that they ought not to have dull senses, or be involved in worldly matters, which are designated by the hair. But the cut of the hair in form of a circle designates the royal dignity which they have and because they ought to regulate themselves and others according to the virtues.” The circle formed at the back of the head by the tonsure is enlarged as the person rises in ecclesiastical dignity. Originally the tonsure was merely a part of the ceremonial of initiation in orders, and was only performed in the act of administering the higher order but about the 7th century it came to be used as a distinct and independent ceremonial; and a question has been raised whether it is to be considered in itself as an order, and to be added to the list of what are called “minor orders.” The now received opinion of Catholic writers is that tonsure is not an order, but only a preparation for orders. Concealment had already been forbidden in Edgar's canon, and by Anselm, in 1102; and Peckham, in 1281, complains that the clergy covered it out of sight with hair laces. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 6:ch. 4:§ 16, 17; 7:3, § 6; Walcott, Sac. Archceöl. s. lt. Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Tooke, John Horne[[@Headword:Tooke, John Horne]]

             an English clergyman, the son of John Horne, was born in Westminster, June 25, 1736, and was educated at Westminster and Eton schools and St. John's College, Cambridge, graduating in 1758. He became an usher in a school at Blackheath, took orders, and served as curate in Kent. In 1760 he received priest's orders, and for three years had charge of the chapelry of New Brentford. After going to France as traveling tutor to the son of Mr. Elwes, of Berkshire, he returned in 1767 and took an active interest in politics, laboring to secure the election of his friend Wilkes from Middlesex. He became (1769) one of the founders of the “Society for Supporting the Bill of Rights,” but quarreled with Wilkes and was attacked by Junius, but successfully defended himself. In 1773 he formally resigned his living, designing to study law; and, rendering great assistance to a Mr. Tooke of Purley, in Surrey, was made by him his heir. He changed his name to Tooke in 1782, and received £8000 from the property. He opposed the American war, and, accusing the king's troops of barbarously murdering the Americans at Lexington, was convicted of libel, and  sentenced to one year's imprisonment and a fine of £200. When released, he applied for admission to the bar, but was rejected on the ground of being a clergyman. In 1790 he was defeated as a candidate for Parliament, and in 1794 was tried for high-treason, but was acquitted. Defeated again in 1796, he succeeded in 1801 in being elected to the House of Commons for the borough of Old Sarum; and retained his seat till the dissolution in 1802, the decision of Parliament (that no one in priest's orders could be a member) disqualifying him from sitting again. He retired to Wimbledon, where he died, March 18, 1812. Mr. Tooke published, The Petition of an Englishman (1765): — Sermon (before 1773): — Letter to John Dunnaing (1778, 8vo): — Letter to Lord Ashburton (1782, 8vo): — ῎Επεα Πτερόεντα, or the Diversions of Purley (1786, 8vo): — and other pamphlets. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Tooth[[@Headword:Tooth]]

             (שֵׁן, shen, ὀδούς). The Hebrew word is by some derived from שָנָה, “to change” or “repeat,” because the teeth are changed, or replaced by others; but it better comes from שָׁנִן, to sharpen. So likewise the Greek ὀδούς is said to be quasi ἐδούς, from ἔδω, “to eat;” and the Latin dens, quasi edens, “eating.” But the three words are probably all primitives, and the latter two at least are' etymologically connected with the English tooth.

I. In the singular this term occurs first with reference to the literal member itself in man, the loss of which, by violence, is specified by Moses, in illustration of his law concerning taliones, “tooth for tooth” (Exo 21:24). This outrage occurring between freemen (or between an Israelite and a foreigner, Lev 24:22) admitted, like other cases of maiming, most probably of a pecuniary compensation, and under private arrangement, unless the injured party proved exorbitant in his demand, when the case was referred to the judge, who seems addressed in Deu 19:21. The Targum of Jonathan renders the words, “the price of a tooth for a tooth,” in Exo 21:24, Lev 24:20, and Deu 19:21 (comp. Josephus, Ant. 4:8, 35, and SEE PUNISHMENT in this Cyclopaedia); but if a master inflicted this irreparable damage upon a servant, i.e. slave, of either sex, he was punished by the absolute loss of the slave's services (Exo 21:27), The same law applied if the slave was a Gentile, notwithstanding the national glosses of the Jewish doctors (Selden, De Jure Nat. et Gent. 4 ,  1468). Our Lord's comment upon the law (Mat 5:38), which was much abused in his time (Horne, Introd. 2, 377, 6th ed.), prohibits no more than retaliation upon the injurer (τῷ πονηρῷ), not such a defense of our innocence as may consist in words, but private revenge, and especially with such a disposition as actuated the aggressor, with impetuous rage or hatred. His exhortations relate rather to those injuries which cannot be redressed by the magistrate or by course of law; these we should bear rather than resort to revenge (see Rosenmüller, Grotius, and Whitby, ad loc.). Indeed, the hermeneutics of our Lord's precepts in his Sermon on the Mount require much knowledge, care, and discrimination, in. order to avoid a prima facie interpretation of them, which has often been given, at variance with his intention, subversive of the principles of natural justice, and productive of false ideas of Christian duty.

In Psa 3:7 we have לְחַי, for the human jawbone; for that of an ass (Jdg 15:15-17, σιαγόνα, “maxillam, i.e. mandibulam;” which becomes מִכְתֵּשׁin Jdg 15:19, τὸν λάκκον τὸν ἐν τῇ σιαγόνι “molarem dentem in maxilla asini”) SEE SAMSON; and for that of leviathan (Job 40:14, τὸ χεῖλος, naxillanr). See Jaw. A “broken (or rather bad, רָעָה, that is, decayed; Vulg. dens putridus) tooth” is referred to in Pro 25:19, as furnishing an apt similitude of “confidence in an unfaithful man in the time of trouble.” “The teeth of' beasts,” or rather “tooth” שֵׁן, is a phrase expressive of devastation by wild animals; thus, “I will send the tooth of beasts upon them” (Deu 32:24), שֵׁןאּבְּהֵמֹת (ὀδόντας θηρίων, dentes bestiarumz; comp. 2Ki 17:25).

The word is sometimes used metaphorically for a sharp cliff or summit of a rock (Job 39:28); thus, “‘The eagle dwelleth and abideth upon the tooth of the rock, עֲלאּשֵׁןאּסֶלִע(ἐπ᾿ ἐξοχῇ πέτρας, inaccessis rupibus). So also (1Sa 14:4), “a sharp rock on the one side and a sharp rock on the other side, שֶׁןאּהִסֶּלִע(ὀδοὺς πέτρας, quasi in modun, dentium scopuli); these eminences were named Bozez and Seneh.

II. TEETH, שַׁנִּיַם, shinna'yim (όδόντες), is found in the dual number only, referring to the two rows, yet used for the plural (1Sa 2:13). The word occurs first with reference to the literal organs in man (Gen 49:12), “His teeth shall be white with milk,” which the Sept. and Vulg. understand to mean “whiteness greater than milk”( ἣ γάλα, lacte candidiores; Num 11:33; Pro 10:26; Son 6:6). Although שַׁנִּיַם. be the general word for teeth, yet the Hebrews had a distinct term for the molars, or jaw teeth, especially of the larger animals; thus, מֵתִלַּעוֹת(Job 29:17; Psa 57:4; Pro 30:14; Joe 1:6); and by transposition מִלְתָּעוֹת(Psa 58:6, μύλαι, molce and 1inolares). The apparent teeth of the leviathan (gyrus dentium) are, however, called שְׁנִּים(Job 41:14). Ivory, “elephants teeth,” 1Ki 10:22, is simply שַׁנִּיַם(Sept. omits; Vulg. dentes elephantorum); dens in Latin is sometimes so used. In 2Ch 9:21 the word is שֶׁנְהִבַּים(ὀδόντες ἐλεφάντινοι, ebur), where שׁןevidently denotes a tooth; but the signification of the latter part, הִבּיםis unknown, and Gesenius thinks that the form of the word may be so corrupted as to disguise its original meaning. May it not be of foreign origin, imported with the material from Ophir? SEE IVORY.

In other passages the reference to teeth is metaphorical; thus, “a flesh-hook with three teeth,” that is, prongs (1Sa 2:13). SEE HOOK. “The teeth of lions” is a symbol of the cruelty and rapacity of the wicked (Job 4:10), “To take one's flesh into one's teeth” signifies to gnaw it with anguish (1Sa 2:13-14; comp. Rev 16:10). The skin of his teeth,” with which Job says he had “escaped” in his affliction, is understood by the Vulgate. of the lips” derelicta sunt tantummodo labia circa dentes meos;” but Gesenius understands it as a proverbial expression, meaning, I have scarcely a sound spot in my body. “To smite upon the jaw bone” and “to break the teeth” mean to disgrace and to disable (Psa 3:7; comp. Mic 6:13; 1Ki 20:35; Lam 3:30). The teeth of calumniators, etc., are compared to “spears and arrows” (Psa 57:4; comp. 1Sa 24:9). To break the teeth of such persons means to disable them (Psa 58:6). To escape the malice of enemies is called an “escape from their teeth” (Psa 124:6; Zec 9:7). Oppression is compared to “jaw-teeth like swords, and grinders like knives” (Pro 30:14).

Beautiful teeth are compared to “sheep newly shorn and washed” in Son 4:2; Son 6:6; but the remaining part of the comparison, “whereof every one beareth twins, and none is barren among them,” is much better rendered by Le Clerc,” all of them twins, and none hath lost his fellow.” To break the teeth with gravel stones” is a most hyperbolical metaphor for inflicting the harshest disappointment (Lam 3:16). “Iron teeth” are the symbol of destructive power (Dan 7:7; Dan 7:19). A nation having the teeth of lions, and the cheek-teeth  of a great lion, denotes one which devours with irresistible force (Joe 1:6; comp. Sir 21:2; Rev 9:8). “Prophets who bite with their teeth, and cry Peace,” are greedy and hypocritical prophets (Mic 3:5). “To take away blood out of the mouth, and abominations from between the teeth,” means to rescue the intended victims of cruelty (Zec 9:7). “Cleanness of teeth” is a periphrasis for hunger, famine (Amo 4:6; Sept. γομφιασμὸν ὀδόντων , Symmachus and Theodotion, καθαρισμόν). Gnashing of teeth means, properly, grinding the teeth with rage or despair. The Hebrew word so rendered is חָרִק(Job 16:9; Lam 2:16; Psa 35:16; Psa 37:12; Psa 112:10); it is invariably rendered in the Sept. βρύχω, and in the Vulg. Infremo, fremo, frendo (see also Act 7:54; Sir 51:2). In the New Test. it is said of the epileptic child (Mar 9:18), τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας, stridet dentibus. The phrase ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων is in the Vulgate “stridor dentium” (Mat 8:12; Mat 13:42; Mat 13:50; Mat 22:13; Mat 24:51; Mat 25:30; Luk 13:28). Suidas defines βρυγμός· τρισμὸς ὀδόντων. Galen, ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀδόντων συγκρουομένων ψόφος The phrase “lest thou gnash thy teeth” (Sir 30:10) is γομφιάσεις τοῦς ὀδόντας σοῦ. “To cast in the teeth” is an old English phrase (for the Hebrew has no such idiom), signifying to reproach; thus “the thieves who were crucified with Jesus cast the same in his teeth,” ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν (Mat 27:44; Vulg. improperabant ei; compare also the Bible and Prayer book version of Psa 42:11). פַּיפַיּוֹת, “a sharp threshing instrument having teeth,” literally “edges” (Isa 41:15). The action of acids on the teeth is referred to in tile proverb “the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge” (Eze 18:2): ἐγομφίασαν, obstupuerunt (Pro 10:26).

## Toparchy[[@Headword:Toparchy]]

             (τοπαρχία, government of a district), a term applied in one passage of the original of the Apocrypha (1Ma 11:28) to indicate three districts to which elsewhere (10, 30; 11:34) the name νομός is given, as also in Josephus (Ant. 13:4, 9). In all these passages the English version employs the term “governments.” The three “toparchies” in question were Aphserima (Α᾿φαίρεμα), Lydda and Ramiath. They had been detached from Samaria, Persea, and Galilee respectively, some time before the war between Demetrius Soter and Alexander Bala. Each of the two belligerents endeavored to win over Jonathan, the Jewish high-priest, to their side, by allowing him, among other privileges, the sovereign power over these  districts without any payment of land-tax. The situation of Lydda is doubtful; for the toparchy Lydda of which Pliny speaks (5, 14) is situated not in Persia, but on the western side of the Jordan. Aph-Eerima is considered by Grotius to denote the region about Bethel, captured by Abijah from Jeroboam (2Ch 13:19). Ramath is probably the famous stronghold, the desire of obtaining which led to the unfortunate expedition of the allied sovereigns Ahab and Jehoshaphat (1 Kings 22). Pliny (5, 14) mentions ten toparchies in Judaea, and so does Josephus (War, 3, 3, 5).

The “toparchies” seem to have been of the nature of the modern Turkish agaliks, and the passages in which the word τοπάρχης occurs all harmonize with the view of that functionary as the aga, whose duty would be to collect the taxes and administer justice in all cases affecting the revenue, and who, for the purpose of enforcing payment, would have the command of a small military force. He would thus be the lowest in the hierarchy of a despotic administration to whom troops would be entrusted; and hence the taunt in 2Ki 18:24, and Isa 36:9 (Sept.): τῶς ἀποστρέψεις τὸ πρὸσωπον (פִּחִת, “captain”) τοπαρχου ἑνός, τῶν δούλων τοῦ κυρίου μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων; — “How wilt thou resist a single toparch, one of the very least of my lord's slaves?” But the essential character of the toparch is that of a fiscal officer, and his military character is altogether subordinate to his civil. Hence the word is employed in Gen 41:34 for the “officers over the land” (פִּקַיד, “overseer”), who were instructed' to buy up the fifth part of the produce of the soil during the seven years of abundance. In Dan 3:3, Theodosius uses the word in a much more extensive sense, making it equivalent to “satraps” (אֲחִשְׁדָרְפְנִיָא, “wise”), and the English version renders the original by “princes;” but the original word here is not the same as in Dan 3:2; Dan 3:27; Dan 6:7, in every one of which cases, a subordinate functionary is contemplated.

## Topaz[[@Headword:Topaz]]

             (פַּטְדָּה,pitdah', apparently of non-Heb. etymology; Sept. τοπάζιον; Vulg. topazius), a gem which was the second stone in the first row of the high- priest's breastplate (Exo 28:17; Exo 39:10). It was one of the jewels that adorned the apparel of the king of Tyre (Eze 28:13); it was the bright stone that garnished the ninth foundation of the heavenly Jerusalem  (Rev 21:20). In Job 28:19, where wisdom is contrasted with precious articles, it is said that “the pitdah of Ethiopia shall not equal it.” It is, according to most ancient versions, the topaz (τοπάζιον; Josephuls, τόπαζος), which most of the ancient Greek writers describe as being of a golden yellow color (Strabo, 16:770; Diod. Sic. 3, 39); while Pliny (Hist. Nat. 37:32) states that its color is green. The topaz of the ancient Greeks and Romans is generally thought to be our chrysolite, while their chrysolite is our topaz. Chrysolite, which is also known by the name of olivine and peridot, is a silicate of magnesia and iron , it is so soft as to lose its polish unless worn with care (Mitchell and Tennant, Minecralogy and Crystallography; p. 512). SEE CHRYSOLITE.

“Bellermann, however (Die Urim und Thummim, p. 39), contends that the topaz and the chrysolite of the ancients are identical with the stones denoted by these terms at the present day. The topaz is a precious stone having a strong glass luster. Its prevailing color is wine-yellow of every degree of shade. The dark shade of this color passes over into carnation red, and sometimes, although rarely, into lilac; the pale shade of the wine-yellow passes into grayish, and from yellowish-white into greenish-white and pale green, tincal, and celadon- green. It may thus be difficult to determine whether the pitdah in the high- priest's breastplate was the yellow topaz; but that it was a topaz there is little reason to doubt. In the passage cited from Job the pitdah is connected with, Cush; and as the name Cush includes Southern Arabia and the Arabian Gulf, the intimation coincides with the statement of Pliny and others, that the topazes known to them came from the Topaz Island in the Red Sea (Hist. Nat. 37:8; comp. 11:29), whence it was probably brought by the Phoenicians (comp. Eze 28:13). SEE ETHIOPIA. Pliny adds, in explanation of ‘the name, that the island where these precious stones were procured was surrounded by fogs, and was, in consequence, often sought for by navigators; and that hence it received its name, the term “topazin” signifying, in the Troglodyte tongue, “to seek” (?).

It may be remarked that Bohlen seeks the origin of the Hebrew word' in the Sanskrit language, in which pita means “yellowish,” “pale;” and, as Gesenius remarks, the Greek τοπάζιο νitself might seem to come from the Hebrew Tif'5 by transposition into טפדה(Thesaur. p. 1101). See Braunius, De Vestitu, p. 508; Hofmann, Mineral. 1, 337; Pareau, Comment on Job. p. 333; Ritter, Erdkunde, 2, 675. SEE GEM.

## Tophel[[@Headword:Tophel]]

             (Heb. תֹּפֵל, mortar Sept. Τοφόλ; Vulg. Thophel), a place mentioned in Deuteronomy 1, 1 as a boundary (? on the N. E.) of the great Sinaitic desert of Paran. It has therefore been with great probability identified with Tufileh (comp. Schwarz, Palaest. p. 210) on a wady of the same name running north of Bozra towards the north-west into the Ghor and south- east corner of the Dead Sea (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2. 570). This latter is a most fertile region, having many springs and rivulets flowing into the Gh6r, and large plantations of fruit trees, whence figs are exported. The bird katta, a kind of partridge, is found there in great numbers, and the steinbock pastures in herds of forty or fifty together (Burckhardt, Holy Land. p. 405,406). The brook Tufileh, or its immediate neighborhood, is still the recognized boundary between Edom and Moab (Tristram, Land of Moab, p. 57).

## Tophet[[@Headword:Tophet]]

             (Heb. To'pheth, תֹּפֶתspittle, as in Job 17:6; i.e. abominable, or, perhaps, place of burning; Jer 7:32 second time]; Jer 19:11-12; with the art., 2Ki 23:10 [“Topheth”]; Jer 7:31-32; Jer 19:6; Jer 19:13-14; once Tophteh', תָּפַתֵּה, Isa 30:33; Sept. Τωφέθ, Ταθέθ, and θοφθά, Vulg, Tophet, Topheth), a place near Jerusalem, where the ancient Canaanites, and afterwards the apostate Israelites, made their children to pass through the fire to Moloch (comp. Psa 106:38; Jer 7:31). It is first mentioned, in the order of time, by Isaiah, who alludes to it as deep and large and having an abundance of fuel (Isa 30:33). He here evidently calls the place where Sennacherib's army was destroyed Tophet, by a metonymy; for it was probably overthrown at a greater distance from Jerusalem, and quite on the opposite side of it, since Nob is mentioned as the last station from which the king of Assyria should threaten Jerusalem (Isa 10:32), where the prophet seems to have given a very exact chorographical description of his march in order to attack the city (Lowth's Transl. notes on 30:33). In the reformation of religion by king Josiah, he. caused Topheth to be defiled in order to suppress idolatry (2Ki 23:10). The means he adopted for this purpose are not specified, whether by' throwing all manner of filth into it, as well as by overthrowing the altars, etc., as the Syriac and Arabic versions seem to understand it. The prophet Jeremiah was ordered by God  to announce from this spot (2Ki 19:14) the approaching captivity, and the destruction, both by the siege of the city and by famine of so many of the people, whose carcasses should be here buried, as that it should “no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter” (Jer 7:31-32; Jer 19:6; Jer 19:11-14). In all succeeding ages blood has flowed there in streams; corpses, buried and unburied, have filled up the hollows; and it may be that underneath the modern gardens aid terraces there lies not only the debris of the city, but the bones and dust of millions Romans, Persians, Jews, Greeks, Crusaders, Moslems. Once the royal music grove where Solomon's singers, with voice and instrument, regaled the king, the court, and the city; then the Temple of Baal, the high- place of Moloch, resounding with the cries of burning infants; then (in symbol) the place where is the wailing and gnashing of teeth. Once prepared for Israel's king as one of his choicest villas; then degraded and defiled till it becomes the place prepared for “the King,” at the sound of whose fall the nations are to shake (Eze 31:16); and as Paradise and Eden passed into Babylon, so Tophet and Ben Hinnom pass into Gehenna and the lake of fire. These scenes seem to have taken hold of Milton's mind; for three times over, within fifty lines, he refers to “the opprobrious hill,” “the hill of scandal,” the “offensive mountain,” and speaks of Solomon making his grove in “The pleasant valley of Hinnom, Tophet thence And black Gehenna called, the type of hell.” SEE GEHENNA.

The name Tophet was commonly supposed to be derived from toph, or drum, from the drums used to drown the cries of the children when made to pass through the fire to Moloch. This was a received Jewish opinion. But there are other derivations; that, for example, of Jerome, who from the root to open (פָתָה) ascribes to it the sense of latitude; of Rosenmüller, who connects it with a different root (יָפָה), and takes it to mean pleasantness; of Gesenius, who, from a Persian root, finds the sense of inflaming, burning; of Rödiger (in Gesen. Thesaur. s.v.), who takes it in the sense of filth, a view substantially concurred in by Böttcher, Hitzig, and Thenius, though derived in a different manner. This is, perhaps, the most probable opinion, as it seems, also, the most directly applicable to the place. See Böttcher, De Inferis, 1, 80,85; Panecius, De Topheth (Viteb. 1694).

Tophet lay somewhere east or south-east of Jerusalem, for Jeremiah went out by the sun gate, or east gate, to go to it (Jer 19:2). It was in  “the valley of the son of Hinnom” (Jer 7:31), which is “by the entry of the east gate” (Jer 19:2). Thus it was not identical with Hinnom, as some have written, except in the sense in which Paradise is identical with Eden, the one being part of the other. It was in Hinnom, and was, perhaps, one of its chief groves or gardens. It seems also to have been part of the king's gardens, and watered by Siloam, perhaps a little to the south of the present Birket el-Hamra. The New Test. does not refer to it nor the Apocrypha, nor yet Josephus. Jerome is the first who notices it; but we can see that by his time the name had disappeared, for he discusses it very much as a modern commentator would do, only mentioning a green and fruitful spot, in Hinnom, watered by Siloam, where he assumes it was “Delubrum Baal, nemus ac lucus, Siloe fontibus irrigatus” (in Jeremiah 7).. Eusebius, in his nonmsticon, under the word θαφέθ, says, “In the suburbs of Ailah is still shown the place so called, to which is adjacent the fuller's pool and the potter's field, or the parcel of ground Acheldamach.” Many of the old travelers (see Felix Fabri, 1, 391) refer to Tophet, or Toph, as they call it; but they give no information as to the locality. Every vestige of Tophet, name and grove, is gone, and we can only guess at the spot; yet the references of Scripture and the present features of the locality enable us to make the guess with the same tolerable nearness as we do in the case of Gethsemane or Scopus. For an account of the modern aspect of the place, see Robinson, Researches. 1,202 sq.; Kitto, Physical History of Palestine, p. 122 sq. SEE JERUSALEM.

## Toplady, Augustus Montague[[@Headword:Toplady, Augustus Montague]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Farnham, Surrey, Nov. 4,1740, and received his rudimentary education at Westminster School. It being necessary for his mother to visit Ireland to pursue some claims to an estate, he accompanied her there, and was entered at Trinity College, Dublin, from which he graduated. He received orders June 6, 1762, and, after some time, was inducted into the living of Broadhembury, Devonshire;, but on account of his health settled in London in 1775, where he officiated in the chapel of the French Calvinists, Leicester Fields. He died Aug. 11, 1778 and, agreeably to his own request, was buried in Tottenham Court Chapel. The fame of Mr. Toplady rests chiefly upon his controversial writings against the Methodists, and a few hymns. Against Wesley he may be said to have had a confirmed antipathy, and employed ridicule as well as argument in opposing his opinions and conduct. He published, The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination Stated and Asserted (Lond. 1769; N.  Y. 1773; later editions): — Letter to Rev. John Wesley (1770): — More Work for Rev. John: Wesley (1772, 8vo): — Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England (1774, 2 vols. 8vo): — The Scheme of Christian and Philosophical Necessity Asserted (1775, 8vo), in opposition to John Wesley's Tract on that subject: — (Collection of Hymns for Public and Private Worship (1776, 1787, 12mo): — Dying Avowal (1778), etc. He was for some years editor of The Gospel Magazine. His works were published after his death by his executor (1783, 8vo), with an enlarged Memoir (1825,6 vols. 8vo). One of his most celebrated hymns is:

“Rock of ages,

 cleft for me,

 Let me hide myself in thee,”

 etc.

See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Tyerman, Life and Times of John Wesley, 3, 139,190, 210; Belcher, Historical Sketches of Hymns, p. 248250; Christopher, Hymns writers and their Hymns, p. 46-49.

## Topographical Terms[[@Headword:Topographical Terms]]

             We have had continual occasion in this Cyclopaedia to point out the great accuracy with which these are used in the original languages of the Scripture, especially the Hebrew, although often obscured by the want of exactness and uniformity in the A.V. It is our purpose under the present head to present a general view of such terms, referring for details to the respective articles. Much has already been done in this direct ion by Dean Stanley in the appendix to his work on Sinui and Palestine. SEE GEOGRAPHY.

A. LAND.

I. Tracts (including especially depressions, levels, and barrens).

1. Émek (עֵמֶקֵ), a valley, used in general (Num 14:25; Jos 8:13; Jos 13:19; Jos 13:27; Jdg 1:19; Jdg 1:34; Jdg 5:15; 1Sa 6:13 [Bethshemesh]; 2Sa 18:18 [“dale”]; 1Ki 20:28; 1Ch 12:15; Jer 21:13; Jer 31:40; Jer 47:5; Jer 48:5; Jer 49:4; Mic 1:4); or specifically “vale of Siddim” (Gen 14:3; Gen 14:8; Gen 14:10), “valley of Shaveh” (Gen 14:17), “vale of Hebron” (Gen 38:14), “valley of Achor” (Jos 7:24; Jos 7:26; Jos 15:7; Isa 65:10; Hos 2:15), “valley of Ajalon” (Jos 10:12), “valley of Rephaim” (Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16; 2Sa 5:18; 2Sa 5:22; 2Sa 23:13; 1Ch 11:15; 1Ch 14:9; 1Ch 14:13; Isa 17:5),  “valley; of Jezreel” (Jos 17:16; Jdg 6:33; Jdg 7:1; Jdg 7:8; Jdg 7:12; Hos 1:5; probably also 1Sa 31:7; 1Ch 10:7), “valley of Keziz” (Jos 18:21), “valley of Beth-rehob” (Jos 18:28), “valley of Elah” (1Sa 17:2; 1Sa 17:19; 1Sa 21:9), “valley of Berachah” (2Ch 20:26), “valley of Baca” (Psa 84:6), “valley of Succoth” (Psa 60:6; Psa 108:7), “valley of Gibeon” (Isa 28:21), “valley of Jehoshaphat” (Joe 3:2), “valley of Decision” (Joe 3:14), “Beth-emek” (Jos 19:27).

2. Gey ( גֵּיאor גֵּי), a ravine (A. V. invariably “valley”), used generally (Psa 23:4; Isa 28:1; Isa 28:4; Isa 40:4; Jer 2:23; Eze 6:3; Eze 7:16; Eze 31:12; Eze 32:5; Eze 35:8; Eze 36:4; Eze 36:6; Mic 1:6; Zec 14:4-5), and specifically of Moab (Num 21:20 : Deu 3:29; Deu 4:46; Deu 34:6), Hinnon (Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16; 2Ki 23:10; 2Ch 28:3; 2Ch 33:6; Neh 11:30; Jer 7:31-32; Jer 19:2; Jer 19:6; Jer 32:35; prob. 1Sa 22:1; 1Sa 22:5; also “valley ate,” 2Ch 26:9; Neh 2:13; Neh 2:15; Neh 3:13), Jiphthahl el (Jos 19:14; Jos 19:27), Zeboim (1Sa 13:18; comp. Neh 11:34), Salt (2Sa 8:13; 2Ki 14:7; 1Ch 18:12; 2Ch 25:11; Psalm Ix, title), Zephathah (2Ch 14:10), Charashimim (1Ch 4:14 : “craftsmen,” Neh 11:35), “passengers” (Eze 39:11), Hamon gag (Eze 39:11; Eze 39:15), Ai (Jos 8:2), near the Jordan (2Ki 2:16), Gedor (1Ch 4:39).

3. Shaveh (שָׁוֵה), a dale, namely, of Kirjathhaim (Num 32:37), and the kings (Gen 14:17; in 1Sa 18:18 this word is not used).

4. Metsullch ( מְצֻלָּה) a dell (Zec 1:8).

5. Bikah (בַּקְעָה), a broad plain between mountains, used generally (Deu 8:7; Deu 11:11, Psa 104:8; Isa 41:18; Isa 63:14; Isa 40:4, “plain”): specifically “valley of Jericho” (Deu 34:3), “valley of Mizpeh” (Jos 11:8), “valley of Lebanon” (Jos 11:17; Jos 12:7), “valley of Meniddo” (Zec 12:11), “plain of Oinoi”, (Neh 6:2), “plain of Aven” (Amo 1:5), “plain of Dura” (Dan 3:1), “plain of Mesopotamia” (Eze 3:23-24; Eze 8:4; Eze 37:1-2; probably the same as “plain of Shinar,” Gen 11:2).

6. Mishor (מַישׁוֹר), downs or table-land, specifically of the plateau of Moab (Deu 3:10; Deu 4:43; Jos 13:9; Jos 13:16-17; Jos 13:21; Jos 20:8; 1Ki 20:23; 1Ki 20:25; 2Ch 26:10; Jer 21:13; Jer 48:8; Jer 48:21).

7. Sharan (שָׁרוֹן), a flat, specifically the pasture land along the Mediterranean (Jos 12:19; Son 2:2; Isa 33:9; Isa 35:2; Isa 65:1), perhaps that of Gilead (1Ch 5:16).

8. Shephelah ( שְׁפֵלָה), a low country, specifically the maritime plain (“vale,” Deu 1:7; Jos 10:40; 1Ki 10:27; 2Ch 1:15; “valley,” Jos 9:1; Jos 11:2; Jos 11:16; Jos 12:8; Jos 15:33; Judges 1, 9; Jer 32:44; “plain,” Jer 17:26; Oba 1:19; Zec 7:7'; “low plains,” 1Ch 27:28; 2Ch 9:27; “low country,”  2Ch 28:18; “Sephela,” 1Ma 12:38).

9. Midbar (מַדַבָּר), a wilderness in the sense of an open tract of unoccupied common, in general a “desert” or “wilderness” (Exo 3:1; Exo 5:3; Exo 23:31; Num 20:1 : Deu 33:10; 2Ch 26:10; Job 24:5; Isa 21:1; Jer 25:24, etc.); specifically that of Sinai (Num 33:15-16, etc.; “south,” Psa 75:6); sometimes (with the art.) fir Arabia in general, or for those parts of it which extend into Palestine (Gen 21:14; Jos 8:15; Jdg 1:16).

10. Arabah (עֲרָבָה), a desert as such, either generally (“wilderness,” “desert,” or “plain,” Job 24:5; Job 39:6; Isa 33:9; Isa 35:1; Isa 35:6; Isa 40:3; Jer 2:6; Jer 5:6; Jer 17:6; Jer 51:43; Amo 6:14; Zec 14:10), or specifically (technically, with the art.) the Arabah (“desert,” Eze 47:8; “plain,” Deu 1:1; Deu 1:7; Deu 2:5; Deu 3:17; Deu 4:49; Jos 3:16; Jos 8:14; Jos 11:16; Jos 12:1; Jos 12:3; 1Sa 23:24; 2Sa 2:29; 2Sa 4:7; 2Ki 14:25; 2Ki 25:4; Jer 39:4; Jer 2:7; “plains,” Jos 11:2; Jos 12:5; “champaign,” Deu 11:30; “Arabah,” Jos 18:18; “Beth-arabah,” Jos 15:6), or (in the plur. without the art.) the Ghor or “the plains” (2Sa 15:28; 2Sa 17:16) of Moab (Num 22:1; Num 26:3; Num 26:63; Num 31:12; Num 33:48-50; Num 35:1; Num 36:13; Deu 34:1; Deu 34:8) or Jericho (Jos 4:13; Jos 5:10; 2Ki 25:5; Jer 39:5; Jer 52:8).

11. Jeshimon (יְשְׁימוֹן), a waste, either generally (especially of the “wilderness” of the wandering, Deu 32:10; Psa 68:7; “desert,” Psa 78:40; Psa 106:14; Isa 43:19-20; “solitary,” Psa 107:4), For specifically the barren tract on both sides of the Dead Sea (“Jeshimon,” Num 21:20; Num 23:25; Num 33:49; 1Sa 23:19; 1Sa 23:24; 1Sa 26:1; 1Sa 26:3).

12. Kikkar (כַּכָּר), a circle (primarily and often, a coin or loaf), specifically (A. V. always “plain”) the floor of the valley through which the Jordan runs (2Sa 18:23; 1Ki 7:46; 2Ch 4:17; Neh 12:28), or the oasis that formerly existed in (the southern part of) it (Gen 13:10-12; Gen 19:17; Gen 19:25; Gen 19:28-29; Deu 31:3). Less distinctive than the above are the terms Geliloth (גְּלַילוֹת), circles, used in the general sense of frontiers (“borders,” Jos 13:2; “coasts,” Joe 3:4), or the windings of the Jordan (“borders,” Jos 22:10-11; “country,” Eze 47:8); Carmel (בִּרְמֶל), a park, employed (besides. its use as a proper name) in the general signification of a well- cultivated region (“fruitful field;” Isa 10:8; “fruitful place,” Jer 4:26; “plentiful field,” Isa 16:10; Jer 48:33; “Carmel,” 2Ki 19:23; Isa 37:24); Sadeh ( שָׂדֶה‘), arable land (“field,” country “land”); Shedemoth (שְׁדֵמות), highly cultivated: soil (“fields” of Gomorrah, Deu 32:32; Kidron, 2Ki 23:4; Jer 31:40; Heshbon, Isa 16:8; comp. Hab 3:17); Abel (אָבֵל), a meadow, employed as the name of a place, and usually in composition;. Maargh (מִעֲרֶה), an open tract (“meadows” of Gibeah, Jdg 20:33; perhaps for מְעָרָה, a cave; by others read ) מֵעָרִבfrom the west); Chelkch' (חֶלְקָה), a (smooth) plot of ground (often in general as a “portion”), in connection with Saddah (“piece,” “parcel,” etc.) or without it (“field,” “piece,” “plot,” etc.); Naphdh נָפָה), a height, only of Dor (“borders,” Jos 11:2; “coast,” Jos 12:23; “region,” 1Ki 4:11), or Napheth (נֶפֶת), in the same connection (“countries,” Jos 17:11); Chibel (חֶבֶל), a district (lit. as measured by Ai rope); applied as a general topographical division (“portion,” or “coast,” Jos 17:5; Jos 17:14; Jos 19:9; Jos 19:29; Zep 2:5-7), especially to Argob (“region” or “country,” Deu 3:4; Deu 3:13-14; 1Ki 4:13).

II. Elevations (considered as such, without reference to their extent of area).

1. Har (הִר), a mountain, employed for single summits (as Sinai, Gerizim, Zion, Olivet) or for ranges (as is Lebanon); also to the general backbone or  highland of Palestine, or of Judah, Ephraim, etc., in particular (A.V. “mountain,” “mount,” “hill''). Occasionally the cognate form har ( הֹרor הוֹר) is employed (usually with the art.), especially with reference to the well-known eminence of that name. The following are the various elevations to which hor is applied: Abarim, Amana (Son 4:8,), Ararat, Baalah, Baal-Hermon (Jdg 3:3; comp. Jos 13:5), Bethel, Bether (Son 2:7), Carmel, Ebanl, Emek (Jos 13:19), Ephron (Jos 15:9), Gesh, Gerizim, Gilboa, Gilead, Halak (Jos 11:17), Heres (Jdg 1:35), Hermon, Hor, Horeb, Jearim (Jos 15:10), Olivet (Zec 14:4; the word is not used in 2Sa 15:30), Mizar (Psalms 42, 6), Moriah, Nebo, Paran (Deu 33:2), Perazim (Isa 28:21), Samaria (1Ki 16:24), Seir, Sephar (Gen 10:30), Sinai, Sion (Sirion or Shenir, all names for Hermon, Deu 3:9; Deu 4:48), Shapher (Num 33:23), Tabor, Zai mon (Jdg 9:48), Zemaraim (2Ch 13:4), Zion. There re also the mountains of the Amorites, of the Amalekites (Jdg 12:15), of Ephraim, of Esau, of Israel, of Judah, of Naiphtali, and of Bashan (Psa 68:15).

The following subordinate terms are applied to parts or features of mountains in personification of the human frame: Irash (ראֹשׁ), head, the top (Gen 8:5; Exo 19:20; Deu 34:1; 1Ki 18:42); Aznoth (אִזְנוֹת), ears, perh. some projection on the summit (Jos 19:34); Kathliph (בָּתֵ, the shouolder, the brow (Deu 33:12; Jos 15:8; Jos 15:10; Jos 18:16); Tsad (צִד), the side or hill-slope (1Sa 23:26; 2Sa 13:34); Kisldth (כַּסְלֹת), loins or flanks, i.e. base (Jos 19:12; Jos 19:18); Tsla (צֵלִע), a rib, i.e. spur (2Sa 16:13); Shekm. (שְׁכֶם), back, i.e. rear (Shechein); Ammah (אִמָּה), elbow; bend (2Sa 16:2); Yerekah (יְרֵכָה), thigh, i.e. recesses (of Mount Ephraim, Jdg 19:1; Jdg 19:18; of Lebanon, 2Ki 19:23; Isa 33:24).

2. Gibah ( גַּבְעָה), a hill (as in the A.V. invariably), the Arabic Jebel, the common designation of less important or individual eminences; applied (besides its general use) to Zion (Isa 31:4; Eze 34:26), and to the following: the hill of the foreskins. (Jos 5:3), of Phinehas (24, 33), of Moreh (Jdg 7:1), of Hachilhh (1Sa 23:19; 1Sa 26:1), of  Ammah (2Sa 2:24), of Gareb (Jer 31:39); also an element of the proper names Gibeah, Geba or Gaba, and Gibeon.

3. Tel (תֵּל), a hillock (the Arabic Tell), is a diminutive mound or knoll,usually an artificial heap of rubbish (Deu 13:17; Jos 8:28; Jer 30:18; Jer 49:2); often an element of proper names, as Tel-Abib, Tel-llarsha, Tel-Melah.

The two following are other appropriations of appellatives as proper names than general designations of an elevated ground:

4. Pisgah, or rather hap-Pisgth (for it has the art. הִפַּסְגָּה), the height (comp. Eugl. “the summit”), vas probably the ragged edge of the table-land of Moab where it suddenly broke down into the declivity towards the Dead Sea (Num 21:20; Num 23:14; Deu 3:17; Deu 34:1).

5. Ophel (עֹפֶל), a swelling mound (so of tumors, Deu 28:27; 1Sa 5:6, etc.), is applied to Elisha's residence near Jericho (2Ki 5:24), elsewhere (with the doubtful exception of Isa 32:14; Mic 4:8) and everywhere with the art., to the sloping tongue of Mount Moriah on the south (2Ch 27:3; 2Ch 33:14; Neh 3:26-27; Neh 11:21).

The following, likewise, are rather designations of portions or elements of hills than the elevations themselves:

6. Maaleh (מִעֲלֶה), an ascent or rise, used (besides its common meaning, Jdg 8:13) of several localities that of the Scorpions (Num 34:4; Jos 15:3), of Adummim (Jos 15:7; Jos 18:17), of Gur (2Ki 9:27), of Ziz (2Ch 20:16), of Luhith (Isa 15:5; Jer 48:5), of Bethhoron (Jos 10:10), of Olivet (1Ma 3:16; comp. 2Sa 15:13) and Saul's city [probably Bethlehem] (1Sa 9:11)

7. Morád (מוֹרָד), a descent or fall, applied (besides its general use, Mic 1:4) to the declivity of the Jordan valley (Jos 7:5), of Bethhoron (Jos 10:10; 1Ma 3:24), of Horouaim (Jer 48:5), and Olivet (κατάβασις, Luk 19:37).

8. Shephi (שְׁפַי), a bare spot on a hill (“high place,” Num 23:3; Isa 41:18; Isa 49:9; Jer 3:2; Jer 3:21; Jer 4:11; Jer 2:29; Jer 12:11; Jer 14:6).

9. Aruts ( עֲרוּוֹ), a precipice (“cliff,” Job 30:6).

10. Misgab (מַשְׂגָּב), a bluff or inaccessible steep, as a “refuge” (2Sa 22:3; Psa 18:2; Isa 25:12, etc.); with the art, a particular fortress of Moab (Jer 48:1).

11. Kephim (כַּפַים), crags or rough isolated “rocks” (Job 30:6; Jer 4:29), hence the Syriac name Ceihas. There remain the two distinctive terms for a stony prominence, with their concomitants.

12. Tsur (צוּר), Chald. and Arab. Tur, a rock or outstanding block of stone whether fixed or builder, of frequent occurrence (A.V. “rock”), both literally (2Ki 5:23, etc.) and figuratively (Psa 31:2; Psa 62:6, etc.), and in only a few cases referring to the height of the rock (Num 23:1; Psa 61:2, etc.); in one case assuming the dignity of a proper name, Tyre. It is specifically applied to Horeb (Exo 17:6), the rock of Obel (Jdg 7:25; Isa 10:26), and is an element of the names Helkath-hazzurim (2Sa 2:16), and Beth-sur (Jos 15:58).

In connection with Sela twice occurs the peculiar term Nekrah (נַקְרָה), a hole or “cleft” (Exo 33:22; Isa 2:21).

13. Sela (סֶלִע), a cliff or abrupt and elevated rock, especially in personification (Psa 18:2; Psa 42:9, etc,), and as a parallel with Tur (Psa 31:2-3; Psa 31:7-8; Psa 31:15-16; Isa 2:21 etc.). In the A.V. it is loosely rendered “rock,” “stone,” etc. It is applied generally to the spot in Ka'desh whence Moses brought forth water (Num 20:8; Num 20:10-11; Neh 9:15; Psa 78:16; comp. Tsur, in Ezekiel 17), to the rocks of Edam, (Jdg 15:8; Jdg 8:11) Rimmol (Jdg 20:45), and Sela-hlam- mahlekoth (1Sa 23:28); also as a proper name to Peta (with the art., 2Ki 14:7; 2Ch 25:12; and prob. Jdg 1:36; without the art., Isa 16:1; Oba 1:3).

In exclusive connection with Sela are found the following descriptive terms: Chagavim (חֲגָוַים), chasms (Son 2:14; Jer 49:16; Oba 1:3): Seph (סְעַי), a cleft (Jdg 15:8; Jdg 15:11; Isa 2:21; Isa 57:5); Tsechiach ( צְחַיחִ), a bald spot, as the summit (f a rock exposed to the drying sun (Neh 4:13; Eze 24:7-8; Eze 26:14);. Nekik (נְקַיק), a cranny or fissure (Isa 7:19 Jer 13:4; Jer 16:16); and Shen (שֵׁן), a tooth or sharp edge or end of a crag (Job 39:28; 1Sa 14:4-5); also as a proper name (1Sa 7:12).

B. WATER.

I. Flowing (including the valley or bed though which it courses); of these the first two are the most general and distinctively descriptive.

1. Nahar, ( נָהָר), a perennial river (as almost always rendered in the A.V.), the Arab. nahr ; used generally in the poetical books of watercourses and of the sea (Job 14:11; Job 20:17; Job 22:16; Job 28:1; Job 40:23; Psa 24:2; Psa 46:4; Psa 78:16; Psa 93:3; Psa 98:8; Psa 105:41; Psa 107:33; Son 8:7; Isa 18:2; Isa 18:7; Isa 33:21; Isa 41:18; Isa 42:15; Isa 43:2; Isa 43:19-20; Isa 1:2; Isa 56:12); also a stream of fire (Dan 7:10); and specifically to some of the great rivers of Mesopotamia and Egypt (Gen 2:10; Gen 2:13-14; Gen 15:18; Exo 7:9; Exo 8:5; 2Ki 5:12; 2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11.; 1Ch 5:26; Ezr 8:15; Ezr 8:21; Ezr 8:31; Ezr 8:36; Isa 18:1; Isa 19:5-6; Jer 46:7-8; Eze 1:1; Eze 1:3; Eze 3:15; Eze 3:23; Eze 10:15; Eze 10:20; Eze 10:22; Eze 32:2; Eze 32:14; Eze 43:3; Dan 10:4; Zep 3:10), especially the Euphrates (Isa 7:20; Jer 2:18; Mic 6:1; Mic 6:12; Zec 9:10), or that in connection with the Tigris (Aram-Niharaim, Gen 24:10; Deu 23:4; Jdg 1:2; Jdg 1:8; Psalms 60 title; 1Ch 19:6), but never the Jordan (unless, perhaps, that or the Dead Sea be intended in Psa 61:6; Psa 74:15; Hab 3:8-9) and with the art. it specifically decimates the Euphrates, either alone (Gen 31:21; Gen 36:37; Exo 23:31; Num 22:5; Num 24:6; Jos 24:2-3; Jos 24:14-15; 2Sa 10:16; 1Ki 4:21; 1Ki 4:24; 1Ki 14:5; 1 Kings 15; 1Ch 1:48; 1Ch 19:16; 2Ch 9:26; Neh 2:9; Neh 3:7; Psa 72:8; Psa 30:11; Isa 8:7; Isa 11:15; Isa 27:12; Isa 48:18; Isa 59:19; and so is the phrase in Ezra, “beyond the river”) or with the name added (Gen 2:14; Gen 15:18; Deu 1:7; Deu 11:24; Jos 1:4; 2Sa 8:3; 2Ki 24:7; 1Ch 5:9; 1Ch 18:3; Jer 46:2; Jer 46:6; Jer 46:10); while in the plural it apparently denotes the canals or branches of the same river (Psa 89:25; Psa 137:1; Isa 44:27; Isa 47:2; Eze 31:4; Eze 31:15 : Nah 1:4; Nah 2:6).

The following are the terms which, in the imagery of the East, are applied to the various parts of a river: Yad (יָד), at “hand” or side, either right or left (Num 13:29; Deu 2:37; Jdg 11:26); Saphcah (שָׂפָה), a “lip” or brink of a river or of the sea (Gen 22:17; Gen 41:3; Gen 41:17;  Exo 2:3; Exo 7:15; Exo 14:30; Deu 2:36; Deu 4:48; Jos 11:4; Jos 12:2; Jos 13:9; Jos 13:16; Jdg 7:12; Jdg 7:22; 1Sa 13:5; 1Ki 4:29; 1Ki 9:26 : 2Ki 2:13; 2Ch 8:17; Eze 47:6-7; Eze 47:12; Dan 12:5; and so of the molten sea, of Solomon's Temple, 1Ki 7:23; 1Ki 7:26; 2Ch 4:2); Lashon (לָשׁוֹן), a “tongue” or bay (Jos 15:2; Jos 15:5; Jos 18:19; Isa 11:15);Gedoth (גְּדוֹת), banks (of the Jordan, Jos 3:15; Jos 4:18; 1Ch 12:15; or of the Euphrates, Psa 8:7); Katseh (קָצֵה), the extreme limit or end (1Sa 14:27), whether of a river (Jos 15:5; Jos 18:19), of the water (Jos 3:8; Jos 3:15), or of: a lake (Num 34:3; Jos 15:2), and so of a country (Gen 47:21; Exo 13:20; Num 33:3 a mountain (Exo 19:12; Jos 18:16), and a town (Jos 18:15; 1Sa 14:2); Maabirs (מִעֲבָר), Mabarah (מִעְבָּרָה), a ford (as of the Jordan, Jos 2:7; Jdg 3:18; Jdg 12:6; the Jabbok, Gen 32:22; or the Arunon, Isa 16:2), and so a pass between hills (at Michmash, 1Sa 13:23; 1Sa 14:4; Isa 10:29; Jer 2:32).

2. Nachal (נִחִל), a brook or summer watercourse, the Arabic wady, signifying both the stream and the torrent-bed or valley (translated very. variously in tie A.V., “brook,” “valley,” “‘river,” “stream,” etc.); it is applied to the following places: the torrent of Gerar (Gen 26:17; 1Sa 15:5), of Eshcol (Num 13:23-24; Num 32:9), of Zered (Num 21:12; Deu 2:13; perhaps Isa 15:7; Amo 6:14), the Arnon (Num 21:14; Deu 2:24; Deu 3:8), of Jabbok (Deu 2:37), of Kaulah (Jos 16:8), of Kishon: (Jdg 4:7; 1Ki 18:40; Psa 83:9; probably Jos 19:11), of Besor (1Sa 30:9), of Sorek (Jdg 16:4), of Kedron (2Sa 15:23; 1Ki 2:3; Jer 31:40) of Gaash (2Sa 23:30; 1Ch 11:32); of Cherith (1Ki 17:3; perhaps 2Sa 24:5), of Egypt (the Wady el Arish, Num 34:5; Jos 15:4; Isa 37:12), of Shittim (Joe 3:18).

The following terms designate artificial or temporary flowings of water of greater or less extent, some of them of local use.

3. Yior ( יַאוֹרor יַאֹר), once (Ecclesiastes 24:27) Or ( אֹר, by abbreviation), is properly a canal (perhaps an Egyptian word), specifically a branch of the Nile (so in the plur., Exo 7:19; Exo 8:5; 2Ki 19:24; Job 28:10; Psa 78:44; Isa 7:18; Isa 19:6-7; Isa 33:21; Isa 37:25; Eze 29:3; Eze 4:5; Eze 4:10; Eze 30:12; Nah 3:8), and so the Nile itself (in the sing. Gen 41:1-3; Gen 41:17 : Exo 1:22; Exo 2:3; Exo 2:5; Exo 4:9; Exo 7:15; Exo 7:17-18; Exo 7:20-21; Exo 7:24-25; Exo 8:3; Exo 8:9; Exo 8:11; Exo 17:5; Isa 23:3; Isa 23:10; Jer 46:7; Eze 29:3; Eze 29:9; Amo 8:8; Amo 9:5; Zec 10:11), and in Daniel (Dan 12:5-7) the river Ulai, a similar alluvial stream.

4. Shichor (שׁחוֹר), a “black” or turbid stream, as swollen or discolored by showers, either generally (Isa 23:3; Jer 2:18) or specifically (the Belus, Jos 19:26; and perhaps the Arish, 13:3; 1Ch 13:5).

5. Peleg (פֶּלֶג), a channel, a poetical term for the divisions of a stream (Psa 46:4), such as the gullies of Reatbeli (Jdg 5:15-16), the subdivisions of an irrigating stream (Psa 1:3), contrasted with Jubol (Isa 30:25), or with Nahal (Job 20:17), or even the dew (Psa 65:9).

6. Mikal מַיכָל), a rivulet (2Sa 17:20).

7. Tealah (תְּעָלָה), a conduit or trench for water raised or poured out for irrigation, such as a ditch (1Ki 18:32; 1Ki 18:35; 1Ki 18:38), an aqueduct (2Ki 18:17; 2Ki 20:20; Isa 7:3; Isa 36:2; see also Job 38:25), or for a garden (Eze 31:4).

The following denote rainfall or its effects more or less direct.

8. Geshem (גֶּשֶׁם), a shower, i.e. sudden and heavy rain as it ordinarily falls in the East.

9. Zerem (זֶרֶם), a storm or violent and overwhelming rain (e.g. Job 24:8; Isa 25:4; Isa 28:2; Hab 3:10; comp. Mat 7:27).

10. Yubal ( יוּבָל), Yabul ( יָבָל), or Ubal ( אוּבָל or אֻבָל), a freshet or overflow of streams from rain (Isa 30:25; Isa 44:4; Jer 17:8); hence the Ulai itself, as liable to such inundations (Dan 8:2-3; Dan 8:6).

11. Aphik (אָפַיק), an outburst or crevasse in the bank of an alluvial stream or mountain torrent, throwing the water into new and destructive channels; a poetical term for any unusual rush (Job 6:15; Psalms 42, 1; Son 5:12; Isa 8:7; Eze 6:2; Eze 31:12; Joe 1:20, etc.).

12. Aphik (נזֵל), a gushing, as tears (Job 36:28; Isa 45:8), brooklets (Psa 78:16; Pro 5:18, etc.), or the sea (Exo 15:8).

13. Shibblleth (שַׁבֹּלֵת), a full stream (Psa 69:12; Psa 69:15; Isa 27:12).

14. Eshed (אֶשֶׁד), a rapid (Num 21:15; Jos 10:5; Jos 12:8); in the plur. especially the tumbling stream bursting forth from the roots of Pisgah (Deu 3:17; Deu 4:49; Jos 12:3; Jos 13:20).

15. Sheteph (שֵׁטֶ), a poetical word apparently for a local inundation (Job 38:25; Psa 32:6; Pro 27:4; Dan 9:26; Dan 11:22; Nah 1:8).

16. Mabbul (מִבּוּל), a deluge, as of the accumulation of waters in the sky (Psa 29:10), and especially Noah's flood.

II. Sources of supply, whether living or otherwise.

1. Ayun (עֲיַן), lit. “an eye,” hence a spring of natural Water open and running (A. V. usually fountain,” but unfortunately “well” in Gen 16:7; Num 33:9 [comp. Exo 15:27]; Deu 7:7; Deu 33:28; 1Sa 29:1; 2Ch 32:3; Neh 2:14; Neh 4:15; Neh 12:37; Pro 8:28). It is applied, in the nature of a proper name (being a marked feature of any locality) to the following places: simply Ain, a city of Simeon (Jos 15:32; Jos 19:7; Jos 21:16; 1Ch 4:32); the Ain, a landmark of Palestine (Num 34:11); the two Ains, i.e. Enam (Jos 15:34; comp. Gen 38:14; Gen 38:21); the spring of Jezreel (1Sa 29:1), of Harod (Jdg 7:1), the dragon spring (Neh 2:13), of Shur (Gen 16:7); also En dor, El eglaimn, En gannlim, En-gedi, Eim-haddah, Enih'ak-kore, En-hazr, En- mishuah,'En-iuimmon, En-rgel, En-shemesh, En-tappuah, and Enon.

2. Mayan ( מִעְיָן), a fountain consisting of a collection of springs (“fountain,” Gen 7:10; Gen 8:2; Lev 11:36; Psa 74:15; Psa 114:8; Pro 5:16; Pro 8:24; Proverbs 25; Proverbs 26; Son 4:12; Son 4:15; Isaiah 61:18; Hos 13:15; Joe 3:18; “well,” Psa 84:6; Isa 12:3; “springs,” Psa 87:7; Psa 104:10); hence (topographically) a place watered by springs (“fountain,” Jos 15:9; 1Ki 18:5; 2Ch 32:4;: “well,” Jos 18:15; 2Ki 3:19; 2Ki 3:25).

3. Motsa (מוֹצָא), a source or spring-head (“spring,” 2Ki 2:21; Isa 41:18; Isa 58:11; “watercourse,” 2Ch 32:30; “water- springs,” Psa 107:33; Psa 107:35).

4. Makor (מָקוֹר), a well-spring or vein of water (Lev 12:7; Jer 51:36; Psa 36:9; Pro 10:11; Pro 16:22, etc.).

5. Guillth (גֻּלּוֹת), boiling or bubbling springs, used only of those given by Caleb to Achsah, (Jos 15:19; Jdg 1:15); and in the shorter form Gal (גִּל), a heap or spring. (Son 4:12); hence billow of the sea (Psa 106:25; Isa 48:18; Jon 2:3, etc.).

6. Mabbua, מִבּוּעִ), a gushing spring (“spring,” Isa 35:7; Isa 49:10; “fountain,” Ecc 12:6).

The following represent (mostly artificial) collections or receptacles of water:

7. Beer (בְּאֵר), a well (as everywhere in the A.V., except “pit” in Gen 14:10; Psa 55:23; Psa 69:15; Pro 23:27) dug in the earth or rock and yielding a perpetual supply, three such are specially named (Gen 26:20-22), besides Jacob's (Joh 4:6), and one at Bahurim (2Sa 17:18). The word stands alone as a proper name (Num 21:16; Jdg 9:21), and enters as an element into the names Beer-Tahai-roi, Beer-sheba, Beeroth-benejankasm, Beeroth, Beer- elim, Baaluth-beer, Berothah, and Berothai. Cognate with this is

8. Bor ( בּאֹרor בּוֹר), a cistern (A.V. usually “pit” or “well”), whether dug (Deu 6:11; Exo 21:33; 2Ch 26:10) or built (Isa 14:19; Jer 2:13), and whether empty (and so often used for “dungeon,” Gen 37:20; Gen 41:14; Exo 12:29; 1Sa 13:16; 2Sa 23:20 : 1Ch 11:22; Jer 36:16; Jer 28:6; Zec 9:1) or as a receptacle of spring or rain water (Psa 7:15; Isa 11:15; Jer 6:7 [Kethib]; Eze 26:20, etc.). Special cisterns of this kind are sometimes mentioned, as they are next in importance to springs in the East; thus in Sechu (1Sa 19:22), of Sirah (2Sa 3:26), of Bethlehem (2Sa 23:15; 1Ch 9:17), at Mizpah (Jer 41:7; Jer 41:9; comp, 2Ki 25:25).

9. Berekah ( בְּרֵכָה); a pool (as uniformly rendered in the A.V.), the Arab. Birkah, an artificial tank for surface water. Special pools of this kind are  mentioned at Gibeon (2Sa 2:13), Hebron (2Sa 4:12), Samaria (1Ki 22:35), Heshbon (Son 7:4), and several at Jerusalem, e.g. the upper (2Ki 18:17; Isa 7:3; Isa 36:3), the lower (Isa 22:9), or old (Isa 22:11), the king's (Neh 2:14; Ecc 2:6), another (Neh 3:16), Siloam (Neh 3:15; Jos 9:7), Bethesda (Jos 5:2).

10. Mikveh (מַקַוֶה), a reservoir or large receptacle for water for irrigation, etc. (“gathering together,” Genesis 1; “pools,” Exo 7:19; “plenty [of water],” Lev 11:36; “ditch,” Isa 21:11).

11. Agam (אֲגָם), a pond of stagnant water (Exo 7:19; Exo 8:5; “standing water,” Psa 107:35; Psa 114:8; hence “reeds,” which abounded in such receptacles, Jer 51:32).

12. Keroth (כְּרֹת), pits or wells in holes dug to water sheep (“cottages,” Zep 2:6); and so likewise Mikreh (מַכְרֶה), a pit for the same purpose (“salt,” Zep 2:9).

13. Mashabim (מִשְׁאֲבַים), troughs for watering animals (Jdg 5:11; comp. Gen 24:19-20; Gen 24:44-45, etc.).

The following are not employed with topographical exactness:

14. Geb (גֵּב) or Geb (גֶּבֶא), a ditch (2Ki 3:16; Isa 30:14; Eze 47:11); hence Gebim, a place near Jerusalem (Isa 10:31).

15. Pachath (פִּחִת), a hollow, used as a trap (“pit,” 2Sa 17:9; 2Sa 18:17; Isa 24:17-18;. Jer 48:43; Jeremiah 44; “hole,” Jer 44:27; “snare,” Lam 3:47). Akin to this is:

16. Shachath (שִׁחִת) or Sihtehah (שׁוּחָה), a pitfall, poetically used (variously rendered in the A.V., Psa 9:15; Pro 26:27; Jer 2:6; Jer 18:20, etc.).

17. Gumats (גּוּמָוֹ.), a deep hole or sunken shaft (Ecc 10:8).

18. Mahamarcah (מִהֲמָרָה), a gulf or whirlpool (“deep pit,” Psa 140:10).

III. Bodies of water and their connections. For these there really is but one Heb. term.

1. Yam (יָם), sea (as always rendered in the A.V. except when used for “west”), including lakes and expanses of rivers; applied specially to the Mediterranean (with the art., Jos 15:47; sometimes with other adjuncts, as “reat,” Num 34:6-7 :' “hinder” or “western,” Deu 11:24; and' so' sometimes when the situation is not west, as in. Egypt [Exo 10:19], Arabia, [27, 13; 38:12]), the Red Sea, that of Chinnereth, the Dead Sea (“salt sea” “sea of the desert” “eastern sea”); also (like the Arab. Bahr) of great rivers, as the Nile (Jer 19:5; Nah 3:8 : Eze 32:2), the Euphrates (Isa 27:1; Jer 51:26, finally of the laver in the Temple (1 Kings 25:18 1Ch 18:8). Connected with Yam are the following:

Miphrâts (מַפְרָוֹ), a bay (“breaches,” Jdg 5:17). Choph (חו), a shore, or rather perhaps cove (comp. “Haifa”), as a lesser form of the preceding: (“haven,” Gen 49:13; “side,” Deu 1:7; “Coasts,” Jos 9:1; “shore,” Jdg 5:1).

Machoz (מָחוֹז), a pot or “haven” (Psa 107:30).

Iyim (אַיַּם), islands, or the distant shores of the Mediterranean, which seemed such to the Hebrews (Eze 27:6; Jer 2:10, etc.).

Waves of the sea are represented (besides Gal, above) by Dakat ( דָּכַי), literally (Psa 93:3); Mishbar ( מַשְׁבָּר), an overwhelming, (metaphor “wave,” 2Sa 22:5; Psa 10:3; Psa 10:7; “billow” Jon 2:3); Bamah (בָּמָה), a light place, usually on land, but put (Job 9:8) for a ridge of the sea.

2. Tehom (תְּהוֹם), the deep, a poetical word for ocean, corresponding to our main (Gen 7:2; Job 28:14; Job 33:6; Job 33:30; Pro 8:27-28; Eze 26:19; Eze 31:15; Jon 2:6; Hab 3:10; fully “the great deep,” Gen 5:2; Gen 5:11; Psa 36:7; Isa 51:10; Amo 1:4); more rarely any other great mass of waters (as those covering the earth at Cioetiton, Gen 1:2; Psa 104:6 or the subterranean waters, Gen 49:25; Deu 33:13; also floods, Job 41:32; Psa 42:7; Eze 31:4). In the plural (תְּהֹמוֹת) it designates either the surges of the sea (Exo 14:5; Exo 14:8; Psa 33:7; Psa 77:16;Psa 106:9; Pro 3:20; Pro 8:24; Isa 13:13), or its alysses (Psa 107:26; Psa 135:6; Psa 148:7); occasionally the [depths of the earth (Psa 71:20), as supply of streams (Deu 8:7).

C. Accessories.

These are such features as to obviously affect the character of the country for purposes of occupation, but not, like the foregoing, of a permanently essential nature.

I. Internal (including natural cavities and grottos)

1. Mearah (מְעָרָה), a cave (“hole,” Isa 2:19; “den,” Isa 32:14; Jer 7:11), Alrab. Megharah, used as a proper name alone (Jos 13:4), but generally with the adjunct of locality of Adnullima (1Sa 22:1; 2Sa 23:13), Makkedah (Jos 10:16. etc.), Elngedi (1Sa 24:3), Obadiah (1Ki 18:4), Zoar (Gen 19:30), Machpelali, Horeb (1Ki 19:9).

2. Chor ( חוֹרor חֹר) and Chur (חוּר), ‘a hole in' the earth or rock (1Sa 14:11; Job 30:6), hence in the proper names Horite, Hanlran, Beth-horlon, Hooronaimili Hor-bagidgad.

3. Mechillah (מְחַלָּה), a fissure or cavern (Isa 2:19).

4. Minharcah (מַנְהָרָה), a burrow or hiding-place (Jdg 6:2).

II. Superficial (including objects of natural growth, such as conspicuous and enduring vegetation).

1. Yáar (יִעִר), a forest or dense growth of trees, but occasionally a thicket only (Isa 21:13). In the historical books it is the usual name for the wooded tracts of Palestine, whether east or west of the Jordan; namely, the “forest of Hareth” ‘(1Sa 22:5), “the forest of Lebanon” (1Ki 7:2; 1Ki 10:17; 1Ki 10:22; 2Ch 9:16; 2Ch 9:20), “the wood of Ephrainim” (2Sa 18:6; 2Sa 18:8; 2Sa 18:17;: see also Jos 17:15; Jos 17:18; 1Sa 14:25-26; 2Ki 2:24). In the poetical parts of Scripture it often occurs, and is translated:” forest” (but “wood” in Deu 19:5; 1Ch 16:33; Psa 80:13; Psa 83:14; Psa 96:12; Ecc 2:6; Son 2:3; Isa 7:2; Eze 24:2 Mic 7:14), It forms and element of the names Kijathjearim and Mount Jeaiim (Jos 15:10). In two passages (1Sa 14:27; Son 5:1) the word is applied to a honey-comb, which is the frequent product of forests.,

2. Choresh (הֹרֶשׁ), a wood, i.e. a thick growth of vegetation, whether in a single tree or in a copse: thus in Eze 31:3 it is used for the thick foliage (“shroud') of the cedar; elsewhere for a limited piece of wood (“forests,” 2Ch 27:4; “bough,” Isa 17:9; “wood of Ziph,” 1Sa 23:15-16; 1Sa 23:18-19).

3. Pardes (פִּרְדֵּס), a Persian word for a park or plantation of timber (“forest,” Neh 2:8) or fruit-trees (“orchard,” Ecc 2:5; Son 4:13).

4. Ets (עֵוֹ), a tree in the widest sense, whether an individual one (Gen 1:29; Gen 2:16; Deu 12:2; Jos 10:16 [comp. Act 10:38]; Isa 7:2, etc.) or “wood” as its product (Exo 7:19 : Lev 11:32; 1Sa 6:14, etc.); hence “timber” (1Ki 5:6, etc.), or a piece (“stick,” Num 15:32; 1Ki 17:10); sometimes as wrought (“taff” of a spear, 1Sa 7:7; “handle” of an axe, Deu 19:5).

The most important of generally used names of particular species of trees are the following, which (do not always seem to be used exactly or distinctively:

5. El in some of its various forms (all from איל אוּל, or אָלִל, to be strong), which, according to Gesenius, are used thus: Eyl may be either an oak or a terebinth; where Allon is opposed to Elah (as in Isa 6:13; Hos 4:13), the former is the oak, the latter the terebinth; on the other hand, all the Words appear to be interchangeable, f r the same tree which is Allon (Jos 19:33) is also in (Jdg 4:11), while that which is Elon (“plain” 9) is likewise Elah (Gen 35:4) and Allah (Jos 24:26). The following are several terms and their application:

Eyl (אֵיל), in the sing., occurs only in the combination El-parian (Gen 14:6); in the masc. plur. Eylim ( אֵיליםor אֵלַים) of a collection of trees (“oaks,” Isa 1:29 “trees,” Isa 61:3; Eze 31:4), and the proper name Elim (from the seventy palms there, Exo 15:27; Exo 16:1; Num 33:9-10). The fem. plur. Eyloth' (אֵילוֹת) or Elyilth (אֵילִת), as a p proper name Eloth or Elath, probably refers to the palm- grove at Akabah (Deu 2:8; 1Ki 9:26; 2Ki 14:22; 2Ki 16:6; 2Ch 8:17; 2Ch 26:2).  Elah (אֵלָה), designated a notable tree, perhaps the terebinth (“oak,” Gen 35:4; Isa 1:30; Eze 6:13; “elms,” Hos 4:13; “teil-tree,” Isa 6:3; with the art. Jdg 6:1; Jdg 6:19; 2Sa 18:9-10; 2Sa 18:14; 1Ki 12:14 “Elah,” 1Sa 17:2; 1Sa 17:19; 1Sa 21:9).

Eylon ( אֵילוֹן), a similar notable tree, perhaps the oak (“plain” of Moreh, Gen 12:6; Deu 11:30; of Mamre, Gen 13:18; Gen 14:13; Gen 18:1; of Zaanaim, Jdg 4:11; of the pillar, Jdg 9:6; of Monenim, Jdg 9:37; (Tabor 1Sa 10:3), and also stands as a proper name, Elon (Jos 19:43).

Ilon (אַילָן), a great tree (Dan 4:10-11; Dan 4:14; Dan 4:20; Dan 4:23; Dan 4:26).

Alliah (אִלָּה), a marked tree (“oak,” Jos 24:6), as. a prop. name Allah- milek (“the king's oak,”  Jos 19:26).

Allon (אֵלּוֹן), the same (“oak,” Gen 30:5; Isa 44:14; Amo 2:9; in connection with Elah, Isa 6:13; Hos 4:13; of Bashall, Isa 2:13; Eze 27:6 ch. Eze 11:3), and in the names Allon- bachuth (Gen 35:8) and Allon'zaanaim (Jdg 4:11), or simply Allon (Jos 19:33).

6. Eshel (אֵשֶׁל), prob. the tamarisk (“tree,” 1Sa 22:6; 1Sa 31:13; “grove,” Gen 21:3).

7. Asheráh (אֲשֵׁרָה), tendered in the A. V. “grove” was an idolatrous image or pillar of Astarte (Jdg 6:25-27), which, on account of its height, was planted in the ground, Deu 16:21; as at Samaria, 1Ki 16:32-33; 2Ki 10:20; 2Ki 17:16 : at Bethel; 2Ki 23:15; at Ophrah, Jdg 6:25; and even at Jerusalem,  2Ki 23:6; so in the plur. אֲשֵׁרַים, Baal's cippi, 1Ki 14:23, etc.); and hence the goddess herself (1Ki 15:13, etc.), among other species of trees that seem to have given names to localities we mention Rimmon, the pomegranate; Liz, the almond; Tamar, the palm; Shittah (in the plu. Shittim), the acacia; Libneh (or Jibnah), the white poplar; and Rithem (Rithmah), the Spanish broon.

III. Human structures (including residences or defenses), whether collective or individual, public or private.

1. Ir (עַיר) or Ar (עָר), a city (as always rendered in the A.V., except “town,” in Deu 3:5; 1Sa 16:4; 1Sa 23:7; 1Sa 27:5; Est 9:9; Jer 19:15; “court,” in 2Ki 20:4), designates a fortified place (2Ki 10:25; 2Ki 17:9; 2Ki 18:8; 1Ch 11:5, etc.), such as Jerusalem, Samaria, Jericho, etc., especially walled cities (Gen 23:10; Genesis 8; Gen 34:20; Gen 34:24; Jos 8:29; Jos 11:4; Jdg 16:2-3; Rth 3:11; 1Sa 23:7; 1Ki 4:13; 1Ki 17:10; 1Ch 11:9; 2Ch 8:5, etc..), in contrast with others (Lev 25:29; Lev 25:31; 1Sa 6:18); but in one case (Deu 3:5) we have “unwalled cities.” The former of these two cognate terms occurs as part of a proper name in Ir- hat-temaritm (Deu 34:3; Jdg 1:16; Jdg 3:13; 2Ch 28:15) Irham-melelach (Jos 15:62), Ir-shemesh (Jos 19:41), Ir-nahash (1Ch 4:12), Ir-ha-heres (Isa 19:18), Rechoboth-ir (Gen 10:11); the latter as Ar (Num 21:15; Deu 2:9; Deu 2:18; Deu 2:29) or Ar-Moab (Num 21:28; Num 22:36, Isa 15:1).

2. Kiryah (קַרְיָה), a town, apparently the aucient (hence their mnaauitish Kirjath) and poetical (but proverbial, Deu 2:36; Deu 3:4; 1Ki 1:41; 1Ki 1:45; or Slamauitan, Ezr 4:10; Ezr 4:12-13; Ezr 4:15-16; Ezr 4:19; Ezr 4:21) word for a city (Num 21:28; Psa 68:2 : Isa 25:2), especially in the proper names Kirjath, Kijnathainm, Kirjatih-arba, Kiljath-huzoth, Kirj atti-jearim, Kirj tharim, Kirjath-baal, Kirjath-sepher, Kirjth-satniah, Kerioth, anid Kiartch.

3. Perazah (פְּרָזָה, only with the plur. Perazoth, פְּרָזוֹת, and the collective Perazin, פְּרָזוֹן, or Perazi, פְּרָזַיunwalled town or open village of considerable size and character (Deu 2:5; 1Sa 6:18; Est 9:19; Eze 38:11; Zec 1:4; but “villages” in Jdg 5:7; Jdg 5:11; Hab 3:14, means chiefs), and in the designation of the Perizzites, or inhabitants of open villages.

4. Kaphar (כָּפָר), a hamlet or small collection of houses (“village,” 1Sa 6:18; 1Ch 27:25; Son 7:11), occurs chiefly in combination as a proper name: Chehar-ha-Amnmonai (Jos 18:24), Chephirah (Jos 9:17), Ciaphar-saba (1Ma 7:31), Caperniumin, and many Talmudic places (Caiphii), like the Arab. Kefr.

5. Chatser (חָצֵר), a village (literally an enclosure), originally a “court” or vestibule (as of the Tabernacle, Exo 27:9, etc.; or TempLeviticus , 1Ki 6:36; of a palace, 2Ki 2:4; Est 1:5; Jer 36:20; comp. Jer 36:22; prison, Neh 3:25; Jer 22:2, etc.; or even of a common house, 2Sa 17:18), but topographically designating a permanent Bedawin encampment of tent- cloths spread over stone walls (Gen 25:16; Isa 42:11), such as the Hazerim dwelt in (Deu 2:23). It appears especially in the proper names Hazeroth, Hazar-addar, Hazareth; Hazar-addah, Hazar-hat- ticon, Haza-shulal, Hazar-isth (or susim), and (in a slightly changed form, Chatsor, חָצוֹר), Hazor.

6. Chavvâh (חִוָּה), in the plur. (Chavoth, חִוֹת), a tent village of a more temporary or frail character than the preceding, was not being surrounded by any defense (“town,” Num 32:41; Jos 13:30; 1Ki 4:13; “Havoth,” Deu 3:14; Jdg 4:13). The following are rather separate erections or fortification than congregated abodes but they are of a fixed character in distinction from the simple and primitive Ohel ( אֹהֶל‘), or “tent.” For all these the general name is Bayith (בִּיַת), a house (as almost always rendered in the A.V.), which is the common expression for a fixed habitation (very generally as built [from בָּנָה] of substantial materials, but occasionally a frailer structure, Gen 10:17; Gen 10:15 : Jdg 18:31; 1Sa 1:7; 2Ki 18:7; Job 8:14), and for a permanent dwelling (as appears from the form of the letter called from it בwhich represents the three sides of a house, the other being left open for a doorway). The main element of the former and most enduring of these erections is denoted by the word Kr ( קירcognate with Kirch above), a wall (as of a house, whether exterior or interior, Lev 14:37; 1Sa 10:25; 1Ki 6:5; Eze 23:14, etc.; hence the side of an altar, Lev 1:5; Lev 5:9; a fence or enclosure, Num 22:25; and the will of a town, only Num 35:4; as the distinctive term for this last is Chomah, הוֹמָה; see Jos 2:15, where both occur together), which, itself is also used as a proper name, Kir (both in Moab, Psa 15:1; comp. 2Ki 3:25,; Isa 16:7; Isa 16:11; Jer 48:31; Jer 48:36; and in Assyria, 2Ki 16:9; Isa 22:6; Amo 1:5; Amo 9:7).

7. Heykal (הֵיכָל), a palace or, large edifice for royalty (Pro 30:28; Isa 39:7; Dan 1:4, etc.), especially the temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem (2Ki 24:13; 2Ch 3:17;  Jer 50:28; Hag 2:15; Zec 6:14-15; elsewhere distinguished by the epithet “holy,” or denoted by “Lord's house”); and so, of the tabernacle previously (1Sa 1:9; 1Sa 3:3; Psa 5:8; poetically for the heavens, Psa 11:4, etc.), specifically for the holy place (1Ki 6:5, etc.).

8. Binrâh (בַּירָה), a citadel (a word of wide etymological affinities, all denoting strength of defense SEE BARIS ), a term of later Hebrew (for the acropolis adjoining the Temple, Neh 2:7; or the Temple itself, 1Ch 29:19) or Chaldaic use (the Persian “palace,” Ezr 6:2 Neh 1:7; Est 1:2; Est 2:3; Est 3:15; Est 8:14; Est 9:6, etc.; Dan 8:2), and in the plur. (“castles,” 2Ch 17:12; 2Ch 27:4).

9. Armon (אִרַמוֹן, ounce (Amo 4:3) Harmony (הִרְמוֹן), the keep or harem of a “palace,” a poetical term (1Ki 16:18; 2Ki 15:25; 2Ch 36:19; Psa 48:3; Psa 48:13; Isa 25:2; Jer 17:21; Amo 1:4; Amo 2:2, etc.).

10. Tirah (טַירָה), a Bedawin castle (Gen 25:16; Num 31:10; “palace,” Eze 25:4).

11. Mibtsâr ( מַבְצָר), a fortress, commonly used with Irs (“fenced city,” Num 32:17; Num 32:36; Jos 10:20; Jos 19:35; 1Sa 6:18; 2Ki 3:19; 2Ki 10:2; 2Ki 17:9; 2Ki 18:8; 2Ch 17:19); such as Tyre (Jos 19:29; 2Sa 24:7), frequent in the poetical books (“fortress,” or “defensed city,” Psalm 29:40; Isa 17:3; Jer 1:8; Nah 3:12, etc.), as well as in the historical (“stronghold,” Num 13:19; 2Ki 8:12). Cognate is, Bitsaron (“Stronghold,” Zec 9:12).

12. Matsor (מָצוֹר) or Metsurah ( מְצוּרָה), a fort (A.V. “fort,” “fenced,” “stronghold,” etc.), either alone (2Ch 11:10), or ,within (2Ch 8:5; 2Ch 11:5; 2 Chronicles 10, 11, 23; 2Ch 13:4; 2Ch 14:6), to denote the fortified towns of Judah and Benjamin, once (Zec 9:3) Tyre and (especially in the poetical books) for offensive works of a siege (“siege” “bulwarks,” or “fort,” Deu 20:19-20; Deu 28:5; Deu 28:3; Isaiah 19; Nah 2:4 etc.) As a proper name (2Ki 19:24; Psa 19:6)] Mazor seems to denote Egypt (Miz-raim).

The remaining terms are rather designations of temporary and natural protection than artificial and settled abodes.

13. Maoz ( מָעוֹז), a stronghold, such as a “rock” (Jdg 6:26), elsewhere poetically as an attributive for military strength (“fort,” “fortress,” “stronghold,” “strength,” Psa 27:1; such as Tyre, Isa 23:4; Isa 23:11; Isa 23:14; or Egypt, Isa 30:2-3;).

14. Maoi (מָעוֹן) or Meonuah (מְעוֹנָה), a secure dwelling place, as of Jehovah (at Shiloh, 1Sa 2:29; 1Sa 2:32; at Jerusalem, Psa 26:5; Psa 68:5; Psa 76:2); and so a den (of a lion, Job 38:40; Psa 104:22; Son 4:8; Nah 2:11-12; Amo 3:4; or other beast, Job 37:5; Jer 9:11; Jer 10:22; Jer 49:33; Jer 51:37).

15. Metsad (מְצָד) or Metsudah (מְצוּדָה), a lair (from the idea of hunting), prop. of wild beasts and hence of birds (Job 39:28; Jer 48:41; Eze 17:20); frequent in the poetical books (“munition,” “fortress,” “defense”) connection with Sela and Tsûr; and topographically applied to the hill forts of Judean (“hold,” 1Sa 22:4-5; 1Sa 24:22; 2Sa 23:14; 1Ch 11:16; 1Ch 12:8; 1Ch 12:16; “fort,” Eze 33:27; “stronghold,” Jdg 6:2; 1Sa 23:14; 1Sa 23:19; 1Sa 23:29), especially Zion (“hold,” 2Sa 5:17; 1Ch 11:16 : “fort,” 2Sa 5:9; “castle” 1Ch 11:5; 1Ch 11:7; “stronghold,” 2Sa 5:7).

16. Sok, ( סֹךְ) or Sukkoh (סֻכָּה), a booth or ‘canopy of leafy boughs as a habitation for man or beast' (“booth,” Leviticus 22:42, 43; Neh 8:14-17; Job 31:20; Jon 4:5; “pavilion,” Psa 31:20; “cottage,” Isa 50:8; “tabernacle,” Isa 4:6), such as Jacob constructed (Gen 21:17), and the Israelites occupied during the Festival of “Tabernacles” (Lev 23:43, in commemoration of their first stopping-place out of Egypt, “Succoth” Exo 13:20), and hence applied to the retreat of the lion (“den,” Psa 10:9; “covert,” Job 38:40; Jer 25:38), and to Jerusalem, Jehovah's retreat (Psa 76:2), to military tents (“tent,” 2Sa 11:11; “pavilion,” 1Ki 20:12; 1Ki 20:16), and to the clouds (“tabernacle,” Job 36:29; “pavilion,” 2Sa 22:12; Psa 18:11).

17. Mistat ( מַסְתָּר), a covert or hiding-place (A.V. “secret” place, etc.), once (Isa 4:6, “covert”) Mistor (מְסתּוֹר), as a shelter from the elements (Isa 4:6), or concealment (Jer 13:17; Jer 23:24; Jer 19:10), and especially the lurking-place of lions (Psa 17:12;  Lam 3:10) and of violent men (Psa 10:5; Psa 10:9; Psa 64:4; Heb 3:14).

In connection with this whole subject, we may add that we have had frequent illustrations, in the aptness with which geographical names are given in the Bible, of that nice sense of locality which a simple people, especially one of nomadic instincts, invariably exhibits. Indeed, the whole Hebrew language is an exemplification, particularly in the varied import of the nearly synonymous roots which unfortunately the lexicons generally fail accurately to distinguish, of the close observance of all physical traits. In like manner the descriptions of locality, which, to a modern Occidental, often seem vague and casual, are generally found, when carefully scanned, to be remarkably precise and graphic, a fact, which later travelers are beginning to appreciate. Instances of this abound in the dooms-day book of Joshua, and many of them we lave pointed out under the art. TRIBE SEE TRIBE .

A question of much practical importance has arisen respecting the lists of towns in the various tribes given in that book, whether they are arranged in geographical order. The presumption, growing out of the minute character of the delineation, evidently copied from some memorandum of survey, is in favor of such accuracy, and this is confirmed by the fact now well recognized by commentators, that the list of nations mentioned in Act 2:9-11 proceeds regularly from the East to the West. Lieut. Conder, in his papers in the Quar. Reports of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,” bases many of his proposed identifications of places on this theory, which he elaborately defends. We are inclined, however, to doubt its trustworthiness for that purpose, as the Oriental mind is not so uniformly methodical as this view implies; and we have found very frequent reason to depart from such a rule in the indications of identification that we have pointed out under the various places named.

## Tor[[@Headword:Tor]]

             SEE TURTLE.

## Torah[[@Headword:Torah]]

             (fully Masseketh Sepher Torah, חורה מסכת ספר), or Treatise of the Law, is a Talmudic treatise containing enactments as to the manner in which, and the material on which, the law is to be written. The five chapters of which this treatise consist are full of information, especially the first and fourth; the former containing some notices concerning the Sept.,  the latter bearing on the sacred text. As to the Sept., see, under that head, Talmudic Notices concerning the Septuagint, in this Cyclop. The fourth chapter gives the passages in which the word אלהים denotes the Deity or has a different signification. These differences are also noticed in correct editions of the Hebrew text by the words קדש and חול, i.e. holy or profane, thus enabling the student at once. to discern whether אלהים should be translated God or gods, or judges, etc. This treatise has been edited, with six others, by Kirchheim (Frankfort-on-theMain, 1851), under the title ירושלמיות שבע מסכתות קטנות; also with the Latin title. Septenm Libri Talmudici Parvi Hierosolymitani quos nunc primum secundut us. Bibliotheca Clarissimi Carmolii edidit. etc. (B. P.)

## Torch[[@Headword:Torch]]

             is the occasional rendering in the A.V. of לִפַּיד, lappid (Zec 12:6), which usually signifies (and is translated) a lamp; and so λαμπάς (Joh 18:3). In Nah 2:3 [Hebrews 4] it represents

פְּלָדָה,peladdh, which rather signifies iron. SEE STEEL. The distinction in the East between a torch and a lantern (q.v.) is not very marked as both are often but forms of flambeaus. SEE LAMP. A flaming torch is sometimes quoted by the prophets as the symbol of great anger and destruction (Zec 12:6). So also Isaiah (Isa 7:4) compares Rezin, king of Syria, and the king of Israel, two bitter enemies to Ahaz, king of Judah, to “two tails of smoking firebrands.” SEE FIREBRAND.

## Tordesillas, Moses[[@Headword:Tordesillas, Moses]]

             a Jewish writer who flourished in 1373 at Avila, in Spain, is the author of האמונה עזר, in which he critically examines 125 passages of the Old Test. regarded by the Christians as Messianic. This work originated through a controversy, which he had had with a Jewish convert at Avila; and, for the benefit of the congregations of Avila and Toledo, he collected all the material which he laid down in his עזר אמונה, forming the second part of a work bearing the general title ס העזרthe first part of it being entitled הדת עזר. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 435; De' Rossi. Dizionario  Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 317 sq., and Biblioth. Jud. Antichrist. p. 26. (B.P.)

## Torgau, Convention of[[@Headword:Torgau, Convention of]]

             Among the German Reformers there was considerable difference of opinion on various subjects, which opinions were advanced and supported with great warmth. All good men friendly to the new Church were desirous of a termination of so many bitter contests, because it was manifest that the papists turned them to their own advantage. After an unsuccessful endeavor to bring about a settlement of these controversies by a conference at Altenburg, it was thought best that a formula or book should be drawn up by wise and moderate theologians, in which these controversies should be examined and decided. James Andrea, a theologian of Tübingen, was appointed to this work in 1659. This business was hastened by the conduct of Kaspar Peucer, son-in-law of Melancthon, who, with others, endeavored in 1570 to abolish throughout Saxony the doctrine of Luther respecting the Lord's supper, and introduce instead that of Calvin. In 1571 they explicitly declared their dissent from Luther respecting the doctrine of the supper and the person of Christ; and, the better to accomplish their wishes, they introduced into the schools a catechism drawn up by Pezel, and favorable to the doctrine of Calvin. Accordingly the elector Augustus summoned a convention of theologians at Torgau in 1574. Having clearly learned the views of the Crypto- Calvinists, as they were generally called, he treated them with severity, imprisoning some and banishing others. After various consultations, James Andrea especially, in a convention of many divines assembled at Torgau by order of Augustus, drew up the treatise designed to bring peace to the Reformed Church, and which received the name of the Book of Torgau. This book, after being examined and amended by many theologians, was again submitted to certain select divines assembled at Germany, and resulted in the famous Formula of Concord (q.v.). See Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History, 5, 3, 151 sq.

## Toribio, Alfonso Mongrovejo, St[[@Headword:Toribio, Alfonso Mongrovejo, St]]

             a Spanish prelate, was born at Mayorga in 1538, and studied at Valladolid, giving himself meanwhile to the most austere form of religious life. From this he was called, in 1575, to the College of San Salvador. In 1580 he was made archbishop of Lima; he was consecrated at Seville, and immediately  departed for Peru. He entered Lima May 24,1581. The diocese covered a large extent of territory, and the means of communication were very poor; but Toribio determined to make a tour of it in person. He sent evangelists into the remote districts, and did all in his power to elevate the Indians, who became much attached to him. His liberality was great, and crowds of poor people would wait at his door for alms. His knowledge of the language rendered access to the people easy, and his labors were incessant. But the fatigue of his long journeys and the warm climate proved fatal, and Toribio died during his third episcopal tour, March 23,1606. He was beatified by Clement XI in 1679, and canonized in 1726. See Prescott, Conquest of Peru, 4:3; Pinelo, Vida de Don Toribio, Arzobispo de Lima (Madrid, 1653). Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé s.v.

## Tormentor[[@Headword:Tormentor]]

             (βασανιστής, Mat 18:34) signifies one who examines by torture, and is derived from βασανίζω, which in its passive form means to be ‘tossed as by the waves of the sea.' Torture, judicially applied, must be distinguished from punishment, however cruel and barbarous it may be; whether it be capital, as impalement or crucifixion; or secondary, as the putting out of the eyes, or any other kind of mutilation. For torture; was not intended to act fatally, nor was it, when so denominated, inflicted as a part of a judicial sentence. SEE TORTURE.

It was usually employed to extort confession or evidence, as when Claudius Lysias, the chief captain, commanded Paul to be brought into the castle and “examined by scourging” (Act 22:24). In the text first cited it is used as the means of obtaining payment of a debt. The “tormentors” there referred to are the jailers, who were allowed to scourge and torture the poor debtors in their care in order to get money from them for the grasping creditors, or else to  excite the compassion of friends and obtain the amount of the debt from them. In early times of Rome there were certain legal tortures, in the shape, at least, of a chain weighing fifteen pounds, and a pittance of food barely sufficient to sustain life (see Arnold, Hist. of Rome, 1, 136), which the creditor was allowed to apply to the debtor for the purpose of bringing him to terms; and, no doubt, they often did not stop here. The incident was one with which the hearers of our Lord's parables were, no doubt, familiar, and its introduction here shows how savage and tyrannical was the spirit of the age. It is no small mark of the mild and equitable spirit of the legislation of Moses that it did not recognize the use of torture in judicial trials. SEE CORPORAL INFLICTIONS. For the “torment” or tympanism of 2 Macc. 6,19, 28, SEE EXECUTION; SEE PUNISHMENT.

## Torquemada[[@Headword:Torquemada]]

             (Lat. Turrecremata), Juan de, a celebrated Spanish Dominican, was born at Valladolid in 1388. He became a friar in 1403; accompanied his superior to the Council of Constance in 1417; graduated from the University of Paris in 1424; taught theology there; was admitted doctor of the Sorbonne in 1429; and was successively chosen prior of the Dominican convents of Valladolid and Toledo. In 1431 he was sent by pope Eugenius IV to the Council of Basle, where he strenuously supported the court of Rome, and contributed to the condemnation of the doctrines of Wycliffe and Huss. He attended, in 1439, the Council of Florence as papal commissary, and was foremost in drawing up the “articles of reunion” between the Greek and Latin churches, and received from the pope the title of “defender of the faith.” He was created cardinal Dec. 18, 1439; and in the year following attended, in the pope's name, the Council of Bourges, where he kept the French prelates on the side of the pope. He became bishop of Palestina in 1455, and of Sabina in 1464. His death took place at Rome, Sept. 26,1468. His principal works are, Meditationes Joannis de Turrecremata, etc. (Rome, 1467, fol.; Augsburg, 1472,fol.; and many later editions): Quaestiones Spiritualis Convivii Deliciis Praeferentes super Evangeliis (Rome, 1477, fol.; Nuremburg, 1478),: Conmentarii in Decreturn Gratiani (Lyons. 1519, 6 vols. fol.; Venice, 1578; Rome, 1726). Many other of his writings remain unpublished. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Torquemada, Tomas de[[@Headword:Torquemada, Tomas de]]

             the first inquisitor general of Spain, was born in 1420, and was a monk of the Order of St. Dominic at Torquemada, Spain, and prior of the monastery of Santa Cruz at Segovia. He was appointed by Ferdinand and Isabella inquisitor-general in 1483; and confirmed in that post Oct. 17 of that year by pope Innocent VIII; who gave him the title of “confessor of sovereigns.” In the course of sixteen years he gave to the flames no less than eight thousand eight hundred victims, besides executing nearly as many in effigy, condemning ninety thousand to perpetual imprisonment and other severe punishments, and expelling from Spain above eight hundred thousand Jews. In his later years his authority was curtailed by the appointment of four colleagues by order of pope Alexander VI. He died at Avila, Sept. 16,1498. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Torre, Lelio Della[[@Headword:Torre, Lelio Della]]

             professor in the Rabbinic College at Padua, was born in the year 1804. When sixteen years of age he was teacher in Turin, and in 1826 he was appointed preacher there. When, in 1827, the Rabbinical school was opened at Padua, he was appointed one of its professors. He died July 9, 1872. Torre wrote in German, Italian, French, and Hebrew. Of his publications we mention, Specchio, ossia Tavola Senottica delle Conjugazioni Ebraiche secondo le Regole dell' Analogia, etc. (Padua, 1828): — Cinique Discorsi detti in Padova, con Annotazioni (ibid. 1834): — Della Socialita della Legge Mosaica (ibid. 1836): — Della Condizione degli Ebrei sotto l' Imlperio Germanico nel Medio Evo (ibid. 1842): — ס תהלים, I Salmi Volgarizzati sui Testo Massoretico, ed Illustrati con Aryomenti e Note (Vienna, 1845): — פרקי אבות, Sentenze dei Padre. Nuovo Traduzione, etc. (2d ed. Padua, 1862). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 435 sq.; Kayserling, Bibliothek jiidischer Kanzelredner, in Homiletisches u. literarisches Beiblatt to the second vol. (Berlin, 1872), p. 58; Servi, in Educae tore Israelitico, July 15, 1872. (B. P.)

## Torrentius (Van Der Beken), Laevinus[[@Headword:Torrentius (Van Der Beken), Laevinus]]

             a Flemish Roman Catholic divine, was born at Ghent in 1525. Educated first at Lonvain, he went thence to Bologna, in order to study civil law and antiquities. There he so distinguished himself by his skill in polite literature, especially poetry, that he became known to the literati of Europe. He took  holy orders, and was at length raised to the bishopric of Antwerp, Hence he was translated to the metropolitan church of Mechlin, where he died, in 1595. Torrentius founded a college of Jesuits at Louvain, to which he left his library, coins, etc. Besides Latin Poems (Antwerp, 1594; printed by Plantin), he wrote Commentaries upon Suetonius (1592) and Horace (1608, 4to).

## Torrey, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Torrey, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Congregational divine, was born at Rowley, Mass., Feb. 2, 1797; and graduated at Dartmouth College in 1816. After studying theology at Andover, he became in 1819 pastor of a Congregational Church at Royalton, Vt. In 1827 he accepted the professorship of Greek and Latin in the University of Vermont, which position he retained until 1842, when he was chosen professor of intellectual and moral philosophy. This chair he occupied until his death, at Burlington, Vt., Nov. 26,1867. He was president of the university from 1863 to 1865. Mr. Torrey was the author of a posthumous volume of Lectures: — A Theory of Art (1875): — editor of the Remains of President James Marsh (1843): — Select Sermons of President Worthington Smith (1861); to both of which he prefixed carefully prepared Memoirs: — and translator of Neander's General History of' the Christian: Religion and Church (Boston, 1854, 5 vols.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Torrey, Reuben[[@Headword:Torrey, Reuben]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Weymouth, Mass., April 3, 1789, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1816. He was licensed to preach, in 1817 by the Rhode Island Congregational Consociation, and, while pursuing his theological studies, preached more or less in different places. He was ordained in May, 1820, and became pastor of the Congregational Church in Eastford, Conn., where he remained for twenty years (1820-40). On resigning, he acted as a supply of the pulpit of the Church in North Mansfield, Conn., for two years (1841- 43), and for the next five-years (1843-48) was pastor of the Church in Prospect, Conn. Subsequently he was pastor for seven or eight years of the Church in North Madison, Conn., and in 1852 removed to Elmwood, a part of Providence, R. I., to take charge of a Church newly formed in that section of the city.  His pastorate with this Church continued for eight years (1852-60). The remainder of his life was spent in Providence, where he died, Sept. 22, 1870. (J. C. S.)

## Torrigiano, Pietro[[@Headword:Torrigiano, Pietro]]

             a celebrated Italian sculptor, was born at Florence about 1472. He studied the antiquities in the gardens of Lorenzo the Magnificent in company with Michael Angelo; but, becoming jealous of the growing distinction of the latter, he assaulted him so violently that he was obliged to leave Florence. He went to Rome, where he was employed by pope Alexander VI; but he afterwards gave up his profession, and became a soldier under the duke of Valentino, and also under Vitelli and Piero de Medici. He again returned to his profession, and, executing several bronze figures for some Florentine merchants, accompanied them to England. He was employed by Henry VIII in erecting the tomb of Henry VII in Westminster Abbey, which was completed in 1519, and, it is supposed, the tomb of Margaret, countess of Richmond, in Henry VI's Chapel. He left England finally in 1519, and visited Spain, where he executed several pieces of sculpture for convents, etc., and, among others, a group of the Virgin and Infant. This was so beautiful that the duke de Arcos commissioned him to make a copy of it, promising liberal payment. Disappointed in receiving a large quantity of copper coin, amounting to only thirty ducats, he seized a mallet and slivered the work into a thousand pieces. The duke accused him to the Inquisition as a sacrilegious heretic for destroying a figure of the Holy Virgin. Torrigiano was condemned, but avoided the ignominious end, which awaited him by starving himself. He died in 1522. See Spooner. Biog., Dict. Of Fine Arts, s.v.

## Torry, Patrick, D.D[[@Headword:Torry, Patrick, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, died at Peterhead, October 3, 1852, aged ninety years. He was consecrated October 12, 1808. At the time of his death he was bishop of Dunkeld, Dumblane, and Fife, Scotland. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1853, page 159.

## Torsey, Henry P., LL.D[[@Headword:Torsey, Henry P., LL.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal educator, was born at Monmouth, Maine, August 7, 1819. His education was acquired at Monmouth and in the Maine Wesleyan Seminary. In 1841 he taught at East Greenwich, R.I.; two years later at Kent's Hill, and in 1844 was elected principal of Maine Wesleyan Seminary, which position he held for thirty-eight years. One year after the war he was United States Treasury agent in the South, and was offered the governorship of one of, the territories by President Lincoln. He was a member of the Maine Conference and of three General Conferences of his Church. He died September 16, 1892. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences (Spring) 1893.

## Tortmah[[@Headword:Tortmah]]

             (Heb. Tormah', תָּרְמָה, deceit; Sept. ἐν κρυφῆ 5. pr. μετὰ δώρων;. Vulg. clam) occurs only in the margin of-Jdg 9:31, as the alternative rendering of the Hebrew word which in the text is given as “privily.” By a few commentators it has been conjectured that the word was originally the same with Arumah (q.v.) in Jdg 9:41 one or the other having been corrupted by the copyists. This appears to have been first started by Kimchi. It is adopted by Junius and Tremellius; but there is little to be said either for or against it, and it will probably always remain a mere conjecture.

## Tortoise[[@Headword:Tortoise]]

             (צָב, tsab, so called, according to Gesenius, from moving slowly; Sept. ὁςριςι.δευκιη ὁ χερσαῖος; Vulg. crocodilus) occurs only in Lev 11:29 as the name of some unclean animal; Bochart (Hieroz. 2, 463) with reason refers the Heb. term to the kindred Arabic dhab, a large kind of lizard, which, from the description of it as given by Damir, appears to be the Psamlnmosaurus scillcus, or Monritor terrestris of Cuvlier (Rayne Anim. 2, 26). This lizard is the waran el-hard of the Arabs, i.e. the land-  waran (Yranus arenarius), in. contradistinction from the waran el-bahr, i.e. the water-lizard (Monitor Niloticus), It is common enough in the deserts of Palestine and North Africa. It is probably the κροκόδειλος χερσαῖος of Herodotus (4, 192) and Dioscorides (2, 71), or perhaps their σκιγκος, the Scincus offcinalis. SEE SNAIL.

The land-monitor (Psammoscaurus scincus) is a lizard three or four feet in length, which, living in the sandy and rocky wastes, subsists on the beetles and other small animals that are found in such arid situations. It is of a-yellowish or dusky tint, with darker green spots and bands, and with yellow claws. Tristram, however, thinks the animal in question is the Uromastix spinipes, a large species of lizard very common in the desert and sands of North Africa and Arabia. It. is also well known in the Judean wilderness, living in holes of the rocks and burrowing in the sand. It sometimes attains the length of two feet. Its most peculiar characteristic is its powerful spiny tail, broad and massive, and incrusted with close rows of stout prickly scales, This is its weapon of defense, which it uses with effect against its assailant. Its: color is grass green, spotted with brown, but darker when irritated. It has a slow and awkward gait, turning its head from side to side with great caution as it walks... It rarely bites, but when it does so nothing will induce it to relinquish its grasp. It feeds chiefly on beetles, but will attack larger animals, even chickens, when in confinement. It is eaten by the Arabs” (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 255). SEE LIZARD.

The same Hebrew word צָב, tsab, is translated “covered [wagons]” in Num 7:3, and the same idea seems to be prominent in Isa 66:20, where our translators have rendered it “litters.” According to Gesenius, it means in both these passages a sedan or palanquin (so called from being gently borne). SEE LITTER.

Several kinds of tortoise inhabit Palestine and the surrounding regions. Among the land tortoises the bordered tortoise (Testudo marginaata), probably the χελώνη χερσαῖα of Aristotle-a little species closely resembling the common T. Greac-replaces this latter in Egypt and the coast of Barbary; and, a near ally, T. Mauritanica, extends throughout. North Africa and Western Asia, from, Algiers to the Caspian. Besides these, several marsh-tortoises (Emys, etc.) are common in the fresh waters of those regions, and are particularly troublesome to horses wading or drinking (see Wood, Bible Animals, p. 507 sq.). SEE ZOOLOGY.

## Tortosa, Council Of (Concilium Dertusense)[[@Headword:Tortosa, Council Of (Concilium Dertusense)]]

             This council was held in Tortosa, a cathedral city of Catalonia, Spain, in 1429, by Peter, cardinal de Foix. All the prelates and many ecclesiastics of the kingdoms of Aragon and Valencia, and of the principality of Catalonia, attended. The king's letters, patent confirming the liberties and immunities of the Church were read, and at the end of the fourth session twenty canons were approved and published.

4. Orders that all beneficed clerks and ecclesiastics in holy orders shall keep breviaries, in order that they may say the office privately when hindered from attending in the choir.

5. Forbids the elevation of unworthy persons to holy orders.

6. Orders curates every Sunday to teach by catechizing some part of the things necessary to he known by Christians in order to salvation, which it declares to be as follows:

(1.) What they ought to believe, contained in the articles of the faith.

(2.) What they ought to pray for, contained in the Lord's Prayer.

(3.) What they ought to keep, contained in the ten commandments.

(4.) What they ought to avoid, viz. the seven mortal sins.

(5.) What they ought to desire, viz. the joys of Paradise.

(6.) What they ought to fear, viz. the plain of hell.

9. Orders neophytes to bring their children to church within eight days after their birth, in order that they may receive baptism is:

15. Forbids the delegates of the holy-see to go beyond their commission. See Mansi, Concil. 12:406; Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.

## Torture[[@Headword:Torture]]

             (Lat. torquere to twist) is pain inflicted as a judicial instrument for extracting evidence from unwilling witnesses or confessions from accused persons. The practice is an ancient one. In ancient Athens slaves were always examined by torture, and their evidence seems on this account to have been deemed more valuable than that of freemen. Any one might give up his slave to torture, or demand that of his opponent, and a refusal to do so was considered as a strong presumption against a person. No free Athenian could be examined by torture, and it was not inflicted upon  Roman freemen or citizens until the time of the emperors. Then it was sometimes inflicted upon even freemen to extract evidence of the crime of lesa majestas, and thus it became a part of the Code of Justinian. Hence it was adopted during the Middle Ages by all European states in which the Roman law was made the basis of legislation. It was adopted early and extensively by the Italian municipalities. In Germany elaborate apparatus for its infliction existed, not merely in the dungeons of the feudal castles, but in the vaults beneath the town halls of Nuremberg, and Katisbon, where the various implements used are yet to be seen. It continued to be practiced in the prisons of Germany until they were visited by Howard, in 1770. It ceased to be a part of the judicial system in France in 1789; and in Scotland it was still in frequent use after the Restoration, and was only abolished by Anne, c. 21, sec. 5. In Russia it was done away with in 1801. In the United States it has never been reckoned an adjunct of judicial examination.

The first instance we have of its used in England is in 1310, in aid of the ecclesiastical law, during the struggle between pope Clement V and the Templars. Edward II, when requested to sanction the infliction of torture by the inquisitors in the case of certain Templars accused of heresy and apostasy, at first refused, but, on a remonstrance by Clementi he referred the matter to the council, and on the recommendation of the council the inquisitors were authorized to put the accused to torture, but without mutilation or serious injury to the person or effusion of blood. During the Tudor period, the council assumed the power of directing torture warrants to the lieutenants of the Tower and other officers against state-prisoners and occasionally also against persons accused of other serious crimes. Under James I and Charles I torture was less resorted to, and only in state trials. It was inflicted for the last time in May, 1640. The worst application of torture was found in the hands of the Inquisition. In 1282 pope Innocent IV called on the secular powers to put to the torture persons accused of heresy in order to extract confessions against themselves and others. The necessity of secrecy in the proceedings led to its extensive adoption, and to refinements of cruelty in its use before unknown. SEE INQUISITION.

The instruments of torture have been many and various. The scourge was the usual instrument of torture among the Romans, who also made use of the equleus, a sort of upright rack, with pincers added to tear the flesh, etc. The most celebrated instrument was the “rack,” known in the south of Europe as early as the 2nd century, but introduced into the Tower by the  duke of Exeter, constable of the Tower. The “boot” was the favorite French instrument of torture. In this, rings of iron were passed around the legs, and wooden wedges driven between them and the flesh until the muscles were reduced to jelly. Among other means of torture were the “thumb-screw,” “iron gauntlets;” the “little ease,” a narrow cell in which the prisoner was confined for several days, and in which the only position possible was one which cramped every muscle; the “scavenger's (properly Skevington's) daughter,” the invention of Sir William Skevington, an instrument which compressed the body so as to start the blood from the nostrils and often from the hands. The torture by water, crucifixion, the fastening of limbs to trees which were forced into proximity to each other and then suffered to fly apart, and pouring melted lead into the ears, are a few of the means by which punishment has been inflicted.

See Barnum, Romanism as It Is (index); Jardine, On the Use of Torture in the Criminal Law of England (Lond. 1889, 8vo); Maclaurin, Introduction to Criminal Trials; Nicolas, Si la Torture est un Moyen Surr a vierfier les Crimes Secrets (1681, 12mo); Reitemaier, Sur la Questions chez les Grecs et les Romuains; Mittermaier, Das deutsche Strafverfahhren, vol. 1. SEE TORMENTOR.

## Torwood Excommunication[[@Headword:Torwood Excommunication]]

             After the skirmish at Airsmoss and the execution of Cameron, Cargill, during a field-preaching at Torwood, near Stirling, publicly excommunicated the king, the duke of York, the duke of Monmouth, the duke of Luderdale, the duke of Rothes, General Dalziel, and Sir George Mackenzie. According to tradition, Rothes, during a dangerous sickness the following year, sent for some of the Presbyterian ministers, and in a fit of remorse confessed the justice of the sentence. The duke of Hamilton added, “We banish these men and yet when dying we send for them.”

## Torzoretsi[[@Headword:Torzoretsi]]

             the last of the classical writers and fathers of the Armenian Church, studied under Parzerpetsi, became vastabed (priest and doctor), and retired to the monastery of Torzor. In 1281 he travelled through Armenia, and went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. On his return he was made patriarch and head of the school of Hromgla. Soon after he retired to a monastery on Mt. Sebouh, and wrote his Treatise on Grammar. In 1284 he went to Tiflis, and gained great celebrity as a preacher. He died in 1326, leaving numerous other works, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Tosaphoth[[@Headword:Tosaphoth]]

             ( תוספות) denotes those additions or supplementary glosses to Rashi's (q.v.)'commentary-on the Talmud which are found along with the latter in every edition of the Talmud. The disciples of Rashi, when they found that their master's expositions could be extended and improved, set about this work of exposition immediately after his death, filling up every gap, and using up every scrap which their searcher had left. Out of reverence for him, they would not put down their opinions in an independent manner, but  denominated them תוספות, additions, and hence they were called Tosaphists. The first Tosaphists were his two sons-in-law, R. Meier ben- Samuel and Jehudah benNathan, the latter called by way of abbreviation Rib ( ריב ן= רבי יהודה בן נתן; his three grandsons, R. Isaac, R. Samuel, and R. Jacob Tam, sons of R. Meier, who are respectively called from their initials Ribam, ריב ם=, ר יצחק בן מאיר, Raskban (q.v.), and R. Tam (q.v.); and, lastly, R. Isaac ben-Asher of Spires, called Riba, ריבא=- רבי יצחק בן אשר, also a-relative of Rashi. The latter is called בעל התוספות, or the Tosaphist κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν. Besides these, we mention Joseph Porat, son of Samuel ben-Meier; Isaac ben-Samuel of Dompaire, also called Isaac the Elder, a nephew of R. Tam; Samuel ben- Natronai, called Rashbate, רשבט; Isaac ben-Mordecai, of Augsburg; Isaac Halaban ben-Jacob of Prague, etc. They are enumerated by Zunz in his Zur Geschichte und Literatur (Berlin, 1845, p. 29.sq), where the student will-find all necessary information. (B. P.)

## Tosi, Joseph[[@Headword:Tosi, Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in the year 1824 at Witschein, in Stria. In 1846, he received holy orders, and in 1853 he as promoted at Vienna as doctor of theology. In the same year he was called as professor of dogmatics to Gratz, where he remained until the year 1868. He then went to Vienna and lectured until the year 1871, when he was appointed canon of St. Stephen's, and died May 14,1875. He published, Lectures on the Syllatbus Erroruum of the Papal Encycl. dated Dec. 8, 1864 (Vienna, 1865): — Ueber Religionslosigkeit und Wissenschaftf, Darwinisimus und den Ursprung des Menschen (Gratz, 1865). Comp. Lifterarischer Handweiserfir das kathol. Deutschland, 1866, p, 59, 1g3; 1875, p. 252. (B. P.)

## Tosiphta[[@Headword:Tosiphta]]

             (תּוֹסַפְתָּא, the addition or supplement) is the title of a great halachic work, which originated in the time of the Mishna (q.v.). It is of great importance, because the Tosiphta (or Tosefta, as it is also called) contains the decisions of the Jewish teachers in their original form, while the Mishna gives them in an abbreviated manner. Thus many things are contained in the Tosiphta which. are not found in the Mishna. The Tosiphta is also richer in quotations from the Old Test. While we have noticed twelve variations in the "textus receptus" of the Mishna — we say "textus receptus," because Lowe's edition, from the Cambridge MS. (The Mishnah on which the Palestinian-Talmud Rests, edited from the unique MS. preserved in the University Library of Cambridge [Cambridge, 1883]) does not always agree with the common text and about ninety-five in the Gemara, we have collated two hundred and thirtythree variations from the Tosiphta, that is, more than double the number that the Talmud presents. The best edition is that of M. S. Zuckermandel, Tosefta nach den Wiener und Erfurter Handschriften herausgegeben (Pasewalk, 1880), and it is to this edition that our references are made. The following incomplete list of variations will at once show the importance of this work for the Old-Test. scholar.

Exo 39:43, כל is omitted, page 521.

Lev 7:19, כל is omitted, page 169.

Lev 7:29, the reading is, "the blood of the peace offerings," for "the sacrifice of his peace offerings," page 47.

Lev 14:57, "and to teach," so Sept., Syr., page 618.

Lev 16:13, "upon the ark," instead of "upon the testimony," page 181.

Num 5:15, "he shall put no oil upon her nor put frankincense upon her," the reading is עליה for עליו p. 294.  Num 11:22, the first ומצא להם omitted, page 305.

Deu 5:14, ואבד ָואמת omitted, page 355.

Deu 17:9, הכהנים הלוים ואל omitted, page 211.

Deu 24:19, בשד omitted, page 22.

Jos 1:1, the last three words omitted, page 315.

Jos 3:16, מאדם, so all versions, page 310; the Revised Version, "at Adam," with marginal note; another reading, "from Adam."

Jos 4:3, the reading is, "hence from under the feet of the priests twelve," page 310.

Jos 4:5, at the end, "and leave them in the place where the feet of the priests stood," page 310.

Jos 8:33, and their officers, ושטריו, page 311; so also Targum (ed. Lagarde), and Mishna, Sota, chapter 7:§ 5; but Lowe's Cambridge edition reads as the present text of the Bible.

1Ki 10:21, "for abundance" omitted, page 71.

2Ki 18:4, "children" omitted, page 465.

Job 36:11, "they shall wax old in the good of their days." The Masoretic text reads יכלי, and the mark כן הוא, i.e., it is thus written, viz. with כ, indicates that there already existed a diversity of readings. Indeed, Michaelis (Hebr. Bible, in loco) adduces a number of MSS. which read יבלו, with beth.

Pro 9:1, "wise women build." The plural noun with a singular verb is strange; the Sept., Targ., and Syr. read חכמה.

Pro 20:27, " the lamp of God"= נר אלהים, page 15; so Talg., Talmud Pesachim, fol. 7, Colossians 2; fol. 8, Colossians 1, and ancient Midrashim.

Eze 47:4, "and caused me to pass through the waters, waters that were to the loins." Bar and Delitzsch, in their edition of Ezekiel, remark, in loco, "in tractatu Yoma 77b, et Tosefta, Succa 3, hic locus adducitur,  tanquam si scriptum esset מֵי מתני כִּמִּיַם et revera in Reuchliniano prima mallus sic scripserat."

Eze 47:8, "to Galilee to the Front Sea," הקדמונה אל הנ לי, page 196; the "Front Sea" is explained by זה ימה של סדום, i.e., that is the sea of Sodom. The reading is not, as in the Masoretic text, הִגְּלילה, but הַגָּלילה, so read Sept., Targ., Syriac. One codex to which Bar and Deilitzsch attach great importance, the codex Jamanensis, reads, as the two editors note, הגָּלילִה, cum gimel Kamezato.

Eze 47:11, לא ירפי, page 196; so also Bar and Delitzsch, against the ולא of the textus receptus. Zec 8:19, "love truth," האמת, page 241; so also Talmud, Yebamoth, fol. 14, Colossians 2.

A few of these variations have already been noted by De' Rossi in his Variae Lectiones. A complete list is given by Pick in Stade's Zeischrift fur die altestamentliche Wissenschajft (Giessen, 1886). (B.P.)

## Tostado, Alonso[[@Headword:Tostado, Alonso]]

             a Spanish prelate, was born at Madrigal in 1400. He studied at Salamanca, and at the age of twenty-two received his degree. He was elected to the chair of theology, and soon gained a wide reputation. In 1431 hew as sent to the Council of Basle, and by some of his utterances attracted the attention and condemnation of the holy see. In 1443 he was ordered to appear before an assembly of theologians at Sienna, and was convicted of unsound doctrine. On his return to Spain, through the intercession of the  king, he received the bishopric of Avila, and was also member of the Council of Castile. He died near Avila Sept. 3, 1455. His works are numerous, and a large number were published at Venice, 1547, 24 vols. fol.; they consist of mystical commentaries on the lives of the Bible and on Matthew. Besides these are Comentario sobre Eiusebio (Salamanca, 1506): — Confesionario (Logrofo, 1520). See Viera Clavio, Elogio de Alonso Tostado; Antonio, Bibl. Hist. Vetus. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Total Abstinence[[@Headword:Total Abstinence]]

             SEE TEMPERANCE.

## Totten, Silas, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Totten, Silas, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was for a long time engaged in educational work in Williamsburg, Virginia, until 1859. In that year he was elected president of the Iowa State University, and also ministered in Trinity Church, Iowa City. For a number of years he was one of the standing committee of the diocese of Iowa; was one of the trustees of Griswold College, Davenport, and was identified with the missionary work in his diocese. In 1864 he was rector of St. John's Church, Decatur, Illinois; in 1867 became rector of Christ Church Seminary, Lexington, Kentucky, in charge of which he remained until his death, October 7, 1873. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1874, page 139.

## Tou[[@Headword:Tou]]

             (1Ch 18:9-10). SEE TOI.

## Toule, Council of[[@Headword:Toule, Council of]]

             SEE TOUSI, COUNCIL OF.

## Toulmin, Joshua, D.D[[@Headword:Toulmin, Joshua, D.D]]

             an English Unitarian minister, was born in London May 11, 1740. Educated at a Dissenting academy, he became minister of a Dissenting congregation in Colyton, Devonshire, and in 1765 of a Baptist congregation in Taunton. Afterwards he adopted Unitarian views from Harvard College in 1794, and in 1804 was chosen one of the ministers of the Unitarian congregation at Birmingham, formerly presided over by Dr. Priestley. Here Dr. Toulmin continued to labor until his death, July 23, 1815. He was an able preacher and an industrious writer. He wrote, Sermons to Youth, etc. (Honiton, 1770, 12mo; 2d ed. Taunton, 1789, 8vo): Memoirs of F. Sotinus (Lond. 1777, 8vo): — Dissertations on the Evidences of Christianity (1785, 8vo): — Review of the Life of John Biddle (1789, 8vo; 1791, 8vo): History of the Town of Taunton (1791, 4to): — Sermons (1810, 8vo): — Historical View of the Protestant Dissenters in England under King, William, (1814, 8vo): — besides single sermons, works, on baptism, etc. See Allibone; Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Toulououse, Councils Of (Concilium Tolosanum)[[@Headword:Toulououse, Councils Of (Concilium Tolosanum)]]

             These councils were held in Toulouse, a city of France, capital of the department of Haute-Garonne, arid situated on the Garonne. It has in it the very remarkable Church of St. Sernin, a masterpiece of Romanesque architecture, recently restored by Viollet Leduc. The Church of the Cordeliers was erected in the 13th century, and destroyed by fire in 1871.

I. The first Council of Toulouse was held Sept. 13. 1056, eighteen bishops being present. Rambaldus, archbishop of Arles, and Pontius, archbishop of Aix, presided. Thirteen canons were-published.

1. Forbids simony.

3. Forbids any fees for consecrating a Church.

4. Forbids all buying and selling of Church prefeirmeut.

5. Enacts that, if a clerk have entered upon the monistic state in order to, obtain an abbacy, he shall be compelled to continue the religious life, but shall be entirely excluded from the honor he coveted.

6. Orders abbots to see that their monks follow the rule of. St. Benedict in their manner of life, food, dress, etc. Any abbot or monk altering (corrigentes) these institutions to be corrected, by his own bishop.

7. Enjoins celibacy upon priests, deacons, and other clerks holding ecclesiastical dignities; offenders to be deprived.

8. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, lay persons to apply Church property At their own use.

9. Forbids the laity to plunder the effects of dead persons.

10 and

11. Relate to the payment of Church dues and tithes.

13. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, all intercourse with heretics and excommunicated persons, unless for the purpose of converting them and bringing them back from their evil Ways.

In this council Berenger, viscount of Narbonne, made complaint of the conduct of archbishop Guifroi, accusing him of giving away the lands appertaining to the Church of Narbonne to those who had borne arms for him. The event of his complaint is unknown. S See Mansi, Coiciltix, 1084.

II. The second council was held July 15,1119, pope Calixtus II presiding, assisted by his cardinals; and the bishops and abbots of Languedoc, Gascony, and part of Spain. Tencanons were published.

1. Is directed against the buying and selling of holy orders or livings

3. Is directed against, the followers of Peter de Bruis, a sect of Manichteans, ordering that the secular, authorities shall repress those who affect an extreme piety, condemn the holy sacrament of Christ's body and blood, infant baptism, the priesthood, and other ecclesiastical orders, and lawful matrimony; directs that they shall be drivel out of the Church as heretics.

5. Forbids to make slaves of free persons.

10. Excommunicates monks, canons, and other clerks who quit their profession, or who allow their beard and hair to grow after the fashion of the people of the world. See Mansi, 10,-856.

III. Held in 1161, convoked by the kings of France and England, who were present. One hundred bishops and abbots of the two kingdoms attended, and solemnly recognized Alexander III as pope, to the exclusion of Victor II. See Mansi, 10:1406.

IV. The Fourth Council of Toulouse was held in September, 1229. The archbishops of Narbonne, Bordeaux, and Auch were present, with many other bishops and abbots. Raymond, count of Toulouse, with several lords, attended; also the seneschal of Carcassone, and the two consuls of Toulouse. Forty-five canons were published for the extinction of heresy and the re-establishment of peace.

The first five enact that the archbishops, bishops, and exempted abbots shall appoint in every parish a priest and two or three laymen of good character, who shall take an oath constantly and minutely to search for heretics in houses, caves, and every place in which they may he hidden; and, having taken precautions that those whom they have discovered shall not escape, to report the fact to the bishop, the lord of the place, or his bailiff.

6. Orders that the house in which, any heretic shall be discovered be destroyed.

8. Forbids to punish any one as a heretic before the bishop has given his sentence.

10. Orders that heretics who have of their own accord recanted shall not be suffered to remain in their own villages, but shall be carried to some place free from all suspicion of heresy; orders them, to wear two crosses upon their dress; forbids to entrust them with any public office, etc.

11. Orders that such as pretend to he converted through fear of death, or from any other motive, shall be shut up, in order, that they may never again corrupt others.

12. Orders every man above fourteen years of, age, and every ,woman above twelve, to abjure heresy, to make open profession of the Romish faith, and to swear to hunt out the heretics. This to be repeated every two years. Recusants to be looked upon as heretics.

13. Requires all persons arrived at years of discretion to confess to their own priest three times a year, and to receive the holy communion at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunmide; those who neglect to do so to be considered as heretics.

14. Forbids the laity to have in their possession any copy of the books of the Old and New Test. except the Psalter and such portions of them as: are contained in the Breviary: or the Hours of the Blessed Virgin; most strictly forbids these works in the vulgar tongue.

16. Declares all wills to behold which are not made in the presence of the priest or his vicar.

25. Forbids to absent, one's self from church on Sunday.

26. Declares the, following to be festival days, viz. all Sundays; Christmas- day; feasts of St. Stephen, St, John the Evangelist, the Holy Innocents, St. Sylvester, the Circumcision, the Epiphany; feasts of the Purification, the Annunciation, the Assumption, and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary; Easter; the two days after Easter; the three Rogation days; Whit- Sunday; the two days after Whit-Sunday; feasts of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, and the Invention and Exaltation of the Holy. Cross; the. feasts, of the twelve apostles; feasts...of St. Mary Magdalene. St. Lawrence, St. Martini, St. Nicholas, and the: Dedication of St. Michael;  and the feasts of the dedications of every church and of all saints to whose honor-churches have been built.

42. Forbids women possessed of castles and other fortified places to marry men who are enemies to the faith and to peace.

43. Forbids judges to receive bribes. 44. Orders that counsel be provided gratis for the poor. See Mansi, 11:425.

V. This council was held in May, 1590, by the cardinal de Joyeuse, archbishop of Toulouse, assisted by the bishops of St. Papoul, Rieux, and Lavaur, and the deputies of the bishops of Lombez, Pamiers, Mirepoix, and Montauban. Various regulations were made relating to the duties of bishops, chapters, beneficed clerks, priests, and others; they also embrace the following subjects: the holy sacraments, relics, indulgences, festivals, vows, seminaries, hospitals, excommunications, residenice, etc. Mansi; 15:1378. See Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.; Hagenbaich, Hist. of Doctrines, 1, 143.

## Toup, Jonathan[[@Headword:Toup, Jonathan]]

             an English clergyman and eminent critic, was born at. St. Ives in December, 1713; and, after a preparatory education in that town and at the school of Mr. Guruey, of St. Merryn, removed to Exeter College, Oxford, where he took his-degree of A.B. His A.M. was received at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in 1756. In 1760 he was appointed to the rectory of St. Martin's, and in 1774 he was installed prebendary of Exeter. In 1776 he was instituted to the vicarage of St. Merryn's. He died Jan. 19,1785. His classical publications occupy the first rank. Emenedationes in Suidam, etc. (Lond. 1760. 8vo; pt. 2, 1764 8vo; pt. 3, 1766, 8vo). Epistola Critica and Celeberimum Virum Guliemumt Episcopum Gllocestriensem (ibid. 1767, 8vo): — Cuae Posteriores, Sive Appendicula Notarumn afeque Emenidationum in Theocritumi, ooni-uztperrie publEicatum (ibid. 1772, 4to): — D. Longini Omnia quae extaint Get Lt. recensuit, etc. (Oxoin. 1778, 8v, 8 with later editions). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Tourieux, Nicolas Le[[@Headword:Tourieux, Nicolas Le]]

             a French divine, was born at Rouen, April 30,1640, and was sent to the Jesuits College at Paris. He completed his-philosophical studies at the College de Grassius, and was appointed vicar of St. Itienille des Tormesent at Rouen. In 1675 he gained the prize given by the French Academy; and, reflecting upon the inconsiderate manner in which he had engaged in all the duties of the priesthood, he renounced it, but was afterwards persuaded to resume the sacred functions by M. de Sacy. His talents procured him a benefice in the holy chapel and the priory of Villers, which the archbishop of Rouein gave him. He spent his last years at his priory of Villerssur Frere in Tardenois, in the diocese of Soissons. His death occurred suddenly at Paris, Nov. 28, 1686. The principal among his numerous works are, La Vie de Jesus Christ. Meilleure Mianiere d'Entendre la At Messe, Annee  Chretienne (Paris, 1685, 13 vols. 12mo) a French translation of the Romnac Breviary (4 vols. 8vo). An Abridgment of the Principal Theological, Treatises (4to) is also ascribed to Tourneux.

## Tournely, Honore[[@Headword:Tournely, Honore]]

             a French Roman Catholic divine, was born Aug. 28, 1658, at Antibes. He received his early education from his uncle, and he duly prepared he'  entered the University of Paris. In 1686 he was made doctor of the Sorbonne, in 1688 professor at Douay, in 1692 professor at the Sorbonne, but retired in 1716, devoting himself entirely to literary pursuits, and died Dec. 26,1729. He published, Pralectiones Theologicae de Mysterio Trinitatis (Paris, 1726): — Pralectiones Theol. de Ecclesiastes Christi (ibid. eod): — Pralectiones Theol. de Sacramentis in Géneralé (ibid. eod.): — Pralectiones Theol. de Sacramentis Baptism et Confirmationiis (ibid. 1727): — Praelectiones Theol. de Agust. Eucharistiae Sacramentis (ibid. 1729): Prelectiosnes Theol. de Sacramientis Paenitentice et Extremae Unctionis (ibid. 1728). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatu. 1, 420, 449,450, 453, 457, 460, 461; — Theologisches. Universal-Lex s.v.; Zedleri Universal-Lex. s.v. (B. P.)

## Tournemine, Rene Joseph[[@Headword:Tournemine, Rene Joseph]]

             a French Jesuit, was born April 26, 1661, at Rennes, of a noble family. In 1680 he entered the Order of the Jesuits, became a monk in 1695, and lectured on philosophy and theology till he was called to Paris, in 1701, to edit the so-called Matzoiraes de Trevoux. In 1718 he was appointed librarian, and died May 16, 1739. His numerous writings are contained, for the most part, in the Memoires. He also edited I. S. Menochii: BLrevis Expositio Senisus Literalis Totius. Scriptuae, ex Optimis Auctoribus pe Epitomen collecta. (Paris, 1719, 2 vols. fol.). See Nicdron, Memoires, 42; Chauffepie, Diction. s.v.; Biog. Universal-Lex. s.v.; Theolog. Universal- Lex. s.v.; — Winer, Handb. der theol. Literatur. 1, 188. (B. P.)

## Tournon, Charles-Thomas Maillard De[[@Headword:Tournon, Charles-Thomas Maillard De]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born at Turin Dec. 21. 1668. He received his education at the Propaganda at Rome, where he, subsequently taught. He was made chamberlain of honor, and in-1701 was raised to the dignity of patriarch of Antioch, and confided with the difficult mission of regulating the affairs of the Church in China and, the Indies. In 1702 he departed on his enterprise, touched at Madagascar, and the following year reached Pondicherry. When he reached Canton, he collected the missionaries, told the object of his coming; and ordered that all traces of the heathen worship should be removed from the churches and houses of the native Christians. The emperor was highly incensed. He joined the missionaries against Tournon, and sent him to Macao, where he was imprisoned in the Convent of the Jesuits. He died June 8, 1710. See Passionei, Memorsie Storiche. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tournon, Frangois De, Cardinal dOstia[[@Headword:Tournon, Frangois De, Cardinal dOstia]]

             was born at Tournon in 1489. At the age of twelve he took the habit of the regular canons of St. Augustine at the Abbey of St. Anthony in Dauphiny. Francis I gave him the Abbey of Chaise-Dieu, and in 1517 made him archbishop of Embrnn. In 1525 he became archbishop of Bourges, and from that time his honors increased with every year. Francis I loaded him with benefices and offices, and employed him in political and ecclesiastical intrigues. In 1530, he was created cardinal, and soon after rose to the dignity of dean of the College of Cardinals. He was one of the principal negotiators of the Treaty of Madrid in 1526, and was actively engaged in bringing about the Peace of Cambria. During the quarrel between Henry VIII of England and the holy see. Tournon proposed concessions to Clement VII, which, if they had been complied with, would have prevented the whole Reformation in England. When Charles V invaded Provence, Tournon was made lieutenant-general of the French army, and directed the operations of the war. He represented France at the Conference of Nice, and in 1538 signed the treaty, which gave France ten years of peace. Tournon was a bitter enemy of reform in whatever shape it might come, and stained his reputation by his bloody attacks upon heresy. The terrible  persecution of the Vaudois was in great part of his instigations. At the death of Francis I he fell out of favor, and under Henry II was obliged to return to Rome. In his new diocese of Lyons he carried on a fearful persecution against the Calvinists. At the death of Henry II he returned to France, and was called to the councils of the queen mother. His appearance was the signal for new rigors, and he endeavored to obtain the return of the Jesuits, to whom he gave his college of Tournon. He had great influence over Charles IX, and what terrors may not be due to this fact? Tournon died at the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Pres April 22,1562. He had little time, among his political affairs, to attend to letters, and left no works behind him. See Fleury-Ternal, Hist. du Cardinal de Tournon; La Thaumassibre, Hist. du Berry; De Thou, Hist. sui Temp. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tours, Councils Of (Concilium Turonese)[[@Headword:Tours, Councils Of (Concilium Turonese)]]

             These councils were held in Tours, department of Indre-et Loire, France. It is the seat of an archbishopric, and the archbishop resides here in a palace of uncommon beauty. It formerly contained the celebrated cathedral of St. Martin of Tours, which was destroyed in 1793, and of which only two towers remain.

I. The first council was held Nov. 18,461, b St. Perpetuus, archbishop of Turs, assisted by nine bishops. Thirteen canons were made for the restoration of the ancient discipline.

1 and

2. Enjoin celibacy upon bishops, priests, and deacons.

3. Forbids them to live, or be on terms of too great familiarity, with any woman.

4. Forbids a clerk to marry a widow. 5. Excommunicates those who renounce the ecclesiastical state.

6. Is directed against those who marry or offer violence to virgins consecrated to God.

7. Excommunicates homicides.

8. Condemns those who fall away from a state of penance after having entered upon it.

9. Deprives of communion bishops who get possession of the bishopric of another, or who promote the clerks of another bishop.

10. Declares ordinations made contrary to the canons to be null.

11. Condemns ecclesiastics who leave their owns Church and go to another diocese without their bishop's leave.

12. Condemns clerks who leave their dioceses to travel without letters from their bishop.

13. Condemns usury in clerks; allows other business and employments. Mansi adds to these thirteen canons six others (Concil. 4:1049).

II. Held Nov. 17, 566; convoked by order of king Charibert, and composed of nine bishops, among whom were Germanus of Paris, Praetextatus of Rouen, and Euphronius of Tours, who presided. Twenty- seven canons were published.

1. Orders provincial councils twice a year.

3. Forbids to place the body of Jesus Christ upon the altar after any fashion, and orders that it shall be placed under the cross.

4. Forbids laymen to come close to the altar with the clerks during the office; but allows them, and women also, to enter the sanctuary for private prayer at other times, and also in order to receive the communion.

5. Orders each Church to maintain its own poor, that they may not be obliged to wander about.

6. Forbids clerks and lay persons to give letters commentary (epistolium), and allows this to bishops only.

12. Orders married bishops to live with their wives as with sisters.

15. Orders that monks who leave their monastery in order to marry shall be separated from their wives, and put to penance; and that the aid of the secular powers shall' be entreated in order to effect this.

17. Orders that monks shall fast during the three Roguation days and during the whole of Whitsnu week; from that time to August 1, three days in each week; during September, October, and November, also three days in each week; and-during December every day till Christmas. Again, on the  first three days of January; and from Epiphany to Lent, three days in each week.

23. Allows hymns composed by an author of respectability to be used at the holy office, besides those of St. Ambrose.

27. Declares that bishops taking any fee, etc., for ordination are to be regarded not merely as guilty of sacrilege, but even as heretics. See Mansi, 5, 851.

III. Held in 813, by order of Charlemagne, for the purpose of re- establishing ecclesiastical discipline. Fifty-one canons were published.

1. Orders the people to be faithful to the emperor, and to pray for his preservation.

2. Orders bishops to give themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the gospels, and epistles of St. Paul, and to try to learn them by heart.

3. Orders them to acquaint themselves with the canons and the pastoral of St. Gregory.

4, 5, and

6. Order that they shall preach frequently; that they shall be frugal in their repasts, and entertain the poor and strangers, affording them both bodily and spiritual food.

7. Forbids priests to be present at plays and fairs and all immodest exhibitions.

9. Forbids priests to administer indiscreetly the Lord's body to boys and any chance persons, lest they be in sine and so receive the greater damnation.

15. Anathematizes those who give money in order to obtain a benefice.

16. Orders bishops to take care that the tithes of each church be divided between the priests, the poor, and the repairs, etc., of the church.

19. Warns priests not to administer the holy Eucharist inconsiderately to children.

21. Forbids priests to eat and drink in taverns.

27. and

28. Forbid to give the veil to young widows, without good evidence of their sincere love of a religious life, and to virgins under twenty-five years of age.

37. Orders that prayer be made kneeling at all times, except on Sundays and during Easter.

38. Warns the faithful not to make a noise when entering church, not to talk when there, and to keep all bad thoughts out of their minds.

39. Forbids to hold pleadings in churches or church porches.

40. Forbids to hold pleadings or markets on Sundays.

43. Is directed against the wicked habit of swearing.

50. Orders all persons to communicate at least thrice a year, unless hindered by some great crime. See Mansi, 7:1259.

IV. Held in 1055, by Hildebrand, the Roman legate (afterwards Gregory VII), and cardinal Geraldus. In this council Berenger was called upon to defend his opinions; but, not being able to do so satisfactorily, he retracted, and made a public confession of the true faith, which he signed; whereupon the legates, believing him to be sincere, received him into communion. See Mansi, 9:1081.

V. Held in 1060, by cardinal Stephen, the Roman legate, and ten bishops. Ten canons were made; the first four condemn simony.

6. Declares that those bishops, priests, and deacons who, although aware of the interdict of Nicholas II, refused to abstain from the exercise of their functions, being at the time in a state of incontinence, should be irrevocably deposed. See Mansi, 9:1108.

VI. Held in Lent, 1096, by pope Urban II, who presided. The decrees of the Council of Clermont were confirmed. The pope received into favor king Philip (who had -been excommunicated for forsaking Bertrade, his lawful wife), upon his humbly making satisfaction. See Mansi, 10, 601.

VII. Held May 19, 1163, in the Church of St. Maurice, by pope Alexander III, assisted by seventeen cardinals. There were also “present, besides Louis VII, king of France, one hundred and twenty-four bishops, four hundred and fourteen abbots, and an immense multitude of others,  both ecclesiastics and laics. These prelates were assembled from all the provinces in subjection to the kings of France and England; some few of them also: were Italians, who had declared for Alexander. Among the English prelates was Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, who was received by the pope with extraordinary honors, all the cardinals present, except twos in immediate attendance upon Alexander, being sent beyond the city walls to meet him. The archbishop of Canterbury sat on the right hand of the pope, the archbishop of York on the left. The immediate object of the council was the condemnation of the synods of Pisa and Lodi, convoked by the emperor Frederick. Ten canons were published.

2. Condemns usury among the clergy.

4. Is directed against the Albigenses, and forbids all intercourse with them; forbids even to give them a retreat or protection, or to buy and sell with them.

5. Forbids to let churches to priests for-an annual rent.

8. Forbids monks to leave their cloisters in order to practice medicine or to learn the civil law.

9. Declares all ordinations made by Octavianus, and other heretics or schismatics, to be null and void. See Mansi, 10, 1411.

VIII. Held June 10, 1236; Juhel de Mavenne, archbishop of Tours; presiding. Fourteen, canons were published.

1. Forbids the crusaders or other Christians to kill or injure the Jews, or to plunder or ill-use them in any way; also orders the secular judges to give up to the ecclesiastical authorities any crusaders whom they may have seized on account of any crime.

7. Orders that all wills shall be put into the hands of the bishop or his archdeacon within ten days after the death of the testator.

8. Denounces those who have two wives living, declares them to, be infamous, and orders that they shall be tied up in public, unless they can pay a heavy fine; orders priests to publish every Sunday in church the sin of having two wives living.

13. Orders the bishops to instruct and to provide for the subsistence of the new converts from Judaism and heresy. See Mansi, 11:11, 503.

IX. Held in 1239, by Juhel de Mayenne, archbishop of Tours, and his- suffragans. Thirteen canons were published, with the approbation of the holy council;” the use of which expression in this case shows that the approbation was not confined to the pope and his legates.

1. Orders that the bishop shall appoint three clerks, or three reputable laymen, in every parish, who shall take an oath to report faithfully concerning all scandals in morality, faith, etc., happening in the neighborhood.

4. Forbids to receive anything for the administration of the sacraments; without prejudice, however, to pious customs.

5 and

6. Forbid curates and rectors to excommunicate their parishioners of their own authority.

12. Forbids clerks and monks to retain any female servants in their houses or priories. See Mansi, 11:565.

X. Held Aug. 1, 1282, by John de Moonsoreau, archbishop of Tours, who presided. Thirteen canons were published.

1 and

2. Are directed against needless lawsuits.

3. Forbid clerks and monks to frequent taverns.

4. Excommunicates those who steal or tear the church books and injure the furniture.

5. Orders the observance of customary processions.

6. Orders the punishment of usurers according to the canon of Lyons.

12 Is directed against those who hinder the payment of tithe See Mansi, 11:1183.

XI. A general assembly of the French clergy was held, by order of Louis XII, in September, 1510, on account of the sentence of excommunication passed against him by pope Julius II. The object of the council was to discuss the question how far it was necessary for Louis to respect the spiritual weapons of the Church, When in the, hands of an adversary who used them only to further injustice, and in matters purely temporal. Eight questions were discussed. The following are the most important

2. Is it allowable for a prince, in defense of his person And property, not only to repel injustice by force of arms, but to seize the lands of the Church in the possession of the pope, his declared enemy, not with any view of retaining them, but only in order to cripple the pope's means of injuring him? Answer in the affirmative.

3. Is it allowable for a prince, on account of such declared hatred on the part of the pope, to withdraw from the obedience of the latter, the pope having stirred up other princes to make War upon him, and urged them to seize upon his territories? Answer: that it is lawful so to withdraw from obedience, not, however, altogether, but so far as the defense of the prince's temporal rights shall render necessary.

4. This withdrawal from obedience being supposed, how is the prince to conduct himself with regard to his subjects, and the prelates with regard to other ecclesiastics, in all those matters in which recourse is usually had to the see of Rome? Answer: it is necessary in such a case to keep to the ancient common rights, and the Pragmatic Salction taken from the decrees of the Council of Basle.

8. If the pope, without ally attention to justice, or even to the appearance of right, employs arms and artifices, and publishes censures against the prince, and against those who protect and defend him, ought the latter to be deserted? Answer: that such censures are altogether null, and not binding in law. See Mansi, 13:1481.

XII. Held in September, 1583, Simon de Maille, the archbishop, presiding, the bishops of Angers, Nantes, Saint-Brien, Rennes, and Quimper, and the deputies of those of Saint-Malo and Mans, were present.

A petition was read, which it was proposed to present to the king, Henry III, requesting him to order the publication of the decrees of Trent in his states; also another petition to the pope, to induce him to remedy certain abuses in -the matter of benefices. A formulary of faith, to be signed by all beneficed clerks, was drawn up, and regulations were made to prevent simony. In consequence of the appearance of the plague in Tours, the prelates adjourned the council to Augers. See Mansi, 15:1001.

## Tousi, Councils Of (Concilium Tullense, Or Apud[[@Headword:Tousi, Councils Of (Concilium Tullense, Or Apud]]

## Toussain (Lat. Thussanus), Pierre[[@Headword:Toussain (Lat. Thussanus), Pierre]]

             father of Daniel, was born at St. Laurent, Lorraine, in 1499. He studied theology at Cologne, Paris, and Rome, and was made a canon at the cathedral of Metz. When the persecution against the Protestants began, he fled to Basle, and formally embraced the Reformation. Two attempts which he made to propagate his views in Fraace (at Metz and in Paris) ended with imprisonment; but in 1539 the duke of Wirtemberg made him superintendent of Miimpelgard, where he introduced the Reformation, not  without great difficulties, however, as he was a Calvinist, and the duke a Lutheran. Toussain died in. 1573. See Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Toussain, or Tussanus, Daniel[[@Headword:Toussain, or Tussanus, Daniel]]

             a French Protestant minister, was born at Montbelliard, in the department of Doubs, July 15, 1541. After some education in his native place, Toussain went to Basle in 1555, where he studied two years. He then spent  two years in Tübingen, applying himself to belles-lettres, philosophy, and divinity. Finding himself in differently acquainted with the French language, he went to Paris in 1559, and, after a residence of a year, went to Orleans, where he taught Hebrew for some time, and, being admitted into the ministry; officiated in the Church there. While in Orleans he was frequently exposed to dangers arising out of the war between the Catholics and Protestants, but escaped them and finally reached Heidelberg, whither he had been invited by Frederick III. The prince afterwards employed him in visiting the Reformed churches in his dominions. On the death of the elector in 1576, his son, Casimir, invited Toussain to Neustadt, made him superintendent of the churches there, and, on the death of Ursinus, professor of divinity. In 1578 he presided at a synod assembled by Casimir for the purpose of establishing conformity in doctrine and discipline, and of assisting the exiles of the palatinate. When the prince became regent in 1583, he removed to Heidelberg, and employed Toussain in promoting the Reformed religion. In 1586 he was appointed to succeed Grynaseus, first professor of divinity at Heidelberg; and in 1594 was chosen rector of the university. He died Jan. 10, 1602, and was buried in the university chapel. His published works, in' many volumes 4to and folio, are principally commentaries on various parts of the Bible, and defenses of particular doctrines of the Reformed Church. His' life was published by his son Paul under the title Vita et Obitus Danielis Tussani, etc. (Heidelberg, 1603, 4to).

## Tow[[@Headword:Tow]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the Heb. words

(1) נַערֵת,neo'reth (so called as being shaken off from flax in hatchelling), refuse (Jdg 16:9);

(2) פּשַׁתֶּה, pishteh (Isaiah 43:37), flax (as elsewhere rendered); SEE LINEN.

## Towel[[@Headword:Towel]]

             (λέντιον, for Lat. linteum, a linen cloth, Joh 13:4-5) was the apron worn by servants and persons in waiting (see Galen, De Comp. Med. c. 9; Sueton. Calig. 26). SEE APRON.

## Tower[[@Headword:Tower]]

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

1. בָּחוֹן בִּחִן, and בָּחוּן(Sept. ἔπαλξις),from בָּחִן, to ‘search,” “explore,” a searcher or watcher; and hence the notion of a watch-tower. In Isa 32:14 the tower of Ophel is probably meant (Neh 3:26).

2. מגַדָּלand מַגְדּלor מגְדּוֹל(πύργος;' turris), from גָּדִלto “become great,” a-lofty tower; used sometimes as a proper noun. SEE MIGDOL,

3. מָצוֹר(πέτρα munitio), a strong fortification; only once “tower” (Hab 2:1). SEE EGYPT.

4. עֹפֵל(οικος;' domus), only in 2Ki 5:24. SEE OPHEL.

5. פּנָּה, usually “corner,” twice only “tower” (Zep 1:16; Zep 3:6; γωνία; angulus).

6. מַצְפֶּה(σκοπιά:specula), “watch-tower.” SEE MIZPAH.

7. מַשְׂגָּב(ὀχύρωμα; robur), “a refuge,” only in poetry. SEE MISGAH.

8. Πύργος, the general term in the New Test. SEE FORTIFICATION.

Isolated watch towers or fortified posts in frontier or exposed situations are mentioned in Scripture, as the tower of Edar, etc. (Gen 35:21; Mic 4:8; Isa 21:5; Isa 21:8; Isa 21:11; Hab 2:1; Jer 6:27; Son 7:4); the tower of Lebanon, perhaps one of David's “garrisons” (.netsib, 2Sa 7:6; Raumrer, Polaest. p. 29). Such towers or outposts for the defence of wells, and the protection of flocks and of commerce, were built by Uzziah in the pasture grounds (midbar), SEE DESERT, and by his son Jotham in the forests (choreshim) of Judah (2Ch 26:10; 2Ch 27:4). Remains of such fortifications may still be seen, which, though not perhaps themselves of remote antiquity, yet very probably have succeeded to more ancient structures built in the same places for like purposes (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 81, 85,180; Roberts, Sketches, pl. 93). Besides these military structures, we read in Scripture of towers built in vineyards as an almost necessary appendage to them (Isa 5:2 : Mat 21:33; Mar 12:1). Such towers are still in  use in Palestine in vineyards, especially near Hebron. and are used as lodges for the keepers of the vineyards. During the vintage they are filled with the persons employed in the work of gathering the grapes (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 1, 213; 2, 81; Martineau,. East. Lif, p. 434; De Saulcy, Travels, 1, 546; Hackett, Ilustr. of Script. p. 163, 171). SEE LODGE.

Mural towers were in all antiquity built as part of the fortifications of towns, especially at the corners of the walls and the gates (2Ch 14:7; 2Ch 26:9; 2Ch 26:15; 2Ch 32:5; 1Ma 5:55; 1Ma 13:33; 1Ma 13:43, etc.; comp. Isa 23:3; Isa 30:25; Eze 26:4; Eze 26:9; see Pliny, 11. N. 6:22, 1). Also in the interior of cities towers served as citadels (Jdg 9:46 sq.). Jerusalem (q.v.) was especially provided with towers of this description, many of which had special names (Neh 3:11; Neh 12:38; Jer 31:38, etc.). Those on the walls and at the gates were used for sentries (2Ki 9:17; 2Ki 17:9; 2Ki 18:8;, Eze 27:11). The Temple (q.v.) was likewise supplied with numerous towers. The “tower in Siloam” (q.v.) (Luk 13:4) was probably some mural defense near that fountain. SEE GATE; SEE WALL.

Among many ancient nations, especially the Babylonians, towers were employed in the siege of cities, as appears from the prophet's account of the divination used by the king of Babylon to determine his line of march into the kingdom of Judah: “At his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem, to appoint captains, to open the mouth in the slaughter, to lift up the voice with shouting, to appoint battering-rams against the gate, and to build a tower” (Eze 21:22). SEE BATTERING-RAM. In the Maccabaean age, towers borne on elephants were used to carry warriors in battle (1Ma 6:37; comp. Pliny, H. N. 11:1 “turrigeri elephantorum humeri”). In Roman sieges the tower (vinea, from the vine-branches with which it was often thatched), run on wheels along an artificial causeway (agger), was proverbial (Luk 19:43). SEE MOUNT.

In the figurative language of Scripture, towers are used for defenders and protectors, whether by counsel or strength, in peace or in war (Psa 18:10; Psalms 61, 3). SEE WAR.

## Tower In Christian Architecture[[@Headword:Tower In Christian Architecture]]

             Any attempt to particularize the various kinds of towers which have been adopted by different nations in former ages would far exceed the scope of this work; the following observations, therefore, are chiefly confined to those which were in use in the Middle Ages in England and the adjacent parts of Europe, and more especially to the towers of churches. Among the Greeks and Romans, towers were employed of various forms and for different purposes, but by no means so abundantly as in after-ages, and in general they appear not to have been so lofty as those of medieval date. The tower of Anidronicus Cyrrhestes, called also the Temple of the Winds, at Athens, is octagonal; at Autun, in France, a considerable part of a large amid lofty square tower of late Roman work exists. The tower for the use of bells is supposed not to have been introduced till the 5th century, and hence the term campanile, applied to the Italian towers. SEE SPIRE.

In the Middle Ages the towers of castles were numerous and of striking character. During the prevalence of the Norman style the keep often consisted of a large rectangular tower, with others of smaller size attached to the angles, and these last mentioned generally rose higher than the, main building, as at the White Tower of London and the castles of Rochester. and Guildford. The keep tower of Conisburgh Castle, in Yorkshire, which is of the latest Norman work, is circular, with large buttresses on the outside; in other examples, especially in those of later date, the keep towers are of various forms, often irregular, apparently so constructed as being considered best adapted to the peculiarities of the sites, and the systems of defense in use at the periods of their erection. Besides these main towers, many others, which, though of less magnitude than the keep, were often of very considerable size, were employed in different parts of fortifications, especially at the entrances, where the gateways were generally flanked by towers projecting considerably before the main walls; these were pierced with loop-holes and oilets, and were commonly surmounted with. machicolations. SEE TURRET.

Church-towers of all dates are greatly diversified, not only in their details, but also in general proportions and form; they are occasionally detached from the building to which they belong, but are usually annexed to it, and are to be found placed in almost every possible situation except about the east end of the chancel. In all cases their use was for hanging the bells, and hence the name belfry. Large churches have often several towers, especially when the plan is cruciform; and in this case there are generally two at the west end, and one, of larger dimensions, at the intersection of the transepts, as at the cathedrals of Canterbury, York, and Lincoln. Ordinary parish churches have usually but one tower. In some examples, where there is an entrance to the church through the lower story of a tower, it is made to form a porch with an open archway on one side, as at Cranbrook, and many other churches in Kent; or on three sides, as at Newnham, Northamptonshire. In towns, towers are sometimes placed over public thoroughfares, and in such situations are built on open archways. It is not unusual to find church-towers which batter, or diminish upward: these are generally of Norman or Early English date; but in some districts, as in Northamptonshire, this mode of construction was continued to a later period.

The towers belonging to the style described in the article SEE SAXON ARCHITECTURE (q.v.) are square and massive, not of lofty proportions, and apparently never were provided with stone staircases. Some of them are considerably ornamented, as at the churches of Barnack and Earl's Barton, Northamptonshire; and others are very plain, as at St. Michael's, Oxford, and St. Benet's, Cambridge: the tower of the Church ‘of Sompting, Sussex, which belongs to this style, terminates with a gable on each of the four sides, and is surmounted by a wooden spire; but whether or not this was the original form may be doubted.

In some parts of Great Britain circular church-towers are to be found, These have sometimes been assumed to be of very high antiquity, but the character of their architecture shows that they commonly belong to-the Norman and Early English styles. They are built of rough flints, generally of coarse workmanship, with very little ornament of any kind, and that little, for the most part, about the upper story one of the best examples is  that of Little Saxham Church, Sinffolk. Plain round towers in the counties of Norfolk and Sutffolk are of all periods; the only materials readily accessible being flints, an these not admitting of square corners, the towers were built round, and this practice is continued even to the present day.

Norman towers are generally square, and of rather low proportions, seldom rising much more than their own breadth above the roof of the church, and sometimes not so much. They generally have broad flat buttresses at the angles, and are usually provided with a stone staircase carried up in a projecting turret attached to one of the: angles; this is very commonly rectangular externally, but the form is not infrequently changed towards the top, especially if the turret is carried up the whole height of the tower: occasionally polygonal Norman towers are to be met with, as at Ely Cathedral. In Normandy a few examples of village church towers of this style exist, which are capped with pyramidal stone roofs, like low square spires, but in general the roofs and parapets are additions of later date. Many Norman towers are very considerably ornamented the upper stories being usually the richest, while others are very plain. Good specimens remain at St. Alban's Abbey; the cathedrals of Norwich, Exeter, and Winchester; Tewkesbury Abbey; South well Minster; the churches of St. Peter, Northampton; St. Clement, Sandwich; Iffly, Oxfordshire; Stewkley, Buckinghamshire, etc.

In Early English towers much greater variety of design and proportion is found than in those of prior date. The prevailing plan is square, but some examples are octagonal, and occasionally the upper part of a square tower is changed to an octagon. Projecting stair-turrets are almost universal, though they are frequently so much masked by buttresses as to be in great measure concealed. Many towers in this style are of lofty proportions, while others are low and massive. The best examples are generally more or less ornamented, and some are very highly enriched. The belfry windows are often large and deeply recessed, with numerous bold moldings in the jambs, and sometimes appear to have been originally left quite open. Considerable variety of outline is produced by the different arrangement, sizes, and forms of the buttresses at the angles of towers in this as well as in the later styles of Gothic architecture, and sometimes, instead of buttresses, small turrets are used, which rise from the ground and generally terminate in pinnacles. Many towers of this date are finished at the top with parapets; some of them with pinnacles at the angles, a few with two gables called pack-saddle roofs (as Brookthorpe, Northamptonshire), and many  are surmounted with spires, which, although perhaps in the majority of cases they are of later date than the towers, appear to have been originally contemplated. Examples remain at the cathedrals of Oxford and Peterborough, the churches of St. Mar, Stamford; Ketton and Ryhall, Rutland . Loddington and Raundes, Northamptonshire; Middleton Stoney, Oxfordshire, etc.

In the Decorated and Perpendicular styles towers differ very considerably both in proportions and amount of enrichment, and considerable diversity of outline and effect is produced by varying the arrangement and form of the subordinate parts, such as windows, buttresses, pinnacles, etc.; but in general composition they do not differ very materially from. Early English towers. Many are very lofty, and others of low proportions; some highly enriched, and some perfectly plaint; a large, and probably the greater, number are crowned with parapets, usually with a pinnacle at each corner, and sometimes with one or two others, commonly of rather smaller size, on each of the sides; many, also, terminate with spires, or, especially in the Perpendicular style with lanterns. Decorated towers remain at Lincoln Cathedral; the churches of Heckington and Caythiorpe, Lincolnshire; Newark, Nottinghamshire; Finedon, Northamptonshire; St. Mary's, Oxford, etc. Perpendicular towers are very numerous in all parts of the kingdom, especially in Somersetshire. Among such as are best deserving of attention may be mentioned those at Canterbury, York, and Gloucester cathedrals; and the churches at Boston and Louth, Lincolnshire; Kettering, Northamptonshire; Cirencester. Gloucestershire; Great Malvern, Worcestershire; and that at St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford.

## Towers, Joseph, LL.D[[@Headword:Towers, Joseph, LL.D]]

             a Dissenting minister, was born in Southwalk, London, in 1737, and was apprenticed to Mr. Goadby, printer, at Sherborne, Dorsetshire, in 1754. He returned to London in 1764, where he worked at his trade, and afterwards became a book-seller. He was ordained a preacher in 1774, and was ‘chosen pastor of a congregation at Highgate. In 1778 he became forenoon preacher at a chapel in Newington Green. He died in 1799. ‘Mr. Towers was an Arian, though closely connected with the Unitarians. He wrote, Review of the Genuine Doctrines of Christianity (Lond. 1763, 8vo): Observations on Hume's History of England (ibid. 1778, 8vo): — British Biography (1766-72, 7 vols. 8vo; 1773-80, 10 vols. 8vo [vols. 1-7 by Towers; 8-10 by n clergyman]): — Vindication of the Political Opinions  of Locke, (1782, 8vo): — Memoirs of Frederick the Great (1788, 2 vols. 8vo; 1795,'2 vols. 8vo: — Tracts on Political and other Subjects (1796,3 vols. 8vo): — besides Sermons; and articles to the Biographia Britannica. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 9s.v.

## Towerson, Gabriel, D.D[[@Headword:Towerson, Gabriel, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, was a native of Middlesex, and became a commoner of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1650, where he took his A.M. in 1657. In 1660 he was elected fellow of All-Souls, and entered holy orders at about the same time. He was first preferred to the rectory of Welwvn, in Hertfordshire, and took his degree of D.D. in 1677. An April, 1692, he was inducted into the living of St. Andrew Undershaft, London, to which he was presented by king William. He died in October, 1697, and was interred at Welwyn. His works are, A Brief Account of Some Expressions in St. Athanatsius's Creed (Oxford, 1663, 4to): — An Explication of the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, and an Explication of the Catechism of the Church of England (Loud. 1676-88, 4 pts. fol.):Of the Sacraments in General, etc. (ibid. 1686, 8vo): — Of the Sacrament of Baptism in Particular among the Heathen and Jews, etc. (1687, 8vo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. S.v.; Allibone Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Towgood, Micaiah[[@Headword:Towgood, Micaiah]]

             an English Dissenting minister, was born at Axminster in 1700, became pastor at Moreton-Hampstead in 1722, removed to Crediton in 1735, and in 1750 to Exeter, where he died in 1792. He wrote, Dissenter's Apology (Lond. 1739, 8vo): — Dissenting Gentleman's Answer to Rev. Mr. White (1746-48, 6th ed. 3 vols. 8vo): — Essay on Charles I (1748; new ed. 1811, 12mo): — Dissertations on Christian Baptism (1750; new ed. with notes, etc., 1815, 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Manning, Life and Writings of Towgood (1792); Skeats, Hist. of Free Churches of England, p. 419 sq.

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

             an English prelate, was made dean of Bristol in 1667 and died in 1683. He published a Sermon on Act 7:8 (Lond. 1676). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Town[[@Headword:Town]]

             (not carefully distinguished in the A. V. from “city,” which latter is the usual rendering of עַיר, occasionally “town” this latter is also the translation, at times, of קַיר, prop. a wall, as usually rendered; חָצֵר, a village, as generally rendered; and so κώμη in the New Test. [once more distinctively κωμόπολις ark 1:38]; בִּת, a daughter, sometimes fig. employed; חִוּוֹה, only in the phrase Havoth-jair [q.v.]; חִוּוֹה; “unwalled towns,” means rather open country). The first mention of such collective residence occurs early in the antediluvian history (Gen 4:17), but we are not to think, in the case of such primitive “cities,” of anything more than a mere hamlet, the nucleus, perhaps, of an eventual metropolis.

Towns, however, appear in the history of the patriarchs as strong central points of the agricultural tribes in nomadic regions. They were therefore enclosed with walls, and thus each town was originally a fortress (see Num 32:17; hence the term מַבְצָר, literally a fort, applied κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν to Tyre, Jos 19:29; 2Sa 24:7); such as the cities which the Israelites captured and demolished under Joshua. For this purpose eminences and hills (comp. Mat 5:14) were naturally selected as more commanding and secure sites (see Konig, De Montibus, Urbium Antiquiss. Sedibus [Annseberg. 1796]), a precaution which Palestine, with its varied surface and exposed situation, especially suggested (comp. 2Sa 4:6). We know little, however, of the exact architectural style of its cities, with the exception of Jerusalem. In modern times Oriental towns are built very wide-spreading, and often include extensive open spaces, gardens, etc. (see Thevenot, 2, 114; Buckingham, p. 95, 335; Taverhier, 1, 169; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 4:395 sq.), e.g. Damascus:(Kampfer estimates Ispahan as more than a day's ride in circuit, Amer. Exot. p. 163). This especially applies to the larger cities of Asia, such as Babylon and Nineveh, which enclosed an area of many miles (see Ritter, Erdk. 11:903). The gates of the cities were closed (Jos 2:5 sq.; Jdg 16:3; 1Sa 23:7; 1Ki 4:13; Psa 147:13, etc.) with strong folding-doors (דְּלָתוֹת דְּלָתִים) with brazen or iron bars (בַּרַיחַים), and were surmounted by turrets (2Sa 18:32), which were guarded by sentries (2Sa 18:24 sq.). In these the governors and judges held their sittings, and a more or less extensive square (רַחֹב, which, however, does not always mean an open place, but sometimes a wide [πλατεῖα] street, Gen 19:2; Jdg 19:15; Jdg 19:17; Jdg 19:20) adjoined  (Ezr 10:9; Neh 8:1; Neh 8:3; Neh 8:16; 2Sa 21:12; 1 Chronicles 32:6; Job 29:7; Son 3:2) where the market was held (2Ki 7:1; comp. ἀγοραί, Josephus, Life, 22). The streets (חוּצוֹת, Job 18:17; Isa 5:25; Jer 37:21, etc.; שְׁוָקַי, Son 3:2; Ecc 12:4, etc.; πλατεῖα, Mat 6:5; Mat 12:19; Act 5:15, etc.) were not so narrow (yet see στενωπός applied to those of Jerusalem in Josephus, War, 6:8, 5) as in modern Oriental towns (Maundrell, p. 172; Olearius, p. 291; Russegger, 1, 367; Robinson, 1, 38; 3, 697), where, as in Acre (Mariti, p. 246), scarcely two laden camels, or in Damascus (Schubert, 3, 29) scarcely a single one, can pass (Burckhardt, Arab. p. 151).

The streets of Hebrew antiquity (at least in the large towns)' had names, which were sometimes taken from those of the kind of trade carried on in them (Jer 37:2; comp. ἀγοραί, Josephus, War, 5, 8, 1, like modern bazaars; Russell, Aleppo, 1, 29 sq.; Harmer, 1, 245 sq.; Arvieux, 1,55; Ker Porter, 1, 406,407). They were occasionally paved in the later period (Josephus, Ant. 15:9,6; 16:5, 3; 20:9,7); in earlier times (comp. Isidore, Orig. 15:16) we find notice of paving in the court of the Temple (2Ki 16:17). From 1Ki 20:34 it would seem that kings sometimes constructed or improved certain avenues (comp. Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 3, 201 sq.). Aqueducts (תְּעָלוֹת) were built in Jerusalem before the exile (2Ki 20:20; Isa 7:3; Isa 22:9; for Pilate's undertaking see Josephus, Ant. 18:3, 2; comp. War, 2, 17, 9; Robinson, 2, 166 sq.); other cities were supplied by springs (see Josephus, Ant. 17:13, 1) and cisterns, the latter, at times, of very expensive construction (War, 7:8, 3). SEE WATER.

As to the varied condition of cities in pre-exile times of Palestine we have only disconnected notices. The oldest ones of the land were destroyed by a natural or miraculous combustion in Abraham's time (Gen 19:24 sq.). During the conquest by the Israelites many were destroyed by fire (Jos 6:24; Jos 6:26; Jos 11:13), but later were in part rebuilt (Jdg 1:26; 1Ki 16:24) and embellished (Jdg 18:28; 1Ki 12:25; 1Ki 15:17; 1Ki 17:21; comp. 2Ch 8:5). The Chaldaean invasion made (especially in the case of Jerusalem) many changes, and during the exile most of the cities were deserted. The Syrian wars under the Maccabees wasted or destroyed several (see 1Ma 5:44; 1Ma 5:65; 1Ma 9:62). Others, however, especially Jerusalem, were fortified, and castles and citadels were built (1Ma 9:50; 1Ma 12:38; 1Ma 13:33; 1Ma 15:7; 1Ma 15:39-40; Josephus, War, 4:7, 2; Ant. 13:16, 3). During the Roman period cities especially multiplied, chiefly  under the patronage of the Herodian family; but many of them were largely occupied by Gentiles, with their heathenish theatres, gymnasia, stadia, and temples (ibid. 15:5, 2; 18:2, 1 and 3; 20:9, 4, etc.). Fortifications and towns also increased (ibid. 15:9, 4; War, 7:8, 3). The post-exilian topography of Palestine therefore exhibits many names of places not mentioned in the Old Test.; some of them, however, may have existed earlier. The district of Galilee was especially rich in towns and villages which amounted in all to two hundred and four (Life, 45). SEE PALESTINE.

The names of Palestinian cities were almost invariably significant, as appears from the present situation and configuration of the land (e.g. Agin, fountain; Bethlehem, bread-producing Gibeon, elevation; Mizpah, look- out; Ramah, height; many of them, accordingly, used with the article). Numbers of these are compounded, e. g with בֵּית(house; see Rödiger, De Arb. Libror. Hist. Interpret. p. 21), עַירor קַרְיָה(city) הֲצִר(court), עֵמֶק(valley), אָבֵל(meadow), בְּאֵר(well), עֵין(spring), and in the post- exilian period with כְּפִר(village); those with בִּעִל(Baal) appear to have been of Canaanitish origin (see Panofka, Ueb. d. Einfuss der Gottheiten auf Ortasdmen [Berl. 1842]). Some are of dual (Kitrjathaim, Jerusalem, Dothan) or plural form (Kerioth, Anathoth, Gebim); in one case (Beth- horon) we hale the distinction of upper and lower villages. Several places of the same name are distinguished by the name of the tribe added (see Mat 2:1; Mat 2:5; Mat 21:11; Luk 4:31). In Roman times, especially under the Herods, many old names were displaced by others of Greek or Latin origin (e.g. Diospolis, Neapolis, Sebaste, Caesarea, Tiberias, later Elia Capitolina), some of which have still survived (comp. Ammian, Marcel. 14:8), while the most of them have again yielded to the older appellation (comp. Josephus, War, 1, 4, 2; Ant. 13:13, 3; see Reland, Palest. p. 567), or to an imitation in Arabic of a similar sound (Palmer, Desert of the Wandering, p. 31). SEE NAME.

On the population of the cities of Palestine nothing definite is known, for the numbers (as Jdg 20:15) from which an estimate might be made are in many cases corrupt (Josephus's statements [e.g. War, 3, 3,1] are suspicious; but see Raumer, Palaest. p. 430 sq.). SEE NUMBER. A distinction between walled towns and open villages is not uniformly maintained in the Old Test., although in the later period they began to be distinguished (see פְּרָזוֹת, Eze 38:11; חֲצֵרַים, Neh 12:25;  comp. בָּנוֹת, Num 21:25; Numbers 32; Jos 15:45; Jdg 11:26; Neh 11:25; אֵם2Sa 20:19; see Gesenius, Monum. Phoen. 2, 263; a metropolis or province is called מְדַינָהin the Talmud, Maas. Sheni, 3, 4, etc.). The New Test., however, males such distinctions (Mar 1:38; comp. Mat 10:11; Mar 6:56 [Mar 8:27]; Luk 8:13; Luk 8:22; Act 8:25): κώμη, e.g. Bethphage (Mat 21:22), Bethany (Joh 11:1), Emmaus (Luk 24:13), Bethlehem (Joh 7:42 ); but πόλις, e.g. Nazareth, Capernaum, Nain; but these terms are used loosely, and the compound κωμόπολις even occurs. So, likewise, Josephus uses πόλις and κώμη almost interchangeably (see Life, 45; Ant. 20:6, 2), and he occasionally employs the ‘diminutive πολίχνη (War , 4:2, 1). In general, however, κώμη (village) chiefly belongs to those places whose name is compounded with כפר(Gesenius, Thesaur. 2, 707). The Talmathdists (but comp. Megillah, 1 3; Erubin, 5, 6) distinguish places thus: כַּרִכַּים, cities with defenses; עַירוֹת.' towns without fortifications; כְּפָרַי, villages (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. p. 599 sq.). Reland gave the first extensive list of the localities of Palestine (in his Palaestina), which might be greatly enlarged from the Talmud (see Baba Bathra, 2 and 3; Baba Metsiah; 11:5). SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

On the municipal government of pre-exilian Palestine no definite information remains. There were judges (שֹׁפטַים) and overseers (שֹׁטַרַים) both named as officers (Deu 16:18), but the latter title is not clear; and elsewhere the elders appear as civil authorities. In post-exilian times the magistrates of Palestinian cities are called councilors (βουλαί, Josephus, Life, 12,13, 34, 61, 68), at whose head, as it would seem, stands a ruler (ἄρχων, ibid. 27; War 2, 21, 3). But from these are to be distinguished the territorial στρατηγοί or ἔπαρχοι, who had their seat in certain towns, and probably had civil jurisdiction over a particular district (Life, 9,11, 17; Ant. 19:7, 4). On the civil law in cities see the Mishna (Sanhedr. 1, 1 sq.). SEE GOVERNMENT.

The gates of cities were guarded during the day by sentinels, who looked out from the turret on the walls no the distance (2Sa 13:24 sq.; 2Ki 9:17 sq.; comp. Eze 27:11), and either with the voice or with a horn gave the news (Jer 6:17; Eze 3:6). Night patrols are also mentioned (Song of Solomon 3, 3). Of lighting the streets,  however, there is no trace, as in western towns (Becker, Gallus, 1, 333 sq.). SEE WATCH.

The mile-stones (still extant, Robinson, 3, 693) set up along the roads to indicate the distance of one town from another belong to Roman times (see Ideler, in the Schrif. d. Berl. Akad. 1812, hist. class. p. 134 sq.). On this point, and on the geographical position of towns, there are only incidental notices in the canonical books (see Gen 12:8; Jdg 21:19, etc.), and clearer indications appear in the books of Maccabees, and particularly in Josephus (see Life, 12, 24, 51, etc., collated by Reland, Palaest. 2, c. 6; comp. Mishna, Maas. Sheni, 5, 2); but it is not till the time of Eusebius and his Latin editor, Jerome (in his Onomasticon), that we get definite data (jon these points; while the later itineraries (namely, the Itiersar. Antoinii [not the emperor of that name] and the Itin. Herosol. [both edited by Wesseling, Amst, 1735, 4to] and Abulfeda (Tabula Syria) give full and exact details on the subject, which, however, have to be supplemented (and often corrected) by modern; comparisons and measurements. SEE GEOGRAPHY.

## Town-clerk[[@Headword:Town-clerk]]

             (γραμματεύς, a scribe, as elsewhere often rendered) is the title ascribed in the A. V. to the magistrate at Ephesus who appeased the mob in the theatre at the time of the tumult excited by Demetrius and his fellow- craftsmen (Act 19:35). The other primary English versions translate in the same way, except those from the Vulg. (Wycliffe, the Rhemish), which render “scribe.” A digest of Bockh's views, in his Staatshaushaltung, respecting the functions of this officer at Athens (there were three grades of the order there) will be found ‘in Smith's Dict. of Class. Ant. s.v. “Grammateus.” The γραμματεύς, or “town-clerk,” at Ephesus was, no doubt, a more important person in that city than any of the public officers designated by that term in Greece (see Creswell, Dissertations, 4:152). The title is preserved on various ancient coins (Wettstein, Nov. Test. 2, 586; Akermann, Numismatic Illustrations, p. 53), which fully illustrate the rank and dignity of the office. It would appear that what may have been the original service of this class of men, viz. to record the laws and decrees of the state and to read them in public, embraced at length especially under the ascendancy of the Romans in Asia Minor, a much wider sphere of duty,  so as to make them in some instances, in effect the heads or chiefs of the municipal government and even high-priests (Deyling, Observ. 3,. 383; Krebs, Decreta Rom. p. 362). They were authorized to preside over the ‘popular assemblies and submit votes to them, and are mentioned on marbles as acting in that capacity. In cases where they were associated with a superior magistrate, they succeeded to his place and discharged his functions when the latter was absent or had died. “On the subjugation of Asia by the Romans,” says Baumstark (Pauly, Encyclop. 3, 949), γραμματεῖς were appointed there in the character of governors of single cities and districts, who even placed their names on the coins of their cities, caused the year to be named from them, and sometimes were allowed to assume the dignity, or at least the name, of Α᾿ρχιερεύς. See Schwartz, Dissertatio de Γραμματεῦσι, Magistratis Civitatum Asiae Proconsulis (Altdorf, 1735); Van Dale, Dissertat. 5, 425; Spanheim, De Usu et Prcest. Numm. 1, 704'; New-Englander. 10:144;' Lewin, St. Paul, 1, 315. SEE ASIARCH.

It is evident, therefore, from Luke's account, as illustrated by ancient records, that the Ephesian town-clerk acted a part entirely appropriate to the character in which he appears. The speech delivered by him, it may be remarked, is the model of a popular harangue. He argues that such excitement as the Ephesians evinced was undignified, inasmuch as they stood above all suspicion in religious matters (Act 19:35-36); that it was unjustifiable; since they could establish nothing against the men whom they accused (Act 19:37); that it was unnecessary, since other means of redress were open to' them (Act 19:38-39); and, finally, if neither pride nor a sense of justice availed anything, fear of the Roman power should restrain them from such illegal proceedings (Act 19:40). SEE EPHESUS; SEE PAUL.

## Townley, Charles Gostling, LL.D[[@Headword:Townley, Charles Gostling, LL.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born in 1780. He devoted himself to the study of law, but with his brother Henry prepared himself for the ministry. After studying divinity at Hoxton Academy he began to preach in Ireland, laboring with self-denying devotedness for the good of both Romanists and Protestants. From 1817 to 1841 he preached in Limerick and vicinity. He then returned to England, where he resided at Brixton, afterwards at Pimlico, and became pastor of a small church at Mortlake, Surrey, where he erected school-houses at his own expense. He died at Pimlico, June 17, 1856. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1857, page 209.

## Townley, James (1)[[@Headword:Townley, James (1)]]

             an English clergyman and educator, was born in London in 1715. He was educated at the Merchant Tailors School, and thence elected to St. John's College, Oxford. Soon after taking orders he was chosen morning preacher at Lincoln's Inn Chapel, and lecturer of St. Dunstan's in the East. Through the patronage of lady Spencer, to whom his wife was related, he obtained the living of St. Bennett, Gracechurch, London; and afterwards became grammar master to Christ's Hospital. In 1759 he was chosen high master of the Merchant Tailors School, and in 1777 was presented to a living in Wales by bishop Shipley, to whom he was chaplain. He died July 15, 1778.  Besides his High Life Below Stairs, a farce (Lond. 1759, 8vo);False Concord, a farce, (1764, unsuccessful and not printed). The Tutor, a farce (1765, 4to, unsuccessful), he published seven single Sermons (1741-69, each 4to). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Townley, James (2), D.D[[@Headword:Townley, James (2), D.D]]

             an eminent Wesleyan minister, was born in Manchester, England, May 11, 1774. His early education was received at the school of Rev. David Simpson (q.v.) of Macclesfield. The training of his pious mother and the impressions made upon his heart by the funeral services of his lamented teacher, resulted in the commencement of that earnest and true Christianity which was ever his best adornment. He became a local preacher at the age of nineteen, and in 1796 was received on probation as an itinerant, from which time until 1832 he fulfilled the duties his ministry faithfully and with increasing honor. In 1827 he was appointed general secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, in which office he abounded in loving and arduous services. At the Conference at Sheffield in 1829 he was elected to the chair, he presided at the Irish Conference of 1830, and retired to Ramsgate in, 1832. This forced cessation from active work was due to physical prostration under his great literary, mission office, and presidential toils. Dissolution, in fact, was already in progress; it was only a question of time. After a sickness of great suffering, the spirit of the gentle and generous Townley was released in the triumph of peace and faith, Dec. 12,1833.

Amid the active duties of his pastorate and offices, Dr. Townlev devoted himself to literary labors with an indomitable perseverance. His studies in Biblical lines made him in all probability the most learned man in the Wesleyan Conference after the death of Dr. Clarke (whom he only survived fifteen months and a half), particularly in all relating to the literary history of the Bible, The following is a list of his works: Biblical Anecdotes (Lond. 1813, 12nmo). Illustrations of Biblical Literature, exhibiting the history and fate of the sacred writings, including notices of translators and other eminent Biblical scholars (ibid. 1821, 3 vols. 8vo; N.Y. 1842, 2 vols. 8vo) — Essays on various subjects in ecclesiastical history and antiquity (Lond. 182.4): — The Reason: of the Laws of Moses, from the More Nebochim of Maimonides, excellently translated, with notes (100 pp.), dissertations (nine), and life of the author (ibid. 1827, 8vo): — Introd. to Literary Hist.  of the Bible (ibid. 1828, 12mo; N. Y. 1832 [a kind of a sequel to his Anecdotes, and introduction to his Biblical Literature): — Introd. to the Critical Study of the Old and New Testaments (his last): — Sermon (in the volume of Miscellaneous Sermons, by Wesleyans, published at the Conference Office [Lond. 1833]).: — History of Missions (valuable sketches published posthumously in the Wesl. Meth. Mag. for 1834, an earnest of an exhaustive work to have, been written had his life been spared): — various articles in the Meth. Mag., etc.

Dr. Townley's fame rests upon his Biblical Literature, a work as valuable now as it was upon the day of its publication, and which the Eclectic Review (18, 386, 407) affirms to be the most comprehensive of the kind in the world. It won for him the doctorate from an American university (that being the first instance of such a degree being conferred upon an English Wesleyan minister), the congratulations of the University of Dublin, and numerous encomiums slight compensation, however, for the immense labor it cost. For reviews and notices of this work see Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1843, art. 1; October, 1842, p. 638; Christ. Rev. [Baptist], June, 1844 (by Dr. Smith); Meth. Quar. Mag. 1822, see Index; Orme, Biblioth. Bibl. p. 435; Horne, Introd. etc. On the Life of Dr. Townley, see Minutes of Eng. Conf. 1834; Hoole, Wesl. Meth. Mag. May, 1835; Peck, in Amer. ed. of Bibl. Lit. vol. 1; Smith, Hist. of Wesl. Meth. 2, 649, 650; 3, 144-146, 203; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 2, 79; Meth. Mag. 1834, p. 78.

## Townley, John H[[@Headword:Townley, John H]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1817. In early life he became a devoted Christian. His career was short but brilliant. He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Elizabeth, and ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Hackettstown, N.J. He remained in this charge eight years, preaching with great acceptability and usefulness, greatly beloved by the congregation and people of the town. On resigning this charge, he accepted a call to the Church at Morristown, N.J. As in the former charge, during his ministry there were repeated outpourings of the Holy Spirit, in which many souls were converted and added to the Church, so in this, revivals followed. His energy and fidelity greatly endeared him to the people of his charge, and gave promise of continued success. His devotion to the cause of Christ, his prompt and ready co-operation in every good work, and his ability and fidelity in the discharge of every duty  devolved upon him, rendered his loss peculiarly afflicting to the Church and the community. He died at Morristown, Feb. 5,1855. (W. P. S.)

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

             an English divine, was born at Ramsgate in 1788, and was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He became chaplain to bishop Barrington in 1822, and was canon of Durham from 1825 till his death, Nov. 23, 1857. He was the author of The Old Testament Arranged in Historical and Chronological Order, on the Basis of Lightfoot's. Chronicle, etc., with copious indexes:— (Lond. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo): the New Testament Arranged in Historical and Chronological Order, etc. (ibid. 1825, 2 vols. 8vo; 5th ed. 1860, imp. 8vo; Amer. ed. of both the foregoing, revised by T. W. Colt, D.D., Boston, 1.837, 2 vols. 8vo): — The Accusations of History against the Church of Rome (Lond. 1825, 8vo; new ed. 1845, 18mo): — Thirty Sermons on some of the most Interesting Subjects in Theology (1830, 8vo): — Plan for Abolishing Pluralities and Non-residence, etc. (ibid. 1833, 8vo): — Life and Defense, etc., of Bishop Bonner (1842, 8vo); Spiritual Communion with God, or the Pentateuch and the Book of Job Arranged, etc. (ibid. 2 vols. roy. 8vo; vol. 1 in 1845; vol. 2, October, 1849): — Historical Researches: — Ecclesiastical and Civil History, etc. (ibid. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo): — Journal of a Tour in Italy in 1850, with an Account of an Interview: with the Pope at the Vatican (1850, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Townsend, John[[@Headword:Townsend, John]]

             an English Dissenting minister, was born March 24, 1757, in the parish of Whitechapel, County of Middlesex. He was educated for five sears at Christ's Hospital, and was then apprenticed to his father. Having received some religious impressions from the preaching of the Rev. Henry Peckwsell, he offered himself as a member at the Tabernacle, and commenced public teaching in some of the villages around London but soon received an invitation to supply the Independent meeting at Kingston, where he was ordained, June 1, 1781. After three years Mr. Townsend quitted Kingston and settled at Bermondsey, where he commenced his official duties at midsummer, 1784, and in which situation he continued to labor in his Master's vineyard till the period of his death, Feb. 7,1826.  Mr. Townsend was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. He also aided in the formation of the Tract Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Female Penitentiary, the Irish Evangelical, the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, the Congregational School (raised entirely by his influence), the Fund for the Relief of Aged Ministers, and especially the Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb, which, if we are not mistaken, owed its establishment chiefly to his exertions. His sober, solid, judicious hints and observations were always listened to with profound ‘attention, and his advice, which was never officially obtruded, was always acceptable. As a preacher he was distinguished by good sense and sound doctrine, commending himself to the conscience and the heart by a clear and judicious exhibition of divine truth. His principal works are, Three Sermons (1797, 8vo): — Nine Discourses on Prayer (2nd ed. Lond. 1799, 8vo): — Hints on Sunday schools and Itinerant Preaching (1801, 8vo): single Sermons (1786-1808). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Townsend, Joseph[[@Headword:Townsend, Joseph]]

             an English clergyman, was a fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, and studied medicine at Edinburgh. He afterwards entered holy orders, and became rector of Pewsy, Wiltshire, anti chaplain to Lady Huntingdon, preaching in her chapel at Bath. He died in 1816. He published, Every True Christian a New Creature (Lond. 1765, 12mo): — Thoughts on Despotic and Free Governments (1781-91, 8vo. -Dissertation on the Poor-laws, by a Well-wisher to Mankind (1786, 8vo): — Observations on Various Plans for the Relief of the Poor (1788, 8vo): — The Character of Moses - Established for Veracity as. a Historian, etc. (Bath, 1813-15, 2 vols. 4to): — besides medical and scientific works, sermons, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Townsend, Stephen, M.D., Ph.D[[@Headword:Townsend, Stephen, M.D., Ph.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1808, and was for forty-six years a member of the Philadelphia Conference, being a supernumerary from 1875 until his death, August 5,1881. He was a man of extensive scholarship. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1882, page 71.

## Townsend, Thomas Stuart, D.D[[@Headword:Townsend, Thomas Stuart, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born in Cork about 1801, and became dean of Lismore in July,1849; dean of Waterford in August, 1800; bishop of Meath in September, 1850; and died at Malaga. Spain, Sept. 16, 1852. He published some educational and religious treatises. See Lond. Athen. 1849, p. 829, 1057; Lond. Gent. Mag. 1852, 2, 522.'

## Townshend, Chauncy Hare[[@Headword:Townshend, Chauncy Hare]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1800, and was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated A.B. in 1821 and A.M. in 1824. He received the university prize for English verse.(Jerusalem) in 1828. During his last years he lived chiefly at Lausanne, Switzerland, and died Feb. 25,1868. He bequeathed to Charles Dickens money, manuscripts, essays, letters, etc., some of which he desired to be published. Accordingly Mr. Dickens published in December, 1869, Religious Opinions of the Rev. Chauney Townshend, published as directed by his will (London, 8vo). He also wrote, Poems; (ibid. 1821, 8vo): — Descriptive Tour in Scotland (ibid. 1840, 8vo): — Facts in Mesmerism (ibid. 1840, 8vo)': — Sermons in Sonnets, etc. (ibid. 1851, 8vo) The Three Gates, in-verse (ibid. 1859, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict., of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Townson (or Tonson), Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Townson (or Tonson), Robert, D.D]]

             a divine of the 17th century, was born in St. Botolph's Parish, Cambridge, became fellow of Queen's College, being admitted therein when but twelve years of age. He was an excellent preacher, attended king James as chaplain into Scotland, became dean of Westminster in 1617, bishop of Salisbury in 1620, and died May 15, 1621. See Fuller, Worthies (Nuttall), 1:231.

## Townson, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Townson, Thomas, D.D]]

             an English clergyman was born at Much Lees, in Essex, in 1715. He was educated at Oxford, where he took his degree of A.M. in 1739; was ordained priest in 1742; became vicar of Hatfield Peverel in 1746; senior proctor of the university: and rector of Blithfield, Staffordshire, in 1749; and rector of Malpas in 1751, where the rest of his life was spent; In 1781 he was made archdeacon of Richmond, and in 1783 was offered the professorship of divinity at Oxford, which he declined. He died April 15, 1792. His most important works are: his Discourses on the Four Gospels, chiefly with regard to the Peculiar Designs of Each, and the Order and Places in which they were Written, published in 1778, which has passed through three editions; and his Discourse on the Evangelical History from the Interment to the Resurrection of our Lord (1792); His collected works were issued in 2 vols. 8vo (Land. 1810), edited by Ralph Churton, A.M. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Tozer, Henry[[@Headword:Tozer, Henry]]

             a learned Puritan divine, was born at. North Tawton, Devonshire, in 1602; was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, and was chosen fellow in 1623. Having taken orders, he was engaged in moderating, reading to novices, and lecturing in the chapel. He was adverse to overturning the establishment of the Church, and in 1643 declined to be one of the assembly of divines. He remained at Oxford, where he preached at Christ  Church before the king, and at St. Mary's before the Parliament. He was appointed in 1646 to take his degree of D.D., but declined. Dr. Hakewell, the rector, having left the college, the government devolved on Mr. Tozer, as sub-rector, who manfully opposed the illegality of the parliamentary visitation, and maintained the rights and privileges of the college. In March, 1647-48, he was cited before the parliamentars visitors to answer the charge of continuing the common prayer in the college after the ordinance for the directory (the new form) came in force; for having sent for and admonished one of the house for refusing to attend the chapel prayers on that account. He replied, in effect, “that these matters referred to the discipline of the college, and that they could be submitted to no other visitors, than those mentioned in the statutes,” meaning the bishop of Exeter. The visitors ordered him to be ejected, but Dr. Tozer continued to keep possession of the college for some time, and they expelled him from the college and university in June, 1648. He refused to surrender the keys of the college, there being no rector to whom he could legally give them, as a consequence he was imprisoned. After a while he was allowed to remain in his rooms in the college, and to enjoy the profits, of a traveling fellowship for three years. On the strength of this he went to Holland sand became minister to the English merchants at Rotterdam. He died there Sept. 11, 1650. Mr. Tozer published a few occasional sermons, Directions for a Godly Life, etc. (1628, 8vo): — Dictea et Facta Chnisti ex, quatuor Evangelistis collecta (1634, 8vo).

## Trachonitis[[@Headword:Trachonitis]]

             (Τραχωνῖτις) is mentioned in the Scriptures only in describing the political divisions of Palestine at the time of John the Baptist's first public appearance: “Philip was then tetrarch of Itursea and the region (χώρας) of Trachonitis” (Luk 3:1). Although Trachonitis was a distinct and vell- defined province, yet it appears that in this passage the phrase “region of Trachonitis” is used in a wider sense, and included two or three other, adjoining provinces. As considerable misapprehension has existed among geographers regarding Trachonitis, and as its exact position and boundaries were first clearly ascertained by the researches of recent writers, it may he well in this place to give a brief resume of the ancient notices of the province, and then to show how they can be applied in setting aside modern errors and establishing correct views.  Josephus states that Uz, the son of Aram, founded Trachonitis and Damascus, which “lay between Palestine and Coele-Syria” (Ant. 1, 6, 4). His next reference to it is when it was held by Zenodorils; the bandit chief. Then its inhabitants made frequent raids, as their successors do still upon the territories of Damascus (Ant. 15, 1). Augustus took it from Zenodorus, and gave it to Herod the Great, on condition that he should repress the robbers (Ant. 16:9, 1). Herod bequeathed it to his son Philip, and his will was confirmed by Caesar (War, 2, 6, 3). This is the Philip referred to in Luke 3, 1. At a later period it passed-into the hands of Herod Agrippa (War, 3, 5). After the conquest of this part of Syria by Cornelius Palma, in the beginning of the 2nd century, we hear no more of Trachonitis.

From various incidental remarks anti descriptions in Josephus's writings, the position of Trachonitis in relation to the other Transjordanic proivinces may be ascertained. It lay on the east of Gaulonitis, while it bordered on both. Anranitis and Batanaea (War, 4:1, 1; 1, 20, 4). It extended, farther north than Gaulonitis, reaching to the territory of Damascus (Ant. 15:10, 3, and 10, 1; War, 3, 10,7), Ptolemy-locates the Trachonitic Arabs along-the base of Mount Alsadamus, and he includes this mountain in the province of Batanea, of which Saccea was a chief town (Geogr 5; 15). Stabo states that there were two Trachons (δύο Τραχῶνες), amid he groups Damascus and Trachon together and states that the latter country is rugged and wild, and the people daring robbers (Geogr. 16:11). Jerome, speaking of Kenath, calls it a city of Trachonitis near Bozrah (Onomast. s.v. “Canath”); and the writers of the Talmud extend Trachon as far as Bobzrah (Lightfoot, Opp. 2, 473; comp. Jerome, Onomast. s.v. “Ituraea;” Reland, Palest. p. 109 sq.).

From these statements, compared with the results of modern research, the exact position and boundaries of this ancient province can be determined. It extended from the southern confines of Damascus, near the bank of the River Awaj (Pharpar), on the north, to Busrah (Bostra and Bozrah), on the south. Bozrah was the capital of Auranitis, and consequently that province lay along the southern end of Trachon. The province of Gaulanitis (now Jaulan) was its western boundary. Batanaea has been identified With Ard el-Bathanyeh, which embraces the whole ridge of Jebel Hauran, at whose western base lie the splendid ruins of Kenath, one of the ancient cities of Trachon (Jerome, Ozomnast. s.v. “Canath,'” Kenath”). Consequently the ridge of Jebel Hauran formed the eastern boundary of Trachon, which extended southward to Busrah in the plain, near the south-western  extremity of the range (Porter, Damascus, 2, 259 sq.; also in Journal of Sac. Lit. for July, 1854). The region thus marked out embraces the modern district of the Lejoah, which may be considered the nucleus of Trachonitis; also the smooth plain extending from its northern border to the ranges of Khiyarah and Maiia. The rocky strip of land running along the western base of Jebel Hauran, and separating the mountain range from the smooth expanse of Auranitis, was likewise included in Trachonitis. This may explain Strabo's two Trachons. In the ruins of Muosmeih, on the northern edge of Lejah, Burckhardt discovered a Greek inscription, which proves that that city was Phaeno, the ancient metropolis of Trachon (Triavels in Syria, p. 117; see also Preface, p. 11).

At first sight it might appear as if Trachon, or Trachonitis (Τραχών.or Τραχωνῖτις), were only a Greek name applied to one of the subdivisions of the ancient kingdom of Bashan; yet there is evidence to show that it is a translation of a more ancient Shemitic appellation, descriptive of the physical nature of the region. Τραχών signifies rough and rugged; and Τραχωνῖτις is “a rugged region” (τραχὺς καὶ πετρώδης τόπος), and peculiarly applicable to the district under notice. The Hebrew equivalent. is Argob (אִרַגֹּב, “a heap of stones ;” from רגב= רגם), which was the ancient name of an important part of Og's kingdom in Bashan. The identity of Trachon and Argob cannot now be questioned. It was admitted by, the Jewish rabbins, for the Targums read תרכונא(Trachona) instead of ארגב(Argob) in Deu 3:14 and 1Ki 4:13 (Lightfoot, Opp. 2, 473); and it is confirmed by the fact that Kenath, one of the threescore great cities of Argob (1Ch 2:23), was also, as has been seen, a city of Trachon. Eusebius, led doubtless by similarity of names, confounded Argob with the castle of Erga or Ragaba, near the confluence of the Jordan and Jabbok. In this he has been followed by Reland (Palcest. p. 959, 201), Ritter (Pal. 2znd Syr. 2, 1041), and even Robinson (Bibl. Res. App. p. 166, 1st ed.). Nothing can be more clear, however, than that Argob, a large province of Bashan containing sixty great cities, was quite distinct from Ragaba, an obscure castle in Gilead (Porter, Dmnascus, 2, 271). Eusebius alsno confounded Trachonitis and Itiraea (Onomast. s.v. “Itureea”); a manifest error. William of Tyre gives a curious etymology of the word Trachonitis: “Videtur autem nobis a traconibus dicta. Tracones enim dicuntur occulti et subterranei meatus, quibusista regio abundat” (Gesta Dei pelr Fsrancos, p. 895). Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that the whole region abounds in caverns, some  of which are of vast extent. Strabo refers to the caves in the mountains beyond Trachon (Geogr. 16), and he affirms that one of them is so large that it would contain 4000 men. Travelers have visited some spacious caves in Jebel Hauran, and in the interior of the Lejah.

The province of the Lejah (Arab. “the Retreat”) comprises the principal part of the Hebrew Argob and Greek Trachon. It is oval in form, about twenty-two miles long by fourteen wide. Its physical features are unparalleled in Western Asia. It is a plain, but its surface is elevated above the surrounding plain to an average height of thirty feet or more. It is entirely composed of a thick stratum of black basalt, which appears to have been emitted from pores in the earth in a liquid state, and to have flowed out on every side until the surface of the plain was covered. Before completely cooling, it seems to have been agitated as by a tempest, and then rent and shattered by internal convulsions. The cup-like cavities from which the liquid mass was projected are still seen; and likewise the wavy surface such as a thick liquid generally assumes which cools while flowing. There are deep fissures and yawning gulfs with rugged broken edges; and there are jagged mounds that seem not to have been sufficiently heated to flow, but which were forced up by some mighty agency, and then rent and shattered to their centers. The rock is filled with air-bubbles and is almost as hard as iron. “In the interior parts of the Lejah,” says Burckhardt, “the rocks are in many places cleft asunder, so that the whole hill appears shivered and in the act of falling down; the layers are generally horizontal, from six to eight feet or more in thickness, sometimes covering the hills, and inclining to their curve, as appears from the fissures which traverse the rock from top to bottom” (Travels in Syria, p. 112).

It is worthy of note how minutely this description accords -with that of Josephus, who says of the inhabitants of Trachon that it was extremely difficult to conquer them or check their depredations, as they had neither towns nor fields, but dwelt in caves that served as a refuge both for themselves and their flocks. They had, besides, cisterns of water and well- stored granaries, and were thus able to remain long in obscurity and to defy their enemies. The doors of their caves are so narrow that but one man can enter at a time, while within they are incredibly large and spacious. The ground above is almost a plain, but it is covered with rugged rocks, and is difficult of access, except when a guide points out the paths. These paths do not run in a straight course, but have many windings and turns” (Ant. 15:10, 1).  The character of the inhabitants remains unchanged as the features of their country. They are wild, lawless robbers, and they afford a ready asylum to murderers, rebels, and outlaws from every part of Syria. It seems to have been so in Old-Test, times; for when Absalom murdered his brother, he fled to his mother's kindred in Geshur (a part of Trachon), and was there three years (2 Samuel 15:37, 38). SEE GESHUR.

It is a remarkable fact that the great cities of Argob, famed at the time of the Exodus for their strength, exist still. The houses in many of them are perfect. The massive city walls are standing; and the streets, though long silent and deserted, are in some places complete as those of a modern town. The city gates, and the doors and roofs of the houses, are all of stone, bearing the marks of the most remote antiquity. It is not too much to say that, in an antiquarian point of view, Trachon is one of the most interesting provinces in Palestine (Porter, Bashaz's Giant Cities; Burckhardt, Travels in Syria; Graham, in the Journal of R. G. S. vol. 28; and Camb. Essays, 1858; Wetzstein, Reisebericht iiber Hauran ulid die Trachonen). Such as desire to compare with the above account the views previously set forth by geographers may consult Lightfoot, loc. cit.; Reland, Palaest. p. 108 sq.; Cellarius, Geogr. Ant. 2, 617 sq. SEE ARGOB.

## Tract[[@Headword:Tract]]

             a psalm, or portion of a psalm, sung in the Latin mass instead of the Gradual, on fixed days; from Septuagesima to Easter, after the Epistle. At the time at which the Church is commemorating the passion of our Lord, this Tract is slowly chanted in lieu of the joyous Gradual. It is called the Tract, as some ritualistic writers affirm, because it is drawn out in a slow and solemn strain. It is said that the psalm or hymn chanted by one voice was the Tract, and when the singer was interrupted by the choir his part was known as the versicle, and the portions allotted to them were called responsories. See Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v.

## Tractarianism[[@Headword:Tractarianism]]

             SEE ENGLISH CHURCH; SEE OXFORD TRACTS; SEE PUSEYISM.

## Tractator[[@Headword:Tractator]]

             the name given in the early Church to preachers and expositors of Scripture; his sermon or treatise being called Tractatus. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 14:ch. 4:§ 1.

## Tractatus[[@Headword:Tractatus]]

             the Latin name for a sermon, discourse, etc.

## Tractoriee[[@Headword:Tractoriee]]

             a name sometimes given to the circular letters of metropolitans summoning the bishops to a council. These circular letters were a legal summons, which no bishop of the province might disobey under: pain of suspension, or some such canonical censure. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 2, ch. 16:§ 17.

## Tracts and Tract Societies[[@Headword:Tracts and Tract Societies]]

             The term tract, although etymologically signifying something drawn out (Lat. tractus), has long been employed in the English language to designate a short or condensed treatise in print. It has primary reference to the form of publication, and is usually applied only to unbound sheets or pamphlets. Thus, a treatise on any topic may be published either in a book or tract form, the tract being much cheaper than the book, but also much more liable to be injured or destroyed. While many political, scientific, and other tracts have been published, yet the vast majority of publications known as tracts are of a religious character; So generally is this true that the word tract used without qualification rarely suggests any other idea than that of a brief religious treatise or appeal. To some extent the idea has been employed by propagandists of error, but far more generally by lovers of truth and by persons willing to make sacrifices for its promotion. Had only miscellaneous tracts been published, or had the publication of tracts on religious subjects only taken place in an accidental or unsystematic manner, there would have been no occasion for this article.

I. Occasion and Character of the Tract Movement. There has, in fact, arisen a great Christian enterprise having for its object the publication and dissemination of religious tracts. This enterprise, like the Gospel itself and other of its auxiliaries, has from small beginnings grown to vast proportions and commanding influence. Although its history is chiefly  limited to the last one hundred years, it has already come to be considered one of the cardinal agencies of Christian propagandism, taking rank with the missionary and Sunday school enterprises, and serving as a powerful auxiliary to both. Although asserting no specific divine appointment, it nevertheless claims to be authorized be inspired analogies. The sacred books both of the Old and the New Testaments were issued and circulated as separate treatises or tracts; so that the Bible itself, in its most approved modern form, may be said to be a bound volume of tracts.

The principle involved is that of giving truth a permanent and available expression in written or printed language, thus enabling it to survive the voice of the living teacher, and to reach persons and places to which he could never have access. God, from the beginning, appointed language as the medium of communication between himself and man, as well as between man and man. He spoke to our race, not only through the hearing of the ear, but also through the perceptions of the eve, thus consecrating both spoken and written language to the office of religious instruction. In giving a written law, he not only provided for the moral guidance of the generation to whom it was first addressed, but for all subsequent ages, while he also continued to teach and admonish men by the voice and the pen of prophets and holy men in successive periods. As a counterpart of the spoken language to be used in preaching, the chosen disciples of our Lord were inspired to write narratives of the life, miracles, and death of him who was the eternal Word, together with the acts and letters of the apostles embodying the instructions which they had personally received from the Lord himself, and which were thus handed down to those who should come after them. Spoken language has the advantage of instant readiness, wherever there is a tongue to speak and an ear to hear. It cal also be varied with circumstances, and, adapted to the special wants and changing perceptions of those to whom it is addressed. On the other hand, written language is available at all times and in all places. It can be cheaply multiplied and scattered on the wings of the wind. It also endures from age to age, while living speakers die. Great as was the personal influence of the apostles through the agency of spoken language, the influence of their writings has been infinitely greater. Their voices expired with their natural life, but their written speech was immortal. It survived all persecutions. It became embodied in many languages, and was diffused in every direction. It has come down through the centuries. It has been taken up by the modern printing-press, and having been translated into hundreds of tongues  and dialects, is now multiplied more rapidly than ever before for the benefit of the present and succeeding generations. By this adjustment of Providence, the apostles, though dead, yet speak, and will continue to speak to increasing millions while the world endures; and those who read their writings may not only receive their teachings, but become partakers and propagators of like precious faith. They may echo the truth, which has made them free in their own forms of expression and with new adaptations to the ever-changing circumstances of humanity.

A peculiarity of written language is that its dissemination challenges co- operation from many not called to the office of preaching. Copyists, printers, purchasers, and distributors may in their several spheres cooperate to bring the truth of God by means of it into contact with human hearts. The tract enterprise, in fact, employs and combines for a common purpose many and, varied agencies. In order that a religious tract may be produced and started. on a career of usefulness, there must first be a writer imbued with the spirit of truth and love, and willing to labor with his pen, in order to express his thoughts in language at once attractive and impressive.” Then there must be pecuniary investment for the publication of the document written. The task of publication, although possible to individuals, is best performed by public institutions, like the existing tract societies, which, having a. corporate existence, live on though their founders die. Such societies can develop and carry out great systems of effort, which their projectors may only live to initiate. Superadded to the publication of tracts, in order to their extended usefulness, there must be co-operative and systematic agencies for their proper and continuous dissemination among readers. When this complicated machinery of moral and spiritual influence is appropriately organized, the humblest Christian may come into working relations with it and be a helper to its highest success. Thenceforward there is a grand co-partnership of results, in which those who write, who print, who circulate, and who read may rejoice together.

As an illustration of the endless stream of influences, which may flow onward from a single instance of bringing religious truth in a printed form to the attention of the unconverted, the following facts are condensed from authentic documents. In the latter part of the 16th century, a good man, known as Dr. Sibbs, wrote a little book entitled The Bruised Reed. A copy of that book, sold by a poor peddler at the door of a lowly cottage in England, was the agency of the Christian awakening of Richard Baxter, who was born in 1615. “The additional reading of a little piece of Mr.  Perkins's work On Repentance, borrowed from a servant,” says Baxter, in a sketch of his own life, “did further inform me and confirm me; and thus, without any means, but books, was (God pleased to resolve me for himself.” Thus brought to tie knowledge and experience of the truth, Baxter became one of the most earnest preaches and prolific writers of any age. He died in 1691, having published matter enough to fill twenty-three large volumes. Two of his smaller works The Call to the Unconverted and The Saints' Everlasting Rest-have passed through countless editions both in England and America, and, doubtless, will continue to be widely read in English speaking countries while time endures. Of the full extent of their influence it is impossible to form an adequate estimate, but here and there links in the chain of sequences can be discovered. Philip Doddridge, when young, borrowed the works of Baxter, and in due time became the author of the Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, a work which led William Wilberforce to seek for pardon through the Redeemer. Wilberforce's Practical View of Christianity was the instrument employed by the Holy Spirit to lead to repentance and a true faith in Christ Legh Richmond, the writer of The Young Cottager, The Dairyman's Daughter, and various other tracts. Mr. Richmond was a laborious clergyman, and for many years a secretary of the Religious Tract Society of London. His tracts above named have been translated into many languages, and have been instrumental, under the blessing of God, in the conversion of many precious souls. Only two days before his summons to a better world, he received a letter mentioning the conversion of two persons, one of them a clergyman, by the perusal of his tract The Dairyman's Daughter. Nearly half a century has since passed away, but the tract has lived on, and, by the help of printers, donors, and distributors, has continued to do its work; while many of those converted through its influence have themselves become successful actors in starting agencies of influence, destined to work on with ever-increasing and multiplying power. Volumes might be filled with incidents illustrating the utility and power of tracts as an agency of evangelization and religious influence both in Christian and pagan lands. In fact, judging from the reports and annals of the, various tract organizations, no branch of Christian activity has been more uniformly productive of the best results than tract distribution.

While the tract enterprise may thus be spoken of in its separate character, it should be borne in mind that it seldom acts or stands alone. Its most approved modes of action are in connection with Church work at home  and missionary effort abroad; consequently its best fruits will doubtless be found in the great day to have been the joint product of many forms of Christian activity. It may be confidently urged that Christian work in connection with the use of religious tracts is practicable to a greater number of people of every age and circumstance in life than any other generally recognized agency of usefulness. Comparatively few are called to be-ministers or missionaries. Many cannot be Sunday-school teachers. But who cannot be the bearer or sender of a tract who indeed, cannot, with comparatively little sacrifice, circulate many tracts through channels of business, in public thoroughfares, through the mails, and, what is better than any other way, by personal presentation?

The present is a reading age, and while, on the one hand, it is important to antagonize the evils resulting from bad reading in all its forms, on the other hand there is no community in which many person mama not be found who will have little, if any, good reading that is not brought to them by the hand of benevolence. He that searches them out and bestows upon them good gifts in the form of Christian tracts and books, accompanied, if need be, with other acts of kindness, will seldom fail of doing good; but he who adds' to the tract earnest Christian inquiry or conversation will do still greater good, and in many instances secure an interest in such promises as these. He which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall' save a soul from death” (Jam 5:20). “And they that turn many to righteousness [shall shine] as the stars forever and ever” Dan 12:3). Ministers of the Gospel especially should consider it a great privilege to have provided and ready to their hand a large supply of Christian truth strongly stated, neatly printed, and specially adapted to aid and render permanent the very work they are endeavoring to do by preaching and pastoral labor. In this respect the publications of the tract societies become an arsenal filled with legitimate weapons of the Christian warfare, a vast store of fixed ammunition with which to defend the citadel of Christian truth, and to assault the positions of the adversary.

In the pulpit the minister is chiefly limited to his own thoughts and expressions. In the use of tracts he may avail himself of the best thoughts, the largest experience, and the ablest statements of the wisest men who have used their pen for the glory of God. His own spoken words may vanish with the breath which utters them. At most, they are not likely to be long remembered; but the printed pages which he scatters may remain to be perused when the giver is dead, and may even descend to coming  generations. In preaching, the minister is limited to his own personal efforts, and can only address those who come to hear him. In his pastoral work he is at liberty to seek out the people; and often the present of a tract or a book will secure for him the friendship and the interested attention of those who would not have volunteered to enter his congregation. Besides, in the work of tract distribution, a hundred willing hands can help him, and feet “shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace” will run for him in paths of duty farther and oftener than he with the utmost diligence can hope to go himself. Ministers should therefore enlist their people in the practical work of tract-distribution. This is too great and too good a work to be confined to ‘a few. Specially appointed tract committees and visitors have their duties; which should neither be omitted nor excused; yet no individual should consider his or her personal responsibility relieved by the official appointment of others. The truth is, that in order to the full accomplishment of tract distribution as a means of evangelical effort in any community, both systematic and occasional, public and individual, exertions must be put forth. The periodical distribution of tracts through districts and towns is very important, but it has disadvantages. For instance, where the district is large there is not time for sufficient personal conversation with different characters — besides, many will not listen to the voice of a stranger. If the Christian acquaintances of such persons should-give them tracts as tokens of friendship, and follow up the gift with affectionate warning and entreaty, the end would be more effectually gained. Thus it is that individual Christians, in their several circles of acquaintance and, business, have a work to do in which well-selected tracts may furnish invaluable aid.

II. History of Initial Tract Enterprises. Aside from the circulation of portions of the Holy Scriptures in fragmentary or tract form, the use of tracts as an agency of religious usefulness dates from the dawn of the Reformation in Europe. Long before the invention of printing, the early Reformers sent out their little tractates to awaken and instruct the people who still sat under the shadow of the Dark Ages. Wycliffe's writings were the means of extensive usefulness. He sent out more than one hundred volumes, small and great, besides his translation of the Bible. Notwithstanding many of his works were burned and people were forbidden to read them on pain of death, yet they spread far and wide. Like seeds of truth borne by the wind, they lodged on the soil of the Continent, and brought forth fruit there in after-years. Works produced by the writers  of that period, although extensively useful, were greatly hindered in their circulation by the size and expensiveness of the manuscript form in which they were issued.

The invention of printing in the 15th century removed many formidable obstacles to the diffusion of truth, and greatly stimulated the literary efforts of those who were striving to reform the Church. Luther appeared, and by his powerful writings and those of his associates, millions of people were led to renounce the errors than which they previously knew nothing better. The efforts of the later Reformers are thus characterized by one of their opponents: “The Gospellers of these days do fill the realm with so many of their noisome little books that they be like to the swarms of locusts which' did infest the land of Egypt.” Fox, the martyrologist, exults over the work and promise of the art of printing in language like this: “God hath opened the press to preach, whose voice the pope is never able to stop with all the puissance of his triple crown. By this printing, as by the gift of tongues and as by the singular organ of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the Gospel soundeth to all nations and countries under heaven; and what God revealed unto one man is dispersed to many; and what is known to one nation is opened to all.”

In the 17th century several traces are found of associations for promoting the printing and sale of religious works, while-much good resulted from the efforts of individuals, both in England and on the Continent. At length, movements on a larger scale began to be made in the line of associated efforts for the diffusion of truth in printed form. The earlier organizations of this kind, though not strictly tract societies, were preliminary, and in some sense introductory, to the great institutions subsequently formed for the exclusive object of printing and circulating religious tracts. In 1701 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was established in England. In 1742 the Rev. John Wesley, in the prosecution of his evangelical work in Great Britain, commenced printing and circulating religious tracts by personal effort and the co-operation of the preachers associated with him. In 1750 the Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor was organized. In 1756 societies for a similar object were commenced both in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Although the three societies named accomplished good, they did not remain permanently established. In 1782 Mr. Wesley instituted a Society for the Distribution of Religious Tracts among the Poor. In his published proposals in behalf of the society, he said,” I cannot but earnestly recommend this to all those who desire to see  true scriptural Christianity spread throughout these nations. Men wholly. unawakened will not take the pains to read the Bible. They have no relish for it. But a small tract may engage their attention for half an hour, and may, by the blessing of God, prepare them for going forward.” Membership in the society required the subscription of half a guinea or more, for which a quota of tracts would be delivered yearly. The publications of the society at that date were thirty in number, embracing Alleine's Alarm, Baxter's Call, Ten Short Sermons, Tokens for Children, A Word to a Soldier, A Word to a Sailor, A Word to a Swear, A Word to a Sabbath-breaker, A Word to a Drunkard, etc. It is not difficult to see in the above scheme the germ of the largest tract societies now in existence. Its tenor, more especially when taken in connection with Mr. Wesley's methods of supplying religious books wherever his societies existed or his preachers went, fully authorized the following assertion of his biographer, Richard Watson “He was probably the first to use, on any extensive scale, this means of popular reformation.” About 1790 Hannah More appeared as a writer of popular tracts. Her first tract, entitled William Chip, was published anonymously. Having been encouraged by its reception, she prepared, with the aid of her sisters, a series of small publications, entitled The Cheap Repository Tracts. In a private memorandum, published after her decease, she said, “I have devoted three years to this Work. Two millions of these tracts were disposed of during the first year. God works by weak instruments to show that the glory is all his own.” From that time forward the number of persons who made themselves useful by publishing and circulating tracts in various ways became considerably increased. Among them honorable mention may be made of Mrs. Rebecca Wilkinson, of Clapham; Rev. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, and Rev. John Campbell, of Edinburgh.

III. Tract Societies distinctively so-called. The time had now arrived for broader and more thoroughly organized movements in behalf of the tract enterprise. The Religious Tract Society of London was initiated in May, 1799. Rev. George Burder, Rowland Hill, Matthew Wilks, Joseph Hughes, and others were among its organizers. A rule of the society, like that of Mr. Wesley, before noted, provided that its membership “consist of persons subscribing half a guinea or upwards annually.” The society was placed upon a basis of broad catholicity. Its object was defined to be the publication of “those grand doctrinal and practical truths which have in every age been mighty through God in converting, sanctifying, and  comforting souls, and by the influence of which men may have been enabled, while they lived, to live to the Lord, and when they died to die unto the Lord.” It is impossible to give in this article a detailed history of any of the societies enumerated; brief and general notices must suffice. But in the briefest notice of the Religious Tract Society of London, it is not too much to say that in the eighty years of its existence it has well and faithfully illustrated the catholic and evangelical principles announced by its founders in the beginning. In so doing it has accomplished its objects on a grand scale and to an unforeseen extent. An incidental event of the most interesting character grew out of the operations of the Religious Tract Society in the third year of its existence. It was no less than the preliminary step towards the organization of the British and Foreign Bible Society-the parent Bible Society of the world. SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES.

For a score of years the business of the Religious Tract Society was of such a moderate extent that a small hired depository sufficed for its transaction. From 1820 the business so expanded as to require the occupation of enlarged premises in Paternoster Row, where, in 1843-44, its present commodious buildings were erected. The design of the society contemplated the double purpose of sales at or near cost, and gratuitous distribution. Both phases of its work were therefore limited to its supply of funds.. Its only income, at first, was from the annual subscriptions of its members. But by degrees, and as necessity required, additions were made from other sources, such as congregational collections, auxiliary societies, life-memberships, legacies, and special donations. As the operations of the society increased, new and varied forms of action were developed, including not only sales through depositories, but by hawkers or peddlers throughout the provinces. Donations were made not only of tracts, but of assorted libraries to soldiers barracks, to sea-going vessels, to emigrant and convict-ships, to workhouses, to coastguard stations, to missionaries' families, to clergymen, to schoolmasters, and city missionaries, to be used for loaning to persons in destitute circumstances. During the first five years of the society's existence, it published only sixty-six different tracts in the ordinary form. Subsequently it began to enlarge the variety as well as the number of its publications. Broadsheets, handbills, children's books, periodicals adapted to different ages and classes, monthly volumes, standard works, and even commentaries on the Scriptures came in turn to be regularly and constantly issued under the imprint of the society. From active work in different parts of Great Britain, the society was led to  extend its work into foreign fields. Such an extension had not been originally contemplated, but nevertheless took place in the order of Providence, and became a striking illustration of the expansive nature of true Christian benevolence. The circumstance which first led to the preparation of tracts in foreign languages was the obvious duty of giving religious instruction to a number of prisoners-of-war confined in England; and the first foreign languages in which the society's tracts were published were the French and the Dutch. As was to have been expected, the foreign prisoners, when released, carried more or less of the tracts they had received to their own countries, and thus, to some extent, created a demand for more and similar publications in those countries. About the same time, a correspondence sprang up between the society and representative evangelical Christians in most of the nations of Europe. Soon afterwards the enterprise of foreign missions began to be extended to various pagan nations. By similar processes, the work of the Religious Tract Society has been expanding and enlarging ever since, with a prospect of continuous expansion and usefulness in time to come.

The Reports of the society from year to year have been replete with interesting details, not only of progress, but also of results; and yet it may safely be inferred that the good which has been directly and indirectly accomplished through its instrumentality has not half been told. Eternity only can reveal the full extent of influences that have been so far-reaching, and in many instances so remote from ordinary human observation. A few items, condensed from the society's official documents, may serve as partial indications of the magnitude to which, from the small beginnings noted above, its operations have grown. The society has printed important tracts and books in one hundred and twenty different languages and dialects. Its present annual issues from its own depositories and those of foreign societies, through which it acts, are about sixty-three millions, and its aggregate issues during eighty years past have been about two thousand millions It has co-operated with every Protestant Christian mission in the world. It has assailed popery on the Continent of Europe, Mohammedanism in the East, and paganism of various forms in heathen lands. It has given a Christian literature to nations just emerging from barbarism. Its publications have passed the wall of China, and have entered the palace of the Celestial emperor. They have instructed the princes of Burmah, and opened the self-sealed lips of the devotee in India. They have gone to the sons of Africa to teach them, in their bondage, the liberty of  the Gospel. They have preached Christ crucified to the Jew and also to the Greek; while in the home land they have continued to offer the truths and consolations of religion to soldiers, to sailors, to prisoners, to the inmates of hospitals, and, in short, to rich and poor in every circumstance of life. In the year 1849, the Religious Tract Society celebrated its semi-centennial jubilee. In connection with that interesting event, a large jubilee fund was raised to increase the usefulness of the society. A jubilee memorial volume was also published, setting forth in an able and interesting manner the history of its first fifty years of work and progress. When, in the year 1899, the society shall celebrate its centennial, a still grander showing of results may be expected.

The additional tract societies of Great Britain, aside from merely local organizations, are not numerous. The following are the principal: The Religions Tract and Book Society of Scotland (Edinburgh). The primary organization of this society dates back to 1793. It is not a publishing society, and for many years had a feeble existence. About 1856 it adopted a system of colportage similar to that of the American Tract Society, and, since that period, has greatly multiplied its influence and usefulness. It embraces branch societies at Glasgow and Aberdeen, and employs some two hundred colporteurs. The Stirling Tract Enterprise, founded in 1848, is chiefly a publishing institution, issuing both tracts and periodicals. The Dublin Tract Society issues tracts in large numbers. The Monthly Tract Society, London, was instituted in 1837.

In passing from Great Britain to other countries, the number of tract societies is found to be very great. For the most part, they combine publication with distribution, receiving aid from the Religious Tract Society of London to enable them to publish tracts and books in their several localities. It is therefore deemed sufficient to give the title and date of organization, omitting details of history and statistics, although in many instances of great interest.

CONTINENT OF EUROPE. Tract Society of Norway and Denmark, 1799; Stockholm Evangelical Society, 1815; Religious Tract Society of Finland, 1818; Tract Society of Copenhagen, 1820; Stuttgart Tract Society, 1813; Prussian Tract Society, Berlin, 1815; Tract Society of Wupperthal, 1814; Lower Saxony Tract Society, Hamburg, 1820 ; Tract Society of Leipsic, 1821; The Netherlands Tract Society, 1821; The Belgian Tract Society, 1835; The Belziain Evangelical Society, 1839;  Religious Tract Society of Paris, 1820; Evangelical Society of France, 1829;. Religious Book Society of Toulouse, 1835; Tract Society of Berne, 1802; Tract Society of Basle, 1810; Tract Societies of Lausanne, Neufchaitel, and Geneva, 1S28; Evangelical Society of Geneva, 1831: Tract Societies of St. Gill, Zurich, and Chur., 1834; Tract and Book Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Bremen, 1850.

INDIA. Native Tract Society at Nagercoil, Travancore, 1824; Calcutta Book and Tract Society, 1825; Tract Societies of Madras, Bellary, Belgaumn, Bombay, Suralt, and Benares, 1825-26; Tract Societies of Bamngalorle, Orissa, AlleIpie, Chunar, and Quilon, 1829-3(0; Tract Societies uof Mirzlnpore, Vizagapatam, Cuddapah, Neyoor, aind Mangalore, 1832-40; Jaffna Religious Tract Society, 1825; Tract Societies of Cotta and Colombo, 1835; Ceylon Christian Vernacular Education Society and Religions Tract Society, 18(0; North Indian Tract Society, Allahabatd; Pnujmaub Religious Book Society; The Christian Union of Java, 1833; Tract Society of Mauritius, 1824; Burmah Bible and Tract Society, 1861.

CHINA. From the beginning of Christian missions in China the circulation of religious tracts and books has been diligently prosecuted. To that end nearly every separate mission has served as a publishing agency of greater or less extent. Almost all the missions have received from the tract societies of England and America aid for their work of publication. In 1878 the Chinese Religious Tract Society was organized at Shanghai. It is composed of representative missionaries of various churches, and proposes to organize auxiliaries and local societies wherever Christian churches are established.

JAPAN. Active measures are in progress for the preparation and diffusion of Christian tracts and books in Japan. But as yet such efforts are limited to the various missions aided by the principal Bible and Tract societies of England and America.

AUSTRALIA. Tract Society of Sydney, 1S23; Tract Society of Van Diemen's Land, 1837; Religious Tract Society of Victoria, 1855; Victoria Tract Distribution Society, 1858.

NEW ZEALAND. New Zealand Tract Society, 1839; Wellington Tract Society, 1848.

SOUTH AFRICA. Cape Town Auxiliary Tract Society, 1820; South African Ladies' Tract. and Book Society, 1832.

WEST INDIES. Jamaica Tract Society, 1835; New Providence Tract Society, 1837.

CANADA. Tract Society of Quebec, 1824; Tract Society of Montreal, 1825; Religious Tract Society-of Toronto, 1824; Religious Tract Society of Halifax, 1824; Religious Tract Society of St. Johns, N. B., 1825; British American Book and Tract Society, Halifax, 1868.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1803; Connecticut Religions Tract Society, 1808 Vermont Religious Tract Society, 1808; The Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, 1809; New York Religious Tract Society, 1812; Evangelical Tract Society, Boston, 1813; Albany Religions Tract Society, 1813; New England Tract Society, 1814; Religions Tract Society of Philadelphia, 1815. Religious Tract Society of Baltimore, 1816; New-York Methodist Tract Society, 1817; Baptist General Tract Society, 1824; American Tract Society, Boston, 1823; American Tract Society, New York, 1825; New York City Tract Society, 1827; New York City Mission and Tract Society, 1864; Willard Tract Society, Boston, 1866; Monthly Tract Society of the United States, New York, 1874.

It is not within the design of this article to give the history of the tract societies enumerated; but it is proper to remark that various modifications have taken place in the title and specific character of some of the earlier American organizations. In several instances primary associations have been merged in the formation of more important societies, while others have continued under new names and with modified forms of action. With increasing experience, the tendency has been to centralize the work of publication in a few strong societies and to multiply the agencies of distribution outward from the great centers of publication. A few examples of combination and reconstruction may be noted. ‘The New England Tract Society, organized in 1814, became in 1823 the American Tract Society, having its location in Boston. The same society in 1878 was merged in the American Tract Society, which was organized in New York in 1825. The last-named arrangement was consummated none too soon, as great confusion had arisen from having two publishing societies of the same corporate name. The Baptist General Tract Society, organized inl Washington in 1824, was subsequently transferred to Philadelphia, and in  1840 became, with enlarged designs, the American Baptist Publication Society. The New York Methodist Tract Society, organized in 1817, subsequently became incorporated as the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

As a counterpart to the above sketch of the rise and development of the Religious Tract Society of London, and as a specimen illustration of results from about half a century's operations of a similar American organization, the following facts are condensed from official publications of the American Tract Society; The society has a large and commodious building in Nassau Street, New York, with twenty steam-presses, tens of thousands of stereotype plates, and every facility for composing, printing, binding, storing, and issuing its own publications to the number of 4000 books, 30,000 tracts, and 20,000 papers daily. It is therefore enabled to abate, in fixing the prices of books, what otherwise would have to be added for rent of buildings hired, and for the profits of trade. It numbers on its list about 6000' distinct publications, including, besides tracts and handbills of various kinds, 1240 volumes of biography history, and helps to Biblical study. Among what are called its home publications, 1584 distinct issues are in foreign languages viz. German, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish, Welsh, Dutch, Danish, Finnish, and Hungarian, designed for immigrants coming to the United States. Of its home publications in the English language, 28,000,000 volumes, besides about 3,000,000,000 pages of tracts, have been issued. Of its periodicals, several of which are illustrated and printed in the highest style of typography, over 5,000,000 are issued yearly to 350,000 subscribers. This society has become distinguished for its faithful and systematic prosecution of the work of colportage. By its agents, employed chiefly in frontier and destitute sections of the country, it has within a period of forty years done a work equal to that of one man for more than 5000 years. It has sold more than 11,000,000 volumes, and donated 3,000,000 to destitute persons and families. It has made more than 12,000,000 visits to families; in about 1,000,000 of which no religious book was found, with the exception of Bibles in. about one third of the number. It has thus done much to meet the moral and religious wants of our frontier population in advance of schools and churches. It is accustomed to make grants each year of fifty thousand dollars' worth of its publications for circulation in prisons and hospitals, in Sabbath-schools and mission-schools, in cities and remote and lonely hamlets, to soldiers and to sailors on our inland waters, and in hundreds of  outward-bound vessels for every corner of the globe. The foreign work of the society has been chiefly accomplished through donations of money granted to missionaries in seventy different foreign stations.. By means of some $700,000 thus appropriated, the society has printed, in 145 different languages and dialects, not less than 4211 distinct publications, including 640 volumes. Thus “fruits” of the society's sowing may be found in almost every land from Russia to the Cape of Good Hope, and from China in the East to Hawaii in the West.”

As a summary of the work accomplished by a distributing tract society, the following items are copied from the Report of the American Tract Society for 1890:

SUMMARY VIEW OF COLPORTAGE FOR FORTY-NINE YEARS

Time employed, months69,601Volumes sold12,341,183Volumes granted3,134,305Public meetings addressed, etc.463,208Families destitute of all religious books except the Bible1,155,377Protestant families destitute of the Bible686,097Families of Roman Catholics visited1,733,438Protestant families habitually neglecting Evangelical preaching1,946,959Families conversed with on personal religion or prayed with7,792,963Family visits13,775,030In addition to the above regular operations, more than $150,000 have been expended for the erection of mission stations and chapels. The total amount of grants in publications for 65 years amount to $2,109,890.84, The foreign grants in cash amount to $696.949.93. Number of pages printed since the formation of the society, 9371,832,882.

The detailed statistics of the tract enterprise in its various forms of action would fill many volumes with facts of intense interest and form a just basis not only of admiration for its past success but also of high expectation for its expanding and multiplying influence in the years and centuries to come.

IV. Collateral Publishing Organizations. Before proceeding to enumerate the more important of them, some words of explanation seem necessary. In the development of the tract enterprise, various kinds of organizations have been found necessary or expedient. Only a few have become great publishing institutions, and no other one has attained such a magnitude of operations as that of the Religious Tract Society of London. Nevertheless, societies for the effective and appropriate distribution of tracts have been found essential to the object of the enterprise as a whole. They have worked in more limited spheres, but have proved indispensable to the highest forms of success. Religious reading, when merely printed, has no more value than other merchandise. A single tract, brought to the eye and heart of an interested reader, accomplishes more for God and humanity than millions of pages resting upon the shelves of a depository. Societies, therefore, that circulate religious publications, and especially by the agency of skilful and sympathetic Christian workers, deserve high respect. Not all of them bear the specific name of tract society. Some of them have mingled the work of Bible and tract distribution. Some have adopted colportage as their chief form of work, while others have devoted their energies largely to other forms of evangelization. In this state of the case, it may not be possible to give a complete list of all the societies that have been organized to promote the circulation of religious tracts. Still less possible would it be to give, within a convenient space, the full historical data of all such institutions. Fortunately, however, numerous details are quite unnecessary, since specimen sketches like those given above are sufficiently descriptive of all similar institutions and their auxiliaries, whether conducted on a larger or smaller scale.

As to plan of organization, there are two classes of tract and book publication societies. One class represents united Christian effort in the sense of being composed of the members of different churches. The other is denominational inn the sense of separate church action. These two classes of societies, though distinct from each other, are by no necessity antagonistic. They may, and usually do, simply represent different modes of accomplishing the same or similar objects. While in England, owing to the pre-eminence and catholicity of the Religious Tract Society, denominational action has generally limited itself to the work of dissemination, there is at least one important example of separate church action-it is that of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. By that body the joint enterprise of tract and book publication and circulation has been continued  from the time of its inception by the Rev. John Wesley min the first half of the 18th century. The publications of the Wesleyan book-room embrace a large assortment of tracts, a variety of periodicals, and a large list of religious books. A due proportion of its tracts and books has been prepared and printed in foreign languages, in adaptation to the wants of the various mission fields of that Church. Book affairs constitute a standard topic of business at the annual meeting of the Conference, which officially appoints a publishing agent and the requisite editors. It also appoints. a tract committee charged with the duty of promoting the circulation of tracts by means of auxiliary and-loan societies and suitable grants. As a branch of church work, cities, villages, and country neighborhoods are districted for consecutive and: periodical visitation by tract distributors. In America, several of the more prominent denominations maintain publication societies both of tracts and books on a similar plan, although few are, as thorough in the work of dissemination.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, founded in London in the early part of the present century, deserves in several respects to be classed alongside of the publishing tract societies of England. It issues, chiefly on business principles, a large assortment of books adapted to juvenile, Sunday-school, and popular reading, all of which have for their object at least indirect Christian influence, besides many thousands of religious tracts.

In addition to facts heretofore stated, it must be borne in mind that the Sunday-school unions (q.v.) of the United States have to a large extent provided the Sunday-school tracts and books used by the different churches, and thus covered an important department of publication embraced within the operations of the Religious Tract Society of London. Besides these, several denominational religious publishing houses have grown up, in which vast numbers of tracts, books, and periodicals are printed.

The oldest and largest of these is the Book Concern of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which was a direct outgrowth of Mr. Wesley's publication enterprise in England, mentioned above. It was begun in Philadelphia by official action of the Church in 1789, and in 1804 was removed to New York, where its principal establishment has since remained. It has branch publishing-houses in Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis; together with depositories in most of the large cities.  Corresponding in character to the above are the American Baptist Publication Society and the Presbyterian. Board of Publication, both located in Philadelphia. All the institutions thus far named publish more or less books and tracts on the subject of temperance. But in 1866 the National Temperance Society was organized in New York, for the express purpose of providing a cheap and sound literature on all subjects relating to theoretical and practical temperance. The National Temperance Publication House may therefore be numbered among the tract and book publishing institutions of the United States. Its publications, already six hundred in number, are circulated to some extent through Sunday-schools, but more extensively through auxiliary temperance organizations in all parts of the land. It may thus be seen that from small beginnings less than a century ago, a vast system of tract and book publication in the interest of Christianity has sprung up and spread abroad its influence in most of the countries and languages of the world.

V. The literature of the subject is as yet chiefly to be found in the annual reports of the various societies and institutions above enumerated. The Jubilee Memorial Volume of the Religious Tract Society (Lond. 1850, 700 pp. 8vo) is a specimen of many similar volumes that will hereafter be forthcoming from that and other societies. (D. P. K.)

## Tracts for the Times[[@Headword:Tracts for the Times]]

             SEE PUSEYISM.

## Tractus[[@Headword:Tractus]]

             SEE TRACT.

## Tracy, Bernard Destult de[[@Headword:Tracy, Bernard Destult de]]

             a French, ascetic writer, was born Aug. 25.1720, at Paray-le-Fraisil, near Moulins. At the age of sixteen he joined the Theatines, and passed his whole life in retirement and piety. He died in Paris, Aug. 14,1878. He is the author of several works on practical-religion and the biographies of saints, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tracy, Samuel Walter, D.D[[@Headword:Tracy, Samuel Walter, D.D]]

             an English Independent minister, was born at Portsea, in February 1778. He studied under Reverend Dr. Bogue, preached at Lichfield, next at Hot Wells, near Bristol, then at Yeovil, was secretary of the London Missionary Society, spent several years on the Continent, and afterwards preached at Hounslow, Chelsea, and Brixton Rise. He died February 16, 1853. See (Lound.) Cong. Year-book, 1854, page 256.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Norwich, Conn., June 2,1807. He went to Philadelphia and united with the Church in February; 1827. Being  induced, by the advice of Rev. John L. Grant, to study for the ministry, he accordingly entered Williamstown Academy, and from thence Williams College, where he remained three years, but left before graduation. After this he taught school a year in Lexington, Ky. Then he spent a year in Andover Theological Seminary, and thence went to Princeton Seminary, where he remained two years. He was licensed to preach in 1835, and was ordained by the Philadelphia Presbytery as an evangelist. Having devoted himself to the work of foreign missions, he sailed for India, and, having reached Madras, he went to the Madura district, his field of labor, in 1837. He established a boarding-school at Tirumangaltum, which grew to a high- grade seminary, having fifty pupils. Here he spent twenty-two years of his life, and he educated more than 250 young men. He prepared many text- books in theology and science and gave important aid in revising the Tamil Bible. In November, 1877, his youngest son and wife joined him and his mother in India as missionaries, to share their labors and their home, but his work was done. After the Sabbath which he spent in the sanctuary, he was attacked with rheumatic cramps and diarrhea, which brought him rapidly to the end, and he died at Tirumangaltum, Nov. 28, 1877. (W.P.S.)

## Trade[[@Headword:Trade]]

             SEE MECHANIC; SEE MERCHANT.

## Traditio (Et Redditio) Symboli (Delivery Of The Creed)[[@Headword:Traditio (Et Redditio) Symboli (Delivery Of The Creed)]]

             These words are used by ecclesiastical writers in reference to the practice generally adopted of requiring baptized persons to repeat the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, in which they had previously been instructed. In the case of infants the sponsors at first repeated these formularies on behalf of the child for whom they answered; but afterwards, in the Middle Ages, the Romish Church began to dispense with this usage, and to satisfy itself with the priest's repeating them. There is still a remnant of this practice in some countries: sponsors are subjected to a catechetical examination by the minister previously to their admission.

## Tradition[[@Headword:Tradition]]

             (παράδοσις), Jewish The Jews pretend that, besides their written law contained in the Pentateuch, God delivered to Moses an oral law, which was handed down from generation to generation. The various decisions of the Jewish doctors or priests on points which the law had  either left doubtful or passed over in silence were the true sources of their traditions. They did not commit their numerous traditions (which appear to have been a long time in accumulating) to writing before their wars against the Romans under Hadrian and Severus. The Mishna, the Gemara, and perhaps the Masorah were collected by the rabbins of Tiberias and later schools. SEE RABBINISM.

Many of their false traditions were in direct opposition to the law of God; hence our Savior often reproached the Pharisees with preferring them to the law itself. He also gives several instances of their superstitious adherence to vain observances, while they neglected essential things (Mat 15:2-3; Mar 7:3-13). The only way in which we can know satisfactorily that any tradition is of divine authority is by its having a place in those writings which are generally acknowledged to be the genuine productions of inspired men. All traditions which have not such authority are without value, and tend greatly to detract and mislead the minds of men (2Th 2:15; 2Th 3:6).

In this respect, however, a notable division existed among the Jews themselves, which has been transmitted to the modern representatives of the two great parties. The leading tenet of the Sadducees was the negation of the leading tenet of their opponents. As the Pharisees asserted, so the Sadducees denied, that the Israelites were in possession of an oral law transmitted to them by Moses. The manner in which the Pharisees may have gained acceptance for their own view is noticed elsewhere in this work, SEE PHARISEE; but, for an equitable estimate of the Sadducees, it is proper to bear in mind emphatically how destitute of historical evidence the doctrine was which they denied. That doctrine is, at the, present day, rejected, probably by almost all, if not by all, Christians; and it is, indeed, so foreign to their ideas that the greater number of Christians have never even heard of it, though it is older than Christianity, and has been the support and consolation of the Jews under a series of the most cruel and wicked persecutions to which any nation has ever been exposed during an equal number of centuries. It is likewise now maintained all over the world by those who are called the orthodox Jews.

It is therefore desirable to know the kind of arguments by which, at the present day, in a historical and critical age, the doctrine is defended. For this an opportunity has lately been given by a learned French Jew, grand-rabbi of the circumscription of Colmar (Klein, Le Judaisme, ou la Veriti sur le Talmud [Mulhouse, 1859]), who still asserts as a fact the existence of a Mosaic oral law. To do  full justice to his views, the original work should be perused. But it is doing no injustice to-his learning and ability to point out that not one of his arguments has a positive historical value. Thus he relies mainly on the inconceivability (as will be again noticed in this article) that a divine revelation should not have explicitly proclaimed the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, or that it should have promulgated laws left in ‘such an incomplete form and requiring so much explanation, and so many additions as the laws in the Pentateuch. Now arguments of this kind may be sound or unsound; based on reason or illogical; and for many they may have a philosophical or theological value; but they have no pretence to he regarded as historical, inasmuch as the assumed premises, which involve a knowledge of the attributes of the Supreme Being and the manner in which he would be likely to deal with man, are far beyond the limits of historical verification.

The nearest approach to a historical argument is the following (p. 10): “In the first place, nothing proves better the fact of the existence of the tradition than the belief itself in the tradition. An entire nation does not suddenly forget its religious code, its principles, its laws, the daily ceremonies of its worship to such a point that it could easily be persuaded that a new doctrine presented by some impostors is the true and only explanation of its law and has always determined and ruled its application. Holy Writ often represents the Israelites as a stiff-necked people impatient of the religious yoke; and would it not be attributing to them rather an excess of docility, a too great condescension, a blind obedience, to suppose that they suddenly consented to troublesome and rigorous innovations which some persons might have wished to impose on them some fine morning? Such a supposition destroys itself, and we are obliged to acknowledge that the tradition is not a new invention, but that its birth goes back to the origin of the religion; and that, transmitted from father to son as the word of God, it lived in the heart of the people, identified itself with the blood, and was always considered as an inviolable authority.” But, if this passage is carefully examined, it will be seen that it does not supply a single fact worthy of being regarded as a proof of a Mosaic oral law. Independent testimony of persons contemporary with Moses that he had transmitted such a law to the Israelites would be historical evidence; the testimony of persons in the next generation as to the existence of such an oral law which their fathers told them came from Moses would have been secondary historical evidence: but the belief of the Israelites on the point twelve hundred years after Moses cannot, in the absence of any intermediate testimony, be deemed evidence of a historical  fact.

Moreover, it is a mistake to assume that they who deny a Mosaic oral law; imagine that this oral law was at some one time as one great system introduced suddenly among the Israelites. The real mode of conceiving what occurred is far different. After the return from, the Captivity, there existed probably among the Jews a large body of customs and decisions not contained in the Pentateuch; and these had practical authority over the people long before they were attributed to Moses. The only phenomenon of importance requiring explanation is, not the existence of the customs sanctioned by the oral law, but the belief accepted by a certain portion of the Jews that Moses had divinely revealed those customs as laws to the Israelites. To explain this historically from written records is impossible, from the silence on the subject of the very scanty historical Jewish writings purporting to be written between the return from the Captivity in B.C. 536 and that uncertain period when the canon was finally closed, which probably could not have been very long before the death of Antiochus Epiphanies, B.C. 164. For all this space of time, a period of about three hundred and seventy-two years, a period as long as from the accession of Henry VIII to the present day, we have no Hebrew account, nor, in fact, any contemporary account, of the history of the Jews in Palestine, except what may be contained in the short works entitled Ezra and Nehemiah. The last named of these works does not carry the history much later than one hundred years after the return from the Captivity; so that there is a long and extremely important period of more than two centuries and a half before the heroic rising of the Maccabees during which there is a total absence of contemporary Jewish history. In this dearth of historical materials, it is idle to attempt a positive narration of the circumstances under which the oral law became assigned to Moses as its author. It is amply sufficient if a satisfactory suggestion is made as to how it might have been attributed to Moses; and in this there is not much difficulty for any one who bears in mind how notoriously in ancient times laws of a much later date were attributed to Minos, Lycurgus, Solon, and Numa.

Under this head we may add that it must not be assumed that the Sadducees, because they rejected a Mosaic oral law, rejected likewise all traditions and all decisions in explanation of passages in the Pentateuch. Although they protested against the assertion that such points had been divinely settled by Moses, they probably, in numerous instances, followed practically the same traditions as the Pharisees. SEE SADDUCEE.

## Tradition, Christian[[@Headword:Tradition, Christian]]

             In the older ecclesiastical fathers, the words παράδοσις and traditio are used to denote any instruction which one gives to another, whether oral or written. In the New Test. also, and in the classical writers, παράδουναι and tradere signify, in general, to teach, to instruct. In this wider sense, tradition was divided into scripta and non scripta sive oralis. The latter, triaditio oralis, was, however, frequently called traditio, by way of eminence. This oral tradition was often appealed to by Irenaeus, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, and others of the ancient fathers, as a test by which to try the doctrines of contemporary teachers, and by which to confute the errors of the heretics. They describe it as being instruction received from the mouth of the apostles by the first Christian churches, transmitted from the apostolic age, and preserved in purity until their own times.

Oral tradition is still regarded by the Roman Church as a principium cognoscendi in theology and they attempt to support their hypothesis respecting it by the use made of it b the fathers. Much dispute has arisen, about the degree of weight to be assigned to tradition generally; many, however, consider that this is an idle controversy, and that each particular tradition should be tried on its own grounds. In coming to a decision on the merits of the question respecting doctrinal tradition, everything depends upon making the proper distinctions with regard to time.

In the first period of Christianity, the authority of the apostles was so great that all their doctrines and ordinances were strictly and punctually observed by the churches, which they had planted. The doctrine and discipline which prevailed in those apostolical churches were, at the time, justly considered by others' to be purely such as the apostles themselves had taught and established. This was the more common, as the books of the New Test. had not, as yet, come into general use among Christians; nor was it, at that early period, attended with any special liability to mistake. In this way we can account for it that Christian teachers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries appeal so frequently to oral tradition. But in later periods of the Church, the circumstances were far different. After the commencement of the 3nd century, when the first teachers of the apostolical churches and their immediate successors had passed away and another race sprung up, other doctrines and forms were gradually introduced, which differed in many respects from apostolical simplicity. And now those innovators appealed  more frequently than had ever been done before to apostolical tradition, in order to give currency to their own opinions and regulations. They went so far, indeed, as to appeal to this tradition for many things not only at variance with other traditions, but with the very writings of the apostles which they had in their hands. From this time forward, tradition naturally became more and more uncertain and suspicious. No wonder, therefore, that we find Augustine establishing the maxim that it could not be relied upon, in the ever-increasing distance from the age of the apostles, except when it was universal and perfectly consistent with itself. The Reformers justly held that tradition is not a sure and certain source of knowledge respecting the doctrines of theology, and that the Holy Scriptures are the only principium cognoscendi. See Knapp, Christian Theology, 7:3; Eden, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Cunningham, Hist. Theology, 1, 186, 480; Hagenbach, fist. of Doctrines (Index); Hook, Church Dict. s.v.; Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 2, 42; Van Oosterzee. Christian Dogmatics, art. “Faith, Rule of.”

TRADITION, in the Church of England, refers to customs, forms, rites, ceremonies, etc. which have been transmitted by oral communication, and, as used in Article 34, is not to be understood as including matters of faith. The traditions for which the article requires respect and obedience are all those customs and ceremonies in established use which are not expressly named in the Scriptures, nor in the written laws or rubrics of the Church, but stand simply on the ground of prescription. Among these may be mentioned the alternate mode of reading the Psalter, the custom of bowing in the Creed, the postures in various offices of the Church, the use of a doxology and collects after a sermon, the practice of pouring the baptismal water upon the head, the quantity of the elements consumed in the Eucharist, etc. These, though unwritten, are not the less obligatory when ascertained to be standing customs of the Church. The article ordains that “whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church which be not. repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked, openly (that others may fear to do the like) as he that; offendeth against the common order of the Church,” etc.

## Traditores[[@Headword:Traditores]]

             (surrenderers or, traitors), a name applied by the ancient Christians to those persons who delivered up their Bible and sacred utensils of the  Church to the heathen in time of persecution. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 16:ch. 6:§ 25.

## Traducianism[[@Headword:Traducianism]]

             is the belief that the souls of children, as well as their bodies, are propagated from their parents, and is opposed to Creationism (q.v.) and the doctrine of the Pre-existents (q.v.). According to Jerome, both Tertullian and Apollinaris were advocates of this opinion, and the opponents of Pelagianism, in general, have been inclined to it. Since the Reformation, it has been more approved than any other in the Lutheran Church, and that not by philosophers and naturalists merely, but also by divines. Luther himself, though he did not declare distinctly in its favor. was also inclined towards this theory; and in the Formula Concordiae it is distinctly taught that both soul and body are propagated by the parents in ordinary generation. What has rendered the hypothesis more acceptable to theologians is its affording the easiest solution of the doctrine of native depravity; and it seems to receive confirmation from the psychological facts that the natural disposition of children not infrequently resembles that of their, parents, and that the mental excellences and imperfections of parents are inherited nearly as often by their children as any bodily attributes. But, after all that can be said, we must be content to remain in uncertainty respecting the subject. As thou knowest not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child, even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all” (Ecc 11:5). See Buck, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychology, p. 128-131; New-Englander, July, 1868, p. 475. SEE SOUL, ORIGIN OF.

## Traducians[[@Headword:Traducians]]

             the adherents of Traducianism (q.v.).

## Traheron, Bartholomew[[@Headword:Traheron, Bartholomew]]

             a learned English divine at the period of the Reformation, was born at Cornwall and educated at Oxford, either in Exeter College or Hart Hall. He traveled extensively in Germany and Italy, and, returning to England, was made keeper of the king's library. In 1551 king Edward VI conferred on him the deanery of Chichester. This he lost on the accession of queen Mary, and, joining the English exiles in Germany, wrote all his important works there. The time of his death is uncertain. Traheron's works are,  Parceresis, lib. 1: — Carmina in Mortem fienrici Dudlei: Analysis Scoparum Johannis Cochlei Exposition of a Part of St. John's Gospel (1558, 8vo): Exposition of the Fourth Chapter of St. John's Revelation (1557, 8vo): — An Answer Made by Bartholomew Traheron to a Private Papist.

## Trail, Walter[[@Headword:Trail, Walter]]

             a Scotch prelate, a canon of St. Andrews. was elected bishop of that diocese in 1385, and was still there in 1400. He died in the castle of St. Andrews in 1401. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 26.

## Traill, Robert[[@Headword:Traill, Robert]]

             an eminent divine of the Church of Scotland, was born at Ely, May, 1642. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and pursued the study of divinity with great ardor for several years. In 1666 he was obliged to secrete himself, because some copies of An Apologetic Relation, etc., were found in his mother's house; and the following year, being suspected of opposing the king, he was obliged to join his father in Holland. In 1670 he went to England, and was ordained by Presbyterian divines in London. In 1677 Mr. Traill was imprisoned for preaching privately, but was released in October of the same year. He then located at Cranbrook, in Kent, but for many years afterwards was pastor of a Scotch congregation in London. He was warmly attached' to the Calvinistic doctrines, and took a zealous concern in the doctrinal controversies. He died in May, 1716. He published a number of theological treatises and discourses, which for many years were printed separately, but collectively after his death (Edinb. 1745, 4 vols. 12mo; 1754, 2 vols. 12mo; Glasgow, 1776-3 vols. 8vo; best ed. 1806, 4 vols. 8vo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Train, Arthur Savage, D.D[[@Headword:Train, Arthur Savage, D.D]]

             a Baptist divine, was born at Framingham, Mass., Sept. 1, 1812, and was a graduate: of Brown University in the class of 1833. He was tutor in the university two years after his graduation, carrying on at the same time his theological studies under Dr. Wayland. In 1836 he was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church in Haverhill, Mass., where he had a successful ministry of twenty-three years. He was elected professor of sacred rhetoric and pastoral duties in the Newton Theological Institute in 1859, and held the office for seven years. In 1866 he accepted a call to the pastorate of the Baptist Church in Framingham, where he remained until his death, Jan. 2, 1872. Dr. Train was a trustee of Brown University from 1845 till his death. (J. C. S.)

## Trajan, Marcus Ulpius Nerva[[@Headword:Trajan, Marcus Ulpius Nerva]]

             emperor of Rome from A.D. 98 to 117, is a noteworthy personage in the history of ancient times by reason of his personal qualities, and also as a general and ruler. He is important to the history of the Church through his connection with the persecution of the adherents of Christianity in his time. At first tolerated by the policy of the Roman rulers as a comparatively feeble though despicable excrescence on the loathsome superstition of Judaism, Christianity was forced upon the notice of the emperors by the tumults excited among the populace by heathen priests, who observed the remarkable progress of that faith With alarm, and Trajan was accordingly led to issue edicts for the gradual suppression of the new teaching which transformed men into haters of the gods. The administration of the younger Pliny as governor of Bithynia was complicated with matters growing out of the rapid extension of Christianity and the consequent rage of the heathen population within his province. He therefore endeavored to enforce against Christians the laws for the suppression of the really dangerous Hetaeries (see Pliny, Epist. 10:43), but found the complaints to be so numerous and the result of the judicial investigations so unsatisfactory that he referred the whole matter to the emperor for instructions. Of the accused, many denied that they were in any way implicated in Christianity; others declared that they had returned to the old faith, and offered incense and libations before the image of the emperor and blasphemed the name of Christ.

Those who avowed themselves Christians confessed to nothing of a damaging character. Their offence consisted merely in meeting before sunrise of a specified day to sing a common hymn in honor of Christ as a god, and in the assumption of a voluntary obligation, under oath, to commit no theft, robbery, nor adultery, but to keep a promise and acknowledge the possession of goods committed to their trust. The torture applied to two maids disclosed nothing more criminal than these statements. Trajan commended the governor's action, and observed that no general and definite prescriptions could be given for such matters. He added that search should not: be made for suspected persons, though, if accused and convicted, they should be punished unless they interposed a denial of the charge of being Christians, and authenticated it by calling on  the gods. Anonymous accusations of any sort should not be received. The execution of several Christians, among them the aged Symeon, who was the son of Clopas, and successor of James at Jerusalem, must be explained in view of the fact that the emperor was at the same time regent of the State and chief priest (pontifex maximus), and would consider it necessary to protect and preserve the religion which was so closely interwoven with the interests of the State. The same idea will apply to the case of Ignatius.

Literature. The principal sources for the history of Trajan are Pliny the younger, Epistolce, especially lib. 10 and Panegynricus (ed. Gierig); Dion Cass. Hist. Rom. lib. 68 (unfortunately extant only in the extract by Xiphilinus); Aurel. Victor, Caes..13, 1 sq. and Epitome 13; Eutrop. 8:2; Orosius, 7:2 sq.; Tertull. Apologet. c. 1; Eüseb. Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 12 sq.; Justin. Apologet. 1, 68; Rufinus, Hist. Ecc 4:9. See Ritterhusii Trajanus in Lucem Reproductus (1608); Mannert, Res Traj. Imp. ad . anu. Gestca (Norimb. 1793); Engel, Coment. de Expedit. Traj. ad Danub. et Origine Valachoarum (Vindeb. 1794); Wolf, Einermilde Stiftung Trajan's (Berl. 1808, 4to); Francke, Zür Gesch. Traj. u. seiner Zeifgenossen (Gustrow, 1837); Baldwin, Comment. et Edict. Vett. Princc. Rom. de Christianis (Hal. 1727, 4to); Bohmer, XII Dissertt. Juris Eccl. Ant. ad Plin. Sec. et Tertull. (2d ed. ibid. 1729), Martini, Persecutt. Christianorum sub Imp. Rom. (Onost. 1802, 4to); Kopke, De Statu et Condit. Christi sub Imp. Rom. Alterius post Christ. Scec. (Berol. 1828); Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 2, 320 sq.; Gieseler, Kirchengesch. 1, 134 sq.; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 95, 98.Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v. SEE PLINY.

## Tramontane[[@Headword:Tramontane]]

             (across the mountain), a term applied by the Italians to those dwelling north of the Alps, and especially to the ecclesiastics and professors of the canon law of Germany and France. SEE ULTRAMONTANE.

## Trance[[@Headword:Trance]]

             (ἔκστασις, ecstasy), a supernatural state of body and mind, the nature of which has been well conjectured by Doddndge, who defines it “such a rapture of mind as gives the person who falls into it a look of astonishment, and renders him insensible of the external objects around him, while in the meantime his imagination is agitated in an extraordinary manner with some striking scenes which pass before it and take up all the attention.” He refers  to some extraordinary instances of this kind mentioned by Gualterius in his note on Act 10:10,(Family Expositor, ad loc. note g). Stockius also describes it as “a sacred ecstasy, or rapture of the mind out of itself, when, the use of the external senses being suspended, God reveals something in a peculiar manner to prophets and apostles, who are then taken or transported out of themselves.” The same idea is intimated in then English word trance, from the Latin transitus, the state of being carried out of one's self. SEE INSPIRATION; SEE PROPHECY.

1. In the only passage (Num 24:4; Num 24:16) in which this word occurs in the English of the Old Test. there is, as the italics show, no corresponding word in Hebrew, simply נפֵל, falling,” for which the Sept. gives ἐν ἕπνῳ, and the Vulg. more literally qui cadit. In the New Test. we meet with the word three times (Act 10:10; Act 11:5; Act 22:17), the Vulg. giving “excessus” in the two former, “stupor mentis” in the latter. The Greek word ἔκστασις employed in these passages denotes the effect of any passion by which the thoughts are wholly absorbed. In the Sept. it corresponds to שמה, a “wonderful thing” (Jer 5:30), תמהון, “astonishment” (Deu 28:28), and תרדמהa prophetic lethargy or “deep sleep” (Gen 2:21; Gen 15:12, etc.). In the New Test. it usually represents the absorbing effects of admiration (Mar 5:42; Luk 5:26; Act 3:10); of terror (Mar 16:8).

2. Used as the Greek word is by Luke (Acts, ut sup.) “the physician,” and, in this special sense, by him only, in the New Test., it would be interesting to inquire what precise meaning it had in the medical terminology of the time. From the time of Hippocrates, who uses it to describe the loss of conscious perception, it had probably borne the connotation which it has had, with shades of meaning for good or evil, ever since. Thus, Hesychius gives as the account of a man in an ecstasy that he is ὁ εἰς ἑαυτὸν μὴ ὤν. Apuleius (Apologia) speaks of it as “a change from the earthly mind (ἀπὸ τοῦ γηϊvνου φρονήματος) to a divine and spiritual condition both of character and life.” Tertullian (De An. 45) compares it to the dream-state in which the soul acts, but not through its usual instruments. Augustine (Confess. 9:11) describes his mother in this state as “abstracta a prsesentibus,” and gives a description of like phenomena in the case of a certain Restitutus (De Civ. Dei, 14:24).

3. We may compare with these statements the more precise definitions of modern medical science. There the ecstatic state appears as one form of catalepsy. In catalepsy pure and simple, there is “a sudden suspension of thought, of sensibility, of voluntary motion.” The body continues in any attitude in which it may be placed, there are no signs of any process of thought; the patient continues silent. In the ecstatic form of catalepsy, on the other hand, “the patient is lost to all external impressions, but wrapped and absorbed in some object of the imagination.” The man is “as if out of the body.” “Nervous and susceptible persons are apt to be thrown into these trances under the influence of what is called mesmerism. There is, for the most part, a high degree of mental excitement. The patient utters the most enthusiastic and fervid expressions or the most earnest warnings. The character of the whole frame is that of intense contemplative excitement. He believes that he has seen wonderful visions and heard singular revelations” (Watson, Principles and Practice, lect. 39; Copland, Dict. of Medicine, s.v. “Catalepsy”). The causes of this state are to be traced commonly to strong religious impressions; but some, though, for the most part, not the ecstatic, phenomena of catalepsy are producible by the concentration of thought on one object, or of the vision upon one fixed point (Quart. Rev. 93, 510-22, by Dr. Carpenter); and, in some more exceptional cases, like that mentioned by Augustine (there, however. under the influence of sound, “ad imitatas quasi lamentantis cujuslibet hominis - voces”), and that of Jerome Cardan ( Vat. Rer. 8:43), men have been able to throw themselves into a cataleptic state at will.

4. Whatever explanation may be given of it, it is true of many if not of most, of those who have left the stamp of their own character on the religious history of mankind, that they have been liable to pass at times into this abnormal state. The union of intense feeling, strong volition, long- continued thought (the conditions of all wide and lasting influence), aided in many cases by the withdrawal from the lower life of the support which is needed to maintain a healthy equilibrium, appears to have been more than the “earthen vessel” will bear. The words, which speak of “an ecstasy of adoration”, are often literally true. The many visions the journey through the heavens, the so-called epilepsy of Mohammed-were phenomena of this nature. Of three great mediaeval teachers, St. Francis of Assisi, St.Thomas Aquinas, and Joannes Scotus, it is recorded that they would fall into the ecstatic state, remain motionless, seem as if dead, sometimes for a whole day, and then, returning to consciousness, speak as if they had drunk deep  of divine mysteries (Gualterius, Crit. Sac. on Act 10:10). The old traditions of Aristeas and Epimenides, the conflicts of Dunstan and Luther with the powers of darkness, the visions of Savonarola, George Fox. Swedenborg, and Bihme are generically analogous. Where there has been no extraordinary power to influence others, other conditions remaining the same, the phenomena have appeared among whole classes of men and women in proportion as the circumstances of their lives tended to produce an excessive susceptibility to religious or imaginative emotion. The history of monastic orders, of American and Irish revivals, gives countless examples. Still more noticeable is the fact that many of the improvisatori of Italy are “only able to exercise their gift when they are in a state of ecstatic trance, and speak of the gift itself as something morbid” (Copland, loc. cit.); while in strange contrast with their earlier history, and pointing perhaps to a national character that has become harder and less emotional, there is the testimony of a German physician (Frank), who had made catalepsy a special study, that he had never met with a single case of it among the Jews (Copland, loc. cit.; comp. Maury, La Magie et Astrologie).

5. We are now able to take a true estimate of the trances of Biblical history. As in other things, so also here, the phenomena are common to higher and lower, to true and false systems. The nature of man continuing the same, it could hardly be that the awfulness of the divine presence, the terrors of divine judgment, should leave it in the calm equilibrium of its normal state. Whatever made the impress of a truth more indelible, whatever gave him to whom it was revealed more power over the hearts of others, might well take its place in the divine education of nations and individual men. We may not point to trances and ecstasies as proofs of a true revelation, but still less may we think of them as at all inconsistent with it. Thus, though we have not the word, we have the thing in several clear instances in the Bible. Some, perhaps many, things recorded in Scripture belong to this supernatural state of trance, which are not expressly referred to it. See the long list of such supposed cases in Bp. Law's Consideration of the Theory of Religion (Lond. 1820, p. 85, 86). We notice here only the most marked examples.

In the Old Test. a state of supernatural ecstasy is evidently denoted by the “deep sleep” which fell upon Adam during the creation of Eve (Gen 2:21), and during which, as appears from the narrative, he was made aware of the transaction, and of the purport of the attendant circumstances (Gen 2:21-24). SEE MARRIAGE. A similar state occurs again in the “deep sleep” which fell upon Abraham (Gen 15:12), during which the bondage of his descendants in Egypt was revealed to him. Possibly all the accounts recorded in that chapter occurred in “vision” (Gen 2:1-12), which ultimately deepened into the trance (Gen 2:12-21). Comp. Gen 2:5; Gen 2:12, where he is said to have seen the stars, though the sun had not gone down. The apparent objection that Abraham was “brought forth abroad” to see the stars is only of the same nature with others explained in the art. SEE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.

Balaam, as if overcome by the constraining power of a spirit mightier than his own,'” sees the vision of God, falling, but with opened eyes” (Num 24:4). The incident of the ass speaking to him, etc., is also understood by many learned Jews and Christians to have occurred in a vision (Bp. Law, ut. sup.). To the same mode of divine communication must be referred the magnificent description in Job 4:13-21. Saul, when the wild chant of the prophets stirred the old depths of feeling, himself also “prophesied” and “fell down” (most, if not all, of his kingly clothing being thrown off in the ecstasy of the moment) “all that day and all that night” (1Sa 19:24). Something there was in Jeremiah that made men say of him that he was as one that “is mad and maketh himself a prophet” (Jer 29:26). In Ezekiel the phenomena appear in more wonderful and awful forms. He sits motionless for seven days in the stupor of astonishment, till the word of the Lord comes to him (Eze 3:15). The hand of the Lord” falls on him, and he too sees the visions of God” and hears the voice of the Almighty, is “lifted up between the earth and heaven,” and passes from the river of Chebar to the Lord's house in Jerusalem (Eze 8:3).

As other elements and forms of the prophetic work were revived in “the apostles and prophets” of the New Test., so also was this. More distinctly even than in the Old Test., it becomes the medium through which men rise to see clearly what before was dim and doubtful, in which the mingled hopes and fears and perplexities of the waking state are dissipated at once. Though different in form, it belongs to the same class of phenomena as the “gift of tongues,” and is connected with “visions and revelations of the Lord.” In some cases, indeed, it is the chosen channel for such revelations. To the “trance” of Peter in the city, where all outward circumstances tended to bring the thought of an expansion of the divine kingdom more distinctly before him than it had ever been brought before, we owe the indelible truth stamped upon the heart of Christendom, that God is “no respecter of persons,” that we may not call any man “common or unclean” (Act 10:11). To the “trance” of Paul, when his work for  his own-people seemed utterly fruitless, we owe the mission which was the starting-point of the history of the Universal Church, the command which bade him “depart ... far hence unto the Gentiles” (Act 22:17-21). Wisely, for the most part, did that apostle draw a veil over these more mysterious experiences. He would not sacrifice to them, as others have often sacrificed, the higher life of activity; love, prudence. He could not explain them to himself. “In the body or out of the body,” he could not tell but the outer world of perception had passed away, and he had passed in spirit into “paradise,” into the third heaven,” and had heard “unspeakable words” (2Co 12:1-4). Those trances too, we may believe, were not without their share in fashioning his character and life, though no special truth came distinctly out of them. United as they then were, but as they have seldom been since, with clear perceptions of the truth of God, with love wonderful in its depth and tenderness, with energy unresting, and subtle tact almost passing into “guile,” they made him what he was, the leader of the apostolic band, emphatically the “master-builder” of the Church of God (comp. Jowett, Fragment on the Character of St. Paul).

Persons receiving this divine influence often fell to the earth under its influence, as in ordinary catalepsy (Gen 17:3, etc.; 1Sa 19:24, Heb. or margin; Eze 1:28; Dan 8:18; Dan 10:15-16; Rev 1:10; Rev 1:17). It is important, however, to observe that in all these cases the visions beheld are also related; hence such cases are distinguished from A mere deliquium animni. We find likewise in the case of Peter that “he fell into a trance” (or rather a “trance fell upon him, ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ᾿ αὐτὸν ἔκστασις), during which he “saw a vision,” which is therefore distinguished from the trance (Act 10:10 comp. Paul's trance, Act 22:17; 2Co 12:2, etc.). The reality of the vision is established by the correspondence of the event. The nearest approach we can make to such a state is that in which our mind is so occupied in the contemplation of an object as to lose entirely the consciousness of the body a state in which the highest order of ideas, whether belonging to the judgment or imagination, is undoubtedly attained. Hence we can readily conceive that such a state might be supernaturally induced for the higher purpose of revelation, etc. The alleged phenomena of the mesmeric trance and clairvoyance, if they serve no higher purpose, may assist our conceptions of it. SEE VISION.

## Trani[[@Headword:Trani]]

             a name common to some Jewish authors, of whom we mention the following:

1. ISAIAH DA, so-called after his native place Trani, a seaport town of Naples, and, by way of abbreviation, Ridi ריד, from the initials ר8 ישעיה דטראניi.e. R. Isaiah da Trani, flourished about A.D. 1232-70. He may be regarded as the founder of the school of Talmudical and traditional exegesis in Italy. He wrote not only numerous annotations on the Talmud, and theological decisions (פסקים) connected with traditional law, but also scholia (נמוקים) to the Bible, which are as follows: נמוקי החומש, Scholia on the Pentateuch (Leghorn, 1792): — קצור פרוש יהושע, Annotations on Joshua, published, with a Latin translation: by J. A. Steinmetz, under the title Esaiae Comment. in Josuama quens in Codiae VMS. Bibl. Senat. Lips. Descriptum et Versione at Notis Illustratum, Pracside J. G. Abicht Ercuditorsunm Examini subjecit (Lips. 1712): — Annotations on Judges and 1 Samuel, printed in the Rabbinical Bible's (q.v.). Besides these published commentaries, the following annotations of Trani are in MS. a commentary on Ezra, Cod. Opp.; a commentary on the Five Megilloth and Daniel, in the Angelica at Rome; commentaries on the minor prophets, Psalms, and Job, to be found in MS. in several European libraries. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 438 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 318 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. col. 1389-92; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leips. 1873), 7:175; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 3, 33; Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Literatur, p. 58.

2. MOSES DA, was born at Salonica in 1505. When a boy he went to Adrianople, and was educated in the house of his uncle. In the year 1521 he went to Safet to continue his studies, and four years later he received ordination, and in .1535 went to Jerusalem, where he died in 1585. His success in teaching was so great that he was styled “The Light of Israel,” “The Senate of Mount Sinai and the Uprooter of Mountains,” because he solved the difficulties in the law. He wrote, אלהי בית, on Jewish rites, ceremonies, prayers, morals, etc. (Venice, 1576): — ס8 קרית ספר, a body of Jewish laws, in which he distinguishes between the laws written by Moses, those which were transmitted by tradition, and those only founded on the decisions of the doctors: — a collection of decisions in 3 parts, and  other works of minor import. See First, Bibl. Jud. 3, 441 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 319 sq.; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 703; Adams, Hist. of the Jews, 2, 14; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u.s. Sekten, 3, 129; Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Literatur, p. 229, 230. (B. P.)

## Transanimation[[@Headword:Transanimation]]

             the transfer of souls from one body to another TRANSMIGRATION SEE TRANSMIGRATION (q.v.).

## Transcaucasian Tartar Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Transcaucasian Tartar Version Of The Scriptures]]

             A peculiar and rather corrupt dialect of the Turkish is spoken by the greater part of the Moslem population in Georgia, Shusti, Shirwan, Derbend, and North-west Persia. As it is vernacular in numerous tribes in all the Russian provinces beyond the Caucasus, this dialect has been termed, by way of distinction, the Transcaucasian. Parts of the New Test. were prepared in this language many years ago by Mirza Ferookh and the Reverend Dr. Pfander. In 1875 the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society proposed to reprint the gospels under the superintendence of Mr. Abraham Amirchanjanz, the son of Mirza Ferookh, who has latterly been employed in the service of the Basle missions. From the report of 1877 we learn that the British Bible Society resolved to print the remaining portions of the New Test., and Mr. Amirchanjanz has revised the remainder of his father's manuscript, and translated the Epistle to the Romans. In 1878 the entire New Test. was printed under the superintendence of Messrs. Amirchanjanz and Sauerwein. From the report of 1881 we learn that the British and Foreign Bible Society had secured the entire services of Mr. Amirchanjanz for editorial work, and that he had undertaken a translation of the Old Test. This translation, which was completed in 1883, induced the American missionaries to give up their version, on which they were engaged, and unite with Mr. Amirchanjanz in a final revision of the Old, Test., in order to secure but one version of the Bible in the Transcaucasian language. (B.P.)

## Transcendent, or Transcendental[[@Headword:Transcendent, or Transcendental]]

             (from trianscendere, to go beyond), words employed by various schoolmen, particularly Duns Scotus, to describe the conceptions that, by their universality, rise above or transcend the ten Aristotelian categories. Thus, according to Scotus, Ens, or Being, because it is predicable of substance and accident alike, of God as well as of the world, is raised above these by including or comprehending them. Again, the predicates assumed by Scotus to belong to Ens, or simple existence, viz. the One, the True, the Good-Unun, Verum, Bonum-are styled transcendent because applicable to Ens before the descent is made to the ten classes of real existence. According to Kant, transcendental applies to the conditions of our knowledge which transcend experience, which are a priori, and not derived from sensitive reflection. Between the hitherto convertible terms transcendental and transcendent Kant drew a distinction of considerable importance in understanding his own system. By the word transcendental he designates the various forms, categories, or ideas assumed to be native elements of human thought; implying that, although they are not products of experience, they are manifested only in experience such as space and time, causality, etc. The word transcendent Kant reserves for those among the transcendental or a priori elements that altogether transcend experience. They may seem to be given in experience, but they are not really given. Such are the “Ideas of the Pure Reason,” God, an immaterial soul, etc. Transcendental elements, when legitimately applied to experience, as causality and relation, are called immanent. See Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; Fleming and Krauth, Vocab. of Phil. Science, s.v.

## Transcendentalism[[@Headword:Transcendentalism]]

             a name given to some forms of recent German philosophy. Fichte taught a subjective idealism, Schelling an objective idealism, and Hegel an absolute idealism-regarding thought and being as identical. Nature is God coming into self-consciousness, for he is ever striving after self-realization: “In order to philosophize aright, we must lose our own personality in God, who is chiefly revealed in the acts of the human mind. In the infinite developments of divinity, anti the infinite progress towards self- consciousness, the greatest success is reached in the exertions of human reason. In men's minds, therefore, is the highest manifestation of God. God recognizes himself best in human reason, which is a consciousness of God. And it is by human reason that the world (hitherto without thought, and so without existence, mere negation) comes into consciousness; thus God is revealed in the world. After arriving at an ideal God, we learn that philosophy and religion draw us away from our little selves, so that our separate consciousness is dissolved in that of God. Philosophy is religion; and true religion frees man from all that is low, and from himself, from clinging to I-hood (Ichheit) and subjectivity, and helps him to life in God as the truth, and thereby to true life. In this ablation of personal identity, we must not claim property even in our own thoughts. Hegel teaches that it is God who thinks in us; nay, that it is precisely that which thinks in us which is God. The pure and primal substance manifests itself as the subject; and true knowledge of the absolute is the absolute itself. There is but a step to take and we arrive at the tenet that the universe and God are one.

The Hegelians attempt to distinguish this from the doctrine of Spinoza, but their distinctions are inappreciable; their scheme is pantheism. And as God is revealed by all the phenomena of the world's history, he is partly revealed by moral action, and consequently by sin, no less than by holiness. Sin is, therefore, a part of the necessary evolution of the divine principle; or, rather, in any sense, which can affect the conscience, there is no evil in sin there is no sin. It was reserved for Hegel to abandon all the scruples of six thousand years, and publish the discovery certainly the most wonderful in the history of human research that something and nothing are the same! In declaring it he almost apologizes, for he says that this proposition appears so paradoxical that it may readily be supposed that it is not seriously maintained. Yet he is far from being ambiguous. Something and nothing are the same. The absolute of which so much is vaunted is nothing. But the conclusion, which is, perhaps, already anticipated by the reader's mind, and  which leaves us incapacitated for comment, is this-we shudder while we record it-that after the exhaustive abstraction is carried to infinity in search of God, we arrive at nothing. God himself is nothing!” (Princeton Essays).

These systems of philosophy in Germany, “that nation of thinkers and critics,” have, each in its turn, influenced the science of Biblical philology; and whether it be the moralism of Kant, or the idealism of Fichte, or the deeper transcendentalism of Hegel, it makes Scripture speak its own dogmas, and consecrates the apostles the coryphaei of its system. When Strauss wrote his Leben Jesu, Germany was thrilled by the publication — all classes of her divines and philosophers, historians and scholars. When, as in this work of Strauss, all historical reality is denied to the gospels, and they are declared to be composed, not of facts, but ideas, and are affirmed to describe, not a personal God or a historical Christ, but a cluster of notions intensely prevalent in Judaea; and when it is argued that the names and events occurring in the evangelical narrations are but symbols of inward emotions, and the blasphemies of pantheism are reasoned for from the union of deity and humanity in Jesus, as shadowing forth the identity of the forms vulgarly named Creator and creature, it is easily seen that the author uses the philosophy of Hegel as the great organ of perverting and desecrating the records of the evangelists, especially of polluting the finer and more experimental portions of the work of the beloved disciple. Weisse, the producer of a similar mixture of boldness and impiety, declares it impossible for any one to understand his theology unless he have mastered his philosophy.

No one can comprehend the systems of Daub, Schwartz, or Schleiermacher till he has mastered the philosophy which Schelling propounded in his early and adventurous youth. “A life beyond the grave,” says. Strauss, “is the last foe which speculative criticism has to encounter, and, if it can, to extirpate.” So, to find a place for such theories, this author commenced a series of wild and unjustifiable attacks on the gospels, finding discrepancies where there are none, creating exaggerations where the narrative is easy and simple, denying the possibility of miracles, and involving the whole narrative in confusion and mystery, in order to destroy its historical character, and render its interpretation possible only on the supposition of its being a useless and disconnected mythology. Whatever sophistry and perverted logic could supply, whatever perplexity a shrewd and malicious criticism could suggest, whatever reasoning a clever and fascinating philosophy could produce, were used to create and garnish the new hypothesis. The whole system is a sad memorial of the  proud and unhallowed wisdom of this world, impugning the revelation already given, delighting in every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, and exalting in withdrawing every thought from the obedience of Christ. Well might Eschenmayer speak of the “Ischariotismus” of Hegelianism. While it kissed, it betrayed, and at length proceeded to the trial and condemnation of its victim (Old and New, Aug. 1870, p, 186). SEE DEISM; SEE PANTHEISM; SEE RATIONALISM,

## Transelementation[[@Headword:Transelementation]]

             (trans and elementum), a term used to signify the change of the elements in one body into those of another.

## Transfiguration[[@Headword:Transfiguration]]

             The Greek word μετεμορφώθη, well rendered “was transfigured,” signifies a change of form or appearance (Mat 17:2; Mar 9:2),.and is so explained in Luk 9:29, “the fashion of his countenance was altered.” This is one of the most wonderful incidents in the life of our Savior upon earth, and one so instructive that we can never exhaust its lessons. The apostle Peter, towards the close of his life, in running his mind over the proofs of Christ's majesty, found none so -conclusive and irrefragable as the scenes when he and others were with his Master in the holy mount (2Pe 1:18) as eye-witnesses that he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory,” This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” The apostle John likewise refers to the convincing power of the “glory” exhibited on that occasion (Joh 1:14). If we divide Christ's public life into three periods the first of miracles, to prove his divine mission; the second of parables, to inculcate virtue; and the third of suffering, first clearly revealed and then endured, to atone for sin-the transfiguration may be viewed as his baptism or initiation into the third and last. He went up the Mount of Transfiguration on the eighth day after he had bidden every one who would come after him take up his cross, declaring that his kingdom was-not of this world that he must suffer many things, and be killed, etc.

The Mount of Transfiguration is traditionally thought to have been Mount Tabor; but as this height is fifty miles from Caesarea Philippi, where Jesus  last taught, it has of late been supposed to have been a mountain much less distant, namely, Mount Hermon. As there was an interval, however, of a week between this and the preceding occurrence, we may naturally conclude that a part of this time was occupied in the journey. SEE TABOR.

The only persons thought worthy to ascend this mount of vision were Peter, James, and John, three being a competent number of witnesses, or they being more faithful and beloved than any others. Whatever the reason was, these three disciples appear on more than one other occasion as an elect triumvirateas at the raising of Jairus's daughter, and during our Lord's agony in the garden. The disciples, in all probability, ascended the mountain anticipating nothing more than that Jesus, as at other times (Luk 6:12), would continue all night in prayer to God. When the curtains of night closed around them, they were so worn out by their labors as to sink down in sleep, till startled from their slumbers by the glory of the Lord shining round about them; for, as Jesus prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered,” and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light... And behold there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.” Peter's words, “Master, it is good for us to be here,” are a natural expression of rapture; and his proposal to build three tabernacles indicated his desire both to keep his Lord from going down to Jerusalem to die there, and to prolong the blessedness of beholding with open face the glory of God. Such is at least a plausible interpretation of his language, while “he wist not what to say.” It is worthy of remark that Peter had no thought of tents for himself and his companions, his only desire being that the beatific vision might endure forever. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them not a black cloud such as that which rested on Mount Sinai, but a cloud glistening as the Shechinah when the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, or as the cloud that filled the house of the Lord when the priests were come out of the holy place. “And behold a voice out of the cloud” that is, out of the long-established symbol of Jehovah's presence” which said, “This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased hear ye him. And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid” like Daniel and all others who have felt themselves entranced by revelations of God. “And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid” showing such gentleness as proved him to be fitly named the Lamb of God. How long the glorification of our Savior continued it were vain to inquire; but it appears from the narrative of Luke that he did not lead down  his disciples till the day following that on which they had ascended the height. As they descended, he bade his disciples keep what they had seen a secret till after his resurrection, doubtless because the whole vision, to those who had not seen it, would have been a rock of offence, appearing, as an idle tale. He also opened their eyes to see that. Elias whom they looked for in the future was to be sought in the past, even In John the Baptist, who was clothed with his spirit and power.

The final causes of the transfiguration, although in part wrapped up in mystery, appear to be in part plain. Among its intended lessons may be the following: First, to teach that, in spite of the calumnies which the Pharisees had heaped on Jesus the old and new dispensations are in harmony with each other. To this end the author and the restorer of the old dispensation talk with the founder of the new, as if his scheme, even the most repulsive feature of it, was contemplated by theirs, as the reality of which they had promulgated only types and shadows. Secondly, to teach that the new dispensation was superior to the old. Moses and Elias appear as inferior to Jesus, not merely since their faces did not, so far as we know, shine like the sun, but chiefly because the voice from the excellent glory commanded to. hear him in preference to them; thirdly, to gird up the energies of Jesus for the great agony which was so soon to excruciate him; as in Gethsemane itself an angel appeared unto him strengthening him; as the Holy Ghost descended upon him in the likeness of a dove before his temptation in the wilderness and as, when the devil left him, angels came and ministered unto him. Fourthly, to comfort the hearts of the disciples, who, being destined to see their Master, whom they had left all to follow, nailed to a cross, to be themselves persecuted, and to suffer their want of all things, were in danger of despair. But, by being eye-witnesses of his majesty, they became convinced that his humiliation, even though he descended into the place of the dead, was voluntary and could not continue long. Gazing at the glorified body of their Master, they beheld not only a proof but an express and lively image, of his resurrection, ascension, and exaltation above the heavens. As in a prophetic vision, they beheld him seated upon clouds; and seen by every eye as the Judge of the quick and the dead, or enthroned in heaven amid the host of his redeemed. Henceforth they ceased not questioning one another what the rising from the dead should mean. Fifthly, to teach that virtue will not allow supine contemplation, but demands the exercise and exertion of our several powers. To some this lesson may seem a refinement, but it is ingeniously deduced by  Schleiermacher from the fact that while Peter yet spake in his ecstasy, the vision in which he longed to wear out his life vanished away as if the aim were to teach us that when we have ascended the mount of vision on the cherub-wings of contemplation, even if we burn to dwell there in a perpetual sweetness, yet We must shun all monastic seclusion that we-may mingle among men and do them good; even as the great Exemplar would not let his chosen repose in rapturous musings, and had scarcely come down from the mountain of his glory before he recommenced his works of usefulness.

The transfiguration is so fine a subject for the painter that we are not surprised to learn that it employed Raphael's best hours, and that his portraiture of it is confessedly the highest of all efforts of pictorial genius. The original work, still unfaded, though more than three centuries have passed over it, hangs in the Vatican. A copy of it in mosaic on a colossal scale, and which might pass with most men for the original, fills the head of the left aisle in St. Peter's at Rome. The design is as simple as the artless narrative of the evangelists. In the center, and in raiment white as the light, is he, the fashion of whose countenance was altered. On either hand, and floating on the air, appear in glory Moses and Elias. Beneath, the disciples, overshadowed by a bright cloud, their hands shielding their dazzled eyes, are fallen on their faces, sore afraid of the voice proceeding out of the cloud, but catching glimpses of Jesus transfigured before them.

For monographs on the transfiguration, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 47.; Hase, Leben Jesut, p. 161; Bagot, On the Transfiguration (Lond. 1840); Anon. Tabor's Teachings (ibid. 1867, 1868); also the (Am.) Free-will Baptist Quarterly, Jan. 1858. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Transfiguration (or Jesus) day[[@Headword:Transfiguration (or Jesus) day]]

             was kept in the Western Church in the time of St. Leo, and in the Greek Church about A.D. 700. By a bull of Calixtus III, 1456 (or 1457), it was ordered to be generally observed, in memory of the victory of Hunniades and the Hungarian army over Mohammed and the Turks. In the English calendar it stands on Aug. 6. In France, after consecration, the chalice was filled with new wine, or, as at Tours, received some of the juice of the ripe grapes; and the clusters are blessed in Germany and the East on this day. Blunt, Dict. of Theol. s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v.

## Transitorium[[@Headword:Transitorium]]

             a term for a short anthem, or respond, in the rite of Milan, chanted after the communion of the priest. Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.

## Translation, Biblical[[@Headword:Translation, Biblical]]

             SEE VERSIONS, TRANSLATION, in ecclesiastical usage, is the removal of a bishop from the charge of one diocese to that of another. After such removal, the bishop, in all his attestations, dates: from the year of his translation (anno translationis nostrae), not from that of his consecration (anno consecrationis nostrae). In the early Church a bishop could not translate himself to another see without the consent and approbation of a provincial council. Some, indeed, thought it absolutely unlawful for a bishop to forsake his first see and betake himself to any other, because they looked upon his consecration to be a sort of marriage to his church, and therefore looked upon his removal to another see as spiritual adultery.

## Transmigration[[@Headword:Transmigration]]

             (a passing over), in the theological acceptation of the term, means the supposed translation of the soul after death into another substance or body than that which it occupied before. The basis of this belief being the assumption that the human soul does not perish together with the body, it can belong only to those nations, which believe in the immortality of the soul. But in proportion as such an idea is crude or developed, as it is founded merely on a vague fear of death, and a craving for material life, or on ethical grounds, and a supposed causal connection between this and a future life, the belief in transmigration assumes various forms. The notion, dating back to a remote antiquity, and being spread all over the world, seems to be anthropologically innate, and to be the first form in which the idea of immortality occurred to man.

1. India. It was in India where the problems of metaphysics and ethics as connected with ontology and the destiny of the soul were elaborated to the last degree on a theistic basis that metempsychosis was most ingeniously and extensively developed. The Hindus believed that human-souls emanated from the Supreme Being, which, as it were, in a state of bewilderment or forgetfulness allowed them to become separate existences and to be born on earth. The soul thus severed from the real source of its life is bound to return to it, or to become merged again into that divine  substance with which it was originally one. But having become contaminated with sins it must strive to free itself from guilt and become fit for its heavenly career. Religion teaches that this is done by the observance of religious rites and a life in conformity with the precepts of-the sacred books; philosophy, that the soul will be reunited with Brahman, if it understands the true nature of the divine essence whence it comes.

So long, therefore, as the soul has not attained this condition of purity. it must be born again after the dissolution of the body to which it was allied; and the degree of its impurity at one of these various deaths determines the existence which it will assume in a subsequent life. So closely was the account of a soul's misdeeds kept that it might pass thousands of years, or kalpas (aeons), in one or other of the heavens, as a reward for good deeds or self-inflicted suffering, and yet be obliged to return to earth or hell to expiate as an animal, man or demon certain sins. To us the details of the soul's migration, as described in the religious works of the Hindus, are only interesting as they afford a. kind of standard by which the moral merit or demerit of human actions was measured in. India (see Manu, Code of Laws, bk. 12). A more general doctrine of the transmigration of souls is based by Hindi philosophers on' the assumption of the three cosmic qualities of sattwa, i.e. purity or goodness; rajas, i.e. troubledness or passion and tamas, i.e. darkness or sin, with which the human soul may become endued. On this basis Manu and other writers built an elaborate theory of the various births to which the soul may be subject. Manu teaches that “souls endued with the quality of sattwa attain the condition of deities; those having the quality of rajas the condition of men; and those having the quality of tamas, the condition of beasts.” The Buddhistic belief in transmigration is derived from that of the Brahmanic Hindus, and agrees with it in principle, though it differs from it in the imaginary detail in which it was worked out. To enlarge here on this difference is not necessary, and yet it will not be superfluous to point out one great difference which separates the notions of one class of Buddhists from those of the rest, as swell as from those of the Brahmanic Hindus. While other Hindis believe that the same soul appears at the several births, the Southern Buddhists teach that the succession of existences is a succession of souls; that when the body dies the soul is “extinguished,” and nothing remains but the good and bad acts performed in life; the, result of these acts becomes the seed of a new life, which soul is the necessary product of the soul of the former life. This dogma is illustrated by various similes, e.g. “One lamp is kindled  at another; the light of the former is not identical with that of the latter, but, nevertheless without this the other light could not have originated.”

2. Egypt. — According to the doctrine of the old Egyptians, the human race originated after the pure gods and spirits had left the earth; and this they did because the daemons, who inhabited the earth, had revolted against them, and tainted it with guilt. In order that the daemons might purify themselves, the gods created human bodies, so that in them they might expiate their guilt. These earthly bodies united to the daemons, are the human race, and human life is merely intended as a means of purifying the soul. All the precepts regulating the course of life are laid down by the Egyptians for this end, and the judgment after death in the palace of Osiris decides whether it has been attained or not. If it has not, then the soul must return to the earth, to renew its expiations either in a human body, in the body of an animal, or in. a plant. Matter was believed to be a substantial reality; and the material form that was once united with spirit in the one being of man was believed to maintain that connection so long as the material form remained. Hence the Egyptian practice of embalming the dead, to arrest the passage of the soul into other forms.

3. Persia. — The transmigration of souls was also a tenet of the Persian religion before the time of Zoroaster, and was derived, with the language. of Avesta, from Indian sources. Pherecydes of Syros who lived before the age of Zoroaster, taught the doctrine, and Pythagoras received it in Babylon from the Magi (q.v.).

4. In Greece, the doctrine of transmigration did not become the belief of the people, but was confined to the mysteries and tenets of philosophers, who probably received it from Egypt or India. According to some, Thales was the first Greek philosopher who propounded it; according to others, Pherecydes the teacher of Pythagoras. It was subsequently greatly developed by Pythagoras and Plato. The Greek mysteries were in fact, not only a school in which metempsychosis was taught, but an indispensable grade or lodge through which all of the aspirants must pass before they could be purified and go on to higher stages of existence. In the system of Plato transmigration had a remedial function, and the soul could attain to divinity only by a varied probation of ten thousand years. The Epictureans denied it, but it appears to have been generally inculcated as one of the deepest doctrines of the mysteries. The Neo-Platonists, who believed in magic, assumed the doctrine of metempsychosis as a natural inheritance.

5. Among the Jews the doctrine of transmigration the Gilgul Neshamoth- was taught in the mystical, system of the Cabala (q.v.). “All the souls,” says the Zohar, or Book of Light, “are subject to the trials of transmigration and men do not know which are the ways of the Most High in their regard. They do not know how many transformations and mysterious trials they must undergo; how many souls and spirits come to this world without returning to the palace of the divine king.... The souls must re-enter the absolute substance whence they have emerged. But to accomplish this end they must develop all the perfections, the germ of which is planted in them; and if they have not fulfilled this condition during one life, they must commence another, a third, and so forth, until they have acquired the condition which fits them for-reunion with, God. On the ground of this doctrine it was held, for instance, that the soul of Adam migrated into David, and will come into the Messiah; that the soul of Japheth is the same as that of Simeon, and the soul of Terah migrated into Job. Modern Cabalists for instance, Isaac Loria have imagined that divine grace sometimes assists a soul in its career of expiation by allowing it to occupy the same body together with another soul, when both are to supplement each other, like the blind and the lame. Sometimes only one of these souls requires the supplement of virtue, which it obtains from the other soul, better provided than its partner. The latter soul then becomes, as it were, the mother of the other soul, and bears it under her heart as a pregnant woman. Hence the name of gestation-or impregnation is given to this strange association of two souls.

6. Of the Druids, it is told by classical writers that they believed in the immortality of the soul, and in its migration after a certain period subsequent to death. Little is known of the manner in Which they imagined such migrations to take place; but, to judge from their religious system, there can be no doubt that they looked upon transmigration as a means of purifying the soul and preparing it for eternal life

7. Norse. — A very poetical form of belief in transmigration is found in Germanic mythology, according to which the soul, before entering its divine abode, assumes certain forms on alternate certain objects, in which it lives for a short period-as a tree, a rose, a vine, a butterfly, a pigeon, etc.

8. Among the early Christians, Jerome relates, the doctrine of transmigration was taught as a traditional: and esoteric one, which was only communicated to a select few. Gnostics and Manichaeans welcomed  it, and the more speculative or mystical of the Church fathers found in it a ready explanation of the fall of man and the doctrine of evil spirits. This considerable step towards reconciling the existence of suffering with that of a merciful God was distinctly set forth by Porphyry and Origen, and passed, in all probability, with all the strange heresies of “Illumination,” through such institutions as the Cairene House of Sight and the Knights Templars, into the-wild doctrines of the obscure sects of the Middle Ages in Europe. The Taborites, an extreme branch of the Hussites, are said to have accepted the doctrine.

One great philosopher, at least, of modern times, G. E. Lessing, accounted for human progress by a species of transmigration. He argues that the soul is a simple being capable of infinite conceptions, which are obtained'' in an infinite succession of time. The order and measure of the acquisition of these conceptions are the senses. These, at present, are five; but there is no evidence that they have always been the same. Nature, never taking a leap, must have gone through all the lower stages before it arrived at that which it occupies now.... And since nature contains many substances and powers which are not accessible to those senses with which it is now endowed, it must be assumed that there will be future stages at which the soul will have as many senses as correspond with the powers of nature.

9. Modern Savages. — Probably the lowest forms of this belief are those found among some of the tribes of Africa and America, which hold that the soul, immediately after death, must look out for a new owner, entering, if need be, even the body of an animal. Some of the Africans assume that the soul will choose with predilection the body of a person of similar rank to that of its former owner, or a near relation of his. They therefore frequently bury their dead near the houses of their relatives in order to enable the souls of the former to occupy the newly-born children of the latter, and the princely souls to re-enter the princely family; and sometimes holes are dug in the grave to facilitate the soul's egress from it.

In North America some tribes slaughter their captives to feed with their blood such souls in suspense. The Negro widows of Matamba are especially afraid of all, souls of their husbands; for at the death of these they immediately throw themselves into the water to drown their husbands souls, which otherwise, they imagine, would cling to them. The natives of Madagascar seem to have invented a kind of artificial transmigration; for in the hut where a man is about to die they make a hole in the roof in order to  catch the outgoing soul and to breathe it into the body of another man at the point of death.

See Metempsychosis by. a Modern Pythagorean, in Blackwood's Mag. 19:511; Confessions of a Metepsychosian, in Fraser's Mag. 12:496; Blunt, Dict of Hist. Theology, s.v.; Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology, p. 645; Gardner, Faiths of the World; Hendrick, Christianity'; Hardy, Buddhism, art. a “Metempsychosis;” Ueberweg, history of Philosophy (see Index).

## Transportation[[@Headword:Transportation]]

             is a term used in Scotland for the removing or translation of a minister from one parish or congregation to another.

## Transubstantiation[[@Headword:Transubstantiation]]

             (change of substance), a word applied to the alleged conversion or change of the substance of the bread and wine in the eucharist into the body and blood of Jesus Christ at the time the officiating priest utters the words of consecration.

I. The Terms. — Probably the first to make use of the word transubstantiatio was Peter Damili (Epositio Can. Miss. cap. 7; Mai, Script. Vet. t. Nov. Col. I, 2, 215), A.D. 988-1072; though similar expressions, such as transitio, had previously been employed. Its use was, however, limited, and in the 12th century was becoming very rare. Its first appearance as a term accepted and recognized by the Church is in the first of the Seventy Constitutions presented to the fourth Council of Lateran (1215) by Innocent II, and tacitly adopted by that council. The term thus adopted by the Western Church has its counterpart in the Eastern Church in the term Metousiosis (Μετουσίωσις), which was formally adopted, in the “Orthodox Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East,” in 1643; and in Art. 17 of the Council of Bethlehem, or of Jerusalem, in 1672.

The Church of England never adopted the word. “transubstantiation” in any formal document; and at the same time that the Council of Trent was fixing it upon the Latin Church, the sacred synod of the English Church was declaring, in the 28th art. of Religion “Panis et vini Transubstantitatio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis Scripture  verbis adversatur et multarumr superstitionum dedit occasioneum” (A.D.1552). This part of Art. 28 now stands in English in the following form: “Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions” (A.D. 1571).

II. The Doctrine. — In the Confession of the Synod of the fourth Lateran Council, transubstantiation is thus defined: “There is only one universal Church, beyond which no man can in any way be saved. In' which Jesus Christ is himself the priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are really contained in the sacrament of the altar, under the form of bread and wine, being transubstantiated, the bread into the body and the wine into the blood, by divine power.” By the institution of Corpus Christi Day by pope Urban IV in 1264 and pope Clement V in 1311 at the Synodo of Vienne, the doctrine in question was expressed in a liturgical form and its popularity secured. Henceforth the sacrifice of the mass formed more than ever the center of the Catholic ritual, and reflected new glory upon the priesthood.

The change effected by transubstantiation is declared to be so perfect and complete that, by connection and concomitance, the soul and divinity of Christ coexist with his flesh and blood under the species of bread and wine; and thus the elements, arid every particle thereof, contain Christ whole and entire divinity, humanity, soul, body, and blood, with all their component parts. Nothing remains of the bread and wine except the accidents. The whole God and man Christ Jesus is contained in the bread and wine, and in every particle of the bread, and every drop of the wine. The natural result of such a doctrine is the elevation of the Host for adoration, a practice unknown till the rise of transubstantiation.

It is claimed by the advocates of transubstantiation that it had the belief and approval of the early fathers of the Church. Bingham (Christ. Antiq. bk. 15 ch. 5, § 4) asserts that “the ancient fathers have declared as plainly as words can make it that the change made in the elements of bread and wine by consecration is not such a change as destroys their nature and substance, but only alters their qualities, and elevates them to a spiritual use, as is done in many other consecrations, where the qualities of things are much altered without any real change of substance.” We give some extracts from the authorities quoted by Bingham. Thus Gregory of Nyssa  (De Bapt. Christi, 3, 369); This altar before which we stand is but common stone in its nature, but after it is consecrated to the service of God, and has received a benediction, it is a holy table, an immaculate altar, not to be touched by any but the priests, and that with the greatest reverence. The bread also at first is but common bread, but when once it is sanctified by the holy mystery, it is made and called the body of Christ.” Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. Myst. 2, note 3), “Beware that you take not this ointment to be bare ointment; for as the bread in the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not mere bread, but the body of Christ, so this holy ointment, after invocation, is not bare or common ointment, but it is the gift or grace of Christ and the Holy Spirit, who by his presence and divine nature makes it efficacious.”

Chrysostom, in his famous Epistle to Caesarius, explaining the two natures of Christ that he had both a human and a divine substance in reality says, “As the bread, before it is sanctified, is called bread, but after the divine grace has sanctified it by the mediation of the priest it is no longer called bread, but dignified with the name of the body of the Lord, though the nature of bread remain in it, and they are not said to be two, but one body of the Son; so here, the divine nature residing or dwelling in the human body, they both together make one Son and one Person.” When this passage was first produced by Peter Martyr, it was looked upon as so unanswerable that the Romish Church declared it to be a forgery, and it was stolen from the Lambeth Library during the reign of queen Mary. Theodoret plainly says that the bread and wine remain still in their own nature after consecration. Augustine, instructing the newly baptized respecting the sacrament, tells them that what they saw upon the altar was bread and the cup, as their own eyes could testify to them; but what their faith required to be instructed about was that the bread is the body of Christ, etc. Answering an objection, supposed to be urged, that Christ had taken his body to heaven, Augustine replies, “These things, my brethren, are therefore called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen and another is understood. That which is seen has a bodily appearance; that which is understood has a spiritual fruit.” He also says that “this very bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ; consequently. it could not be his natural body in the substance, but only sacramentally. The natural body of Christ is only in heaven, but the sacrament has the name of his body, because, though in outward, visible, and corporeal appearance it is only bread, yet it is attended with a spiritual fruit.” Isidore, bishop of Seville (A.D. 630), speaking of the rites of the Church, says, “The bread, because it nourishes and strengthens our bodies, is therefore called the body of  Christ; and the wine, because it creates blood in our flesh, is called the blood of Christ. Now, these two things are visible, but, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, they become the sacrament of the Lord's body” (De Eccles. Ofic. 1, 18). From the time of Paschasius this doctrine had been the subject of angry contention, and one of its bitterest opponents was the able scholastic writer Duns Scotus, whose opinions were maintained in the 11th century by Berengarius and his numerous followers.

III. Arguments. — The doctrine of transubstantiation is defended by a literal interpretation of the words spoken by our Lord at the last supper, “This is my body,” “This is my blood.” From these words it is argued that there is the real bodily presence of Christ's body, which is accounted for by the miracle of a change of substance of the bread and wile. In answer it is urged,

1. The accounts which the Romanists give of this supposed miracle are at variance with their own statement of it. In such a case, for instance, as that of the miracle of Moses rod, every one would say, “the rod was changed into a serpent” (all the attributes of this last being present), not vice versa; so that by Romanists' own account it is Christ's body and blood that are changed into bread and wine.

Wherever a miracle was wrought in the Old or New Test., as in the instance above alluded to, or in the turning of the water into wine at Cana, such change was obvious to the senses; the appeal, in fact, for the reality of the miracle is to the senses; while, therefore, we might admit that if a Romish priest were to assert that he had converted our Savior's body into bread and wine, he was safe as far as the senses go, we should hold, per contra, that if he professed to have turned bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, that body and blood ought to be clear to the senses.. We had bread and wine before the consecration; we have, as to sense, bread and wine after. In the whole history of miracles, nothing of this sort has ever been known; nor can we, under such circumstances, admit that the alleged change has taken place. Suppose Aaron's rod to have remained still with all the attributes of a rod, could Pharaoh and his court believe it to be now a serpent?

2. The late origin of the doctrine of transubstantiation has been alleged as one reason for its rejection, and it is certainly a point worthy of  considerable notice. If, however, it had been as early as the superstitious veneration for relics and images, it would have been but an ancient error.

3. It must be evident to everyone who is not blinded by ignorance and prejudice that our Lord's words, This is my body,” are mere figurative expressions; and that they were no more likely to be designed to be received literally than the declarations; made by our Lord that he was a “vine,” a “lamb,” a “door,” a “way,” a “light…”

4. Besides, such a transubstantiation is so opposite to the testimony of our senses as completely to undermine the whole proof of all the miracles by which God has confirmed revelation. According to such a transubstantiation, the same body is alive and dead at once, and may be in a million of different places whole and entire at the same instant of time; accidents remain without a substance, and substance without accidents; and a part of Christ's body is equal to the whole. It is also contrary to the end of the sacrament, which is to represent and commemorate Christ, not to believe that he is corporeally present (1Co 9:24-25).

5. The practical evil of this and of consubstantiation (q.v.) is that it leads to the paying divine adoration to a bit of bread, and the still more noxious superstition of thinking that Christ's body can be received and act like a medicine on one who is “not considering the Lord's body,” as, e.g., an infant, or a man in a state of insensibility.

See Blunt, Dict. of Hist. Theol. s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Bingham, Christ. Antiq. (see Index); Brown, Compendium, p. 613; Cosen, On Transubstantiation (1858); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Hill, English Monasticism (Lond. 1867); Kidder, Messiah, 3, 80; Knott, On the Supper of our. Lord (1858); Smith, Errors of the Church of Rome, dial. 6; Thirlwall, Transubstantiation: What Is It? (1869); Van Oosterzee, Christ. Dogmat. (see Index); Watson, Biblical Dict. s.v.

## Trap[[@Headword:Trap]]

             (מוֹקֵשׁ, mokesh, Jos 23:13, a snare, as elsewhere rendered; מִלְכֹּדֵתmalkodeth, Job 18:10, a noose; מִשְׁחַית, mashchith, Jer 5:26, a destroyer, as elsewhere; and so Spa, Rom 11:9, lit. the chase). SEE HUNTING.

## Trapier, Paul, D.D[[@Headword:Trapier, Paul, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, a graduate of the General Theological Seminary, was for several years prior to 1856 rector in Charleston. S.C. In 1857 he resided in Lynchburg, Virginia, and remained there until 1859, when he removed to Camden, S.C., having been appointed professor of ecclesiastical history and the evidences of Christianity in the theological seminary there. When the seminary was removed, in 1866, to Spartansburg, Dr. Trapier removed to that place, holding the same professorship. In 1868 he was assigned to ecclesiastical history and  exegesis. In 1870 he removed to Locust Grove, Md., and became rector of Shrewsbury parish, where he remained until his death, July 12, 1872, aged sixty-six years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1873, page 133.

## Trapp, John[[@Headword:Trapp, John]]

             a Puritan divine, was born in 1601, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was schoolmaster at Stratford-on-Avon and vicar of Weston-on Avon from 1624 until his death, in 1669. He wrote, God's Love-Tokens (Lond. 1637, 4to): — Theologia Theologice (1641, 8vo): — Commentaries on the Scriptures, viz.— St. John the Evangelist (1646, 4to); All the Epistles and the Revelation of St. John (1647, 4to; 2d ed. 1649, 4to); All the New Testament (1647, 2 vols. 4to; new ed. 1663, imp. 8vo); Pentateuch (1650, 4to; 2d ed. 1654, 4to); Joshua to 2d Chronicles; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Songs of Solomon (1650, 4to); The Twelve Minor Prophets (1654, fol.); Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, and the Psalms (1656, fol.; 2d ed. 1657, fol.); Proverbs to Daniel (1656, fol.) all published together in 1662 (5 vols. fol.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Trapp, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Trapp, Joseph, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at Cherrington, Gloucestershire, in November, 1679. Educated at first by his father, he was afterwards placed under the. care of the master of New College, Oxford, and in 1695, entered Wadham College in the same city. ‘He was chosen, a fellow of his college in 1704, and first professor of poetry in 1708. In 1709-10 he acted as manager for Dr. Sachevereil on his memorable trial, and in 1711 was appointed chaplain to Sir Constantine Phipps, Lord Chancellor of Ireland. In 1720 he was presented to the rectory of Damltzey, Wiltshire, which he resigned in 1721 for the vicarage of the united parishes of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and St. Leonard's, Foster Lane, London. He received his degree of D.D. from Oxford in February, 1727. He was, in 1733, preferred to the rectory of Harlington, Middlesex, by lord Bolingbroke, whose chaplain he had previously been. In 1734 he was elected one of the joint lecturers of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. He died at Harlington, Nov. 22,1747. Mr. Trapp was a hard student, and published numerous works, viz., Pralectiones Poetic, etc. (Oxon. 1711-19, 3 vols. 8vo), being his Latin lectures as professor of poetry: — A Preservative, etc., in several discourses (collected in 1722, 2 vols. sm. 8vo): — The AEneid of Virgil Translated into Blank Verse (1718, 2 vols. 4to): — Explanatory Notes on the Four Gospels, etc. (1747-48, 2 vols. 8vo; Oxford, 1775, 8vo; 1805, 8vo): — besides poems, sermons, theological tracts, etc. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Trappists[[@Headword:Trappists]]

             the members of a monastic order in the Church of Rome which is characterized by the extreme austerity of its rule. It had its origin in the Cistercian abbey of La Trappe in Normandy during the abbacy of Rancé (q.v.). This prelate had been grossly addicted to sensual pleasures, and had also evinced considerable fondness for scholarly pursuits; but his conscience became awakened, and he was transformed into an intense ascetic. He renounced all the benefices he possessed except that of La Trappe; and when he had repaired the buildings of that abbey, he undertook the restoration of its ancient discipline. He introduced a number of strict Benedictines, and became a monk himself and regular abbot. In 1675 he caused the members of the order to renew their vows, and imposed on them the additional obligation to preserve unchanged all his arrangements and rules.

This immutable rule obliges the Trappists to sleep on a bed of straw, with pillow also of straw, placed on a board and covered with a blanket. They must rise at two o'clock in the morning. Eleven hours of their day are devoted to prayers and masses, the remaining hours to hard labor performed in strict silence. Scientific pursuits are forbidden. The Trappist's thoughts are to be directed only to repentance and death. His only speech, apart from hymns and prayers, is the responsive greeting “Memento mori.” He maintains a constant fast ill the plainness and frugality of his food, which is served upon a bare table. After supper and subsequent religious meditations and exercises, he labors for a time upon the grave he is to occupy after death, and then retires to rest at eight o'clock in summer and at seven in winter. The order contains lay brothers, professors, and feres donnes, i.e. temporary associates. Its garb consists of a long robe with wide sleeves of coarse grayish-white wool; a black woolen cowl with two strips a foot wide which reach down to the knee; a broad girdle of black leather, from which are suspended a rosary and a knife, symbols of devotion and toil; and wooden shoes. In the choir a dark brown mantle with sleeves, and a cowl of like color, are worn. The lay brothers wear gray habits.

Rance's immoderate austerity occasioned the death of a number of monks, and brought upon him the censure of many critics. His aversion to literary  employments was also condemned, among others by Mabillon in the Traite des Etudes Alonastiques (1691). The order did not spread beyond its original limits until after the founder's death (Oct. 12, 1700), and has never become very strong in its numbers. A female branch was instituted at Clocet, France, in 1705, by princess Louise de Conde. The revolution expelled the Trappists from France, but they established themselves in Valsainte, Freibourg, Switzerland, where a monastery founded by Augustine l'Estrange (1791) was made an abbey by Pius VI, and Augustine placed at its head. Again assailed by the French and compelled to flee, the Trappists found a temporary home in Poland. They were everywhere disliked, however, and found no settled home until after the restoration of the Bourbons: in 1817, when they recovered their original abbey of La Trappe. Other stations were established, among them a female convent near London. In 1834 a papal decretal consolidated the Trappists into a Congregation des Religieux Cisterciens de N. D. de la Trappe. They. possess settlements in Algiers and North America, but are chiefly found in France. See the Allgem. Darmst. Kirchenzeitung, 1831, p. 1424; 1832, p. 90, 119; 1833, p. 1464; 183, p. 1087; Chateaubriand, Vie de Rancé (Par. 1844); Ritsert, Ordeno d. Trappisten (Darmst. 1833).

In 1851 Muard founded an order of Trappist preachers in the bishopric of Sens, who established themselves in a convent near Avallon. They observe the Trappist rule and wear the habit of the order, but by dispensation are allowed to break the vow of silence and serve the Church by preaching. See Der Kattholik. Sept. 1851, p. 239 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Helyot, Ordres Religieux, s.v.

## Trask, John[[@Headword:Trask, John]]

             a Sabbatarian Puritan, was a native of Somersetshire, and, after being a schoolmaster until he was thirty-four years of age, became a preacher in London about 1617. He was at first refused ordination by the bishop of Bath and Wells, but “afterwards got orders and began to vent his opinions.” He enjoined severe asceticism upon his followers, inducing them to fast three days at a time, alleging that the third day's fast would bring them to the condition of justified saints, according to the promise “after two days he will revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight” (Hos 6:1). Among other precepts strictly enforced by Trask was that of doing everything by the law of Scripture, having been converted to this view by the arguments of Hamlet Jackson. Trask  prescribed to his followers ceremonial customs respecting dress and domestic life; required Jewish strictness in the observance of Sunday; and eventually adopted Saturday as the Sabbath. On April 1, 1634, the commissioners for ecclesiastical causes ordered the prosecution of all separatists, novelists, and sectaries, among whom the Traskists were named. Trask was brought before the Star-chamber, where his Judaizing opinions and practices were refuted by bishop Andrewes, and he was put in the pillory. He is said to have afterwards recanted his errors, but became an Antinomian before his death, the date of which is not given. His followers began to be called Seventh-day men about the year 1700. The published works of Trask are, Sermon on Mar 16:16 (Lond. 1615, 8vo): — Treatise of Liberty from Judaism (1620, 4to): — Power of Preaching (1623, 8vo): — The True Gospel, etc., from the Reproach of a New Gospel (1636, sm. 12mo). See Paget, Heresiography (1662, p. 161,184); Baker, Chronicle; Fuller, Church History of Great Britain; Brook, Puritans; Chamberlain, Present State of England for 1702. p. 258. — Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Traskites[[@Headword:Traskites]]

             SEE TRASK, JOHN.

## Trauthson[[@Headword:Trauthson]]

             the name of an ancient Tyrolese family which furnished two representatives to the episcopal office in the Church of Rome. The former of these was twenty-first bishop of Vienna, and died in 1702. The latter, JOHANN JOSEPH, Count Trauthson and Falckenstein, was born in 1704 at Vienna, in which city he studied (and possibly at Rome and Sienna), became canon and provost, and in 1751 was made prince-archbishop of Vienna. He issued a pastoral letter in which he urged his clergy to prefer the presentation of necessary truths to that of merely useful truths in their sermons, and remonstrated against the excessive zeal expended in the preaching of the merits of saints, while but little attention was given to the preaching of the merits of Christ. He also condemned the introduction of odd or laughable elements into the preaching. This circular occasioned great excitement, and called forth a number of apologetical and; polemical tracts, which are enumerated in Acta Hist. Eccl. 18:1008 sq.; Heinsius, Kirchenhist. 4:329 sq.; and Henke, Kirchengesch 5, 292 sq. Many Protestants suspected that the archbishop had understated the tenets of his Church in order to win  over uninformed Protestants, and many Romanists charged him with having begun the betrayal of the Church. Both, however, were mistaken. Trauthson was influenced by the “enlightenment” of his time, butt was none the less a zealous supporter of the Church of Rome. His letter was, however, productive of no special results. Maria Theresa appointed him chief director of studies in the University of Vienna and director of the Theresianum, and pope Benedict XIV made him cardinal in 1756. He persuaded the curia to reduce the number of festivals in his diocese. He died March 10, 1757. His pastoral letter has been translated into many languages. See Von Einem, Vers. einer vollsf. Kirchengesch. d. 18. Jahrh. (Leips. 1782 sq.), 1, 554,590; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 7:309-313; Leben d. Cardinale d. 18. Jahrh. 3, 260. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Traveling[[@Headword:Traveling]]

             (prop. some form of אָרִח, arach, especially אֹרֵחִ, orach, a traveler; fem.

אֹרְחָה, orechah, a “traveling company” [Gen 37:25; Isa 21:13], i.e. caravan) in the East is still much more cumbersome than with us, since it is almost exclusively undertaken solely on errands of business, and rarely for purposes of pleasure. Its laboriousness is partly occasioned by the sandy and desert nature of the country, which often requires way- marks to be set up for guidance (Arrian, Exped. Alex. 5, 26); partly by the bad and neglected roads (comp. Philo, Opp. 2, 578), especially in winter, SEE ROAD; partly by the general absence of proper hotels, SEE INN; and partly by the bands of robbers who infest the country in general (comp. 2Co 11:26). SEE ROBBER.

Commerce (q.v.) is carried on by means of caravans (q.v.), which carry all necessaries with them, and are often so large as to seem like a considerable army (see Wellsted, Reisen, p. 227). Part of the company is always armed, and constitutes the van and rear guard (see Olivier, Voyage, 6:329 sq.). In the desert a local guide is usually employed (comp. Num 10:31), and a beacon-fire as a standard by night (see, generally, Jahn, Archaeol. I, 2, 17 sq.). Single travelers in the interior of the well-inhabited country, or in Palestine proper, usually ride upon asses (1Sa 25:20; 1Sa 25:42; 2Sa 17:23; 1Ki 2:40; 2Ch 28:15; comp. Luk 10:34); tourists, however, and sheiks, upon horses; and in some instances wagons were anciently used as vehicles (1Ki 12:18; 2Ki 19:21; Act 8:28) in certain parts of the country. Most persons went on foot (comp. Joh 4:6) and carried their most essential supplies with them  (Jdg 19:18 sq., i.e. πήρα, Mat 10:10), likewise a tent (q.v.) under which to encamp if in a solitary region (Dionys. Hal. 8:3). Gloves are mentioned in the Mishna (Chelimu, 16:6) as travelling apparatus. The Jews journeyed to the great festivals in caravans (Luk 2:42; Luk 2:44) with song and rejoicing. Single travelers usually found a ready hospitality (except among the Samaritans towards Jews), and eventually khans (q.v.) were established along the highways, especially for non-Israelites (see Reisegger, Reisen, 3, 62 sq.). Travelers of distinction were often welcomed with torch lights and great ceremony (2Ma 4:22), and for princes the roads were frequently repaired (Psa 68:5; Isa 40:3; Diod. Sic. 2, 13; Arrian, Alex. 4:30; Josephus, War, 3, 6, 2). Also on departing they were dismissed with an honorary procession (προπέμπειν, Act 21:5; deducere, Cicero, Cat. Maj. 18) and many ceremonious attentions (Act 15:3; Rom 15:24; 1Co 16:16; 3Jn 1:6). Samaria was avoided as a route by the Jews. The Galileans, in visiting the festivals at Jerusalem, usually went along the Jordan or through Pertea (Luk 17:11; Joh 4:4; Josephus, Ant. 20:6, 1). SEE SAMARITAN. Journeying on the Sabbath was forbidden in post-exilian times (see Josephus, Ant. 13:8, 4). SEE SABBATH-DAYS JOURNEY. On account of the heat travel was sometimes pursued by night. (See, generally, Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 12-16.) SEE JOURNEY.

## Travis, George[[@Headword:Travis, George]]

             all English clergyman, was a native of Royton, Lancashire, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford. He became vicar of Eastham and rector of Hendley, Cheshire; prebendary of Chester in 1783; and archdeacon of Chester in 1786. He died Feb. 24,1797. He published, Letters to Edward Gibbon, etc., in defense of 1Jn 5:7 (Chester, 1784, 4to; corrected and enlarged, 1794, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Treasure[[@Headword:Treasure]]

             (prop. אָצָר, to hoard, θησαυρός, in Scripture signifies anything collected together in stores, e.g. a treasure of corn, of wine, of oil; treasures of gold, silver, brass; treasures of coined money. Snow, winds, hail, rain, waters, are in the treasuries of God (Psalm 1357; Jer 51:16). We read also of a treasure of good works, treasures of iniquity, to lay up treasures in heaven, to bring forth good or evil out of the treasures of the heart.  Joseph told his brethren, when they found their money returned in their sacks, that God had given them treasures (Gen 43:23). The kings of Judah had keepers of their treasures, both in city and country (1Ch 27:25; 2Ch 32:27, etc.), and the places where these magazines were laid up were called treasure-cities. Pharaoh compelled the Hebrews to build him treasure-cities, or magazines (Exo 1:11). The word treasures is often used to express anything in great abundance, “In Jesus Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col 2:3). The wise man says that wisdom contains in its treasuries understanding, the knowledge of religion, etc. Paul (Rom 2:5) speaks of heaping up a treasure of wrath against the day of wrath; and the prophet Amos says (Amo 3:10) they treasure up iniquity, they lay up iniquity as it were in a storehouse, which will bring them a thousand calamities. The treasures of impiety or iniquity (Pro 10:2) express ill-gotten riches. The treasures of iniquity, says the wise man, will eventually bring no profit; and, in the same sense, Christ calls the riches of iniquity mammon of unrighteousness, an estate wickedly acquired (Luk 16:9). Gospel faith is the treasure of the just; but Paul says, “We have this treasure in earthen vessels” (2Co 4:7). Isaiah says of a good man, “The fear of the Lord is his treasure” (33, 6). On the Scripture allusions to “hidden treasures” see Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 195 sq.; Freeman, Hand-book of Bible Manners, p. 350 sq. SEE STORE.

## Treasure-City[[@Headword:Treasure-City]]

             (in the plur. עָרֵי מַסְכְּנות, cities of provisions, “store-cities,” 1Ki 9:19). Pithom and Raamses (q.v.) are mentioned in Exo 1:11, as treasure-cities built by Pharaoh by the unpaid labor of the Hebrews; they were probably magazines or depots for the royal revenue (which was doubtless paid in kind), such as are intimated in Gen 41:48; see 48:26. The Jewish kings had similar places of public deposit (2Ch 8:4; 2Ch 8:6; 2Ch 16:4; 2Ch 17:2). SEE TREASURE.

## Treasurer[[@Headword:Treasurer]]

             (technically Heb. and Chald. גַּזְבָּר, gizbar, Ezr 1:8; Ezr 7:21; Chald. also גַּדְבָּר, gidbar, Dan 3:2-3; improp. סֹכֵן, soken, Isa 22:15, an associate, i.e. the king's intimate friend), an important officer in all Oriental courts. SEE KING.

In Dan 3:2-3, the Chald. אֲדִרְגָּזֵר,adargazer (Sept. τύραννος, A.V. “judge”), occurs among the titles of Babylonian royal officers, and has (perhaps from the resemblance of the word to the Greek γάζα) been thought by some to mean the officers of the Turkish court and government, now called defenders, who have the charge of the receipts and disbursements of the public treasury. Gesenius and others conceive that the word means chief judges (from אדר, magnificent, and גזרין, deciders); but Dr. Lee seems to prefer seeking its meaning in the Persian adar, fire, and gazar, passing; arid hence concludes that the adargazerin were probably officers of state who presided over the ordeals  by fire, and other matters connected with the government of Babylon. SEE JUDGE.

## Treasurer, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Treasurer, Ecclesiastical]]

             the keeper of the treasures, e.g. the monuments, sacred vessels, relics, and valuables of a church, cathedral, or religious house. He was known by different names; sacrist, from having charge of the sacristy, cellarer, as providing the eucharistic elements and canonical bread and wine; matricular, as keeper of the inventory; constre in France and Germany; custos and cimeliarch in Italy; and in the Greek scenophylax. The custos had charge of all the contents of the Church, but at length became superintendent of deputies, discharging his personal duties, and at last took the title of treasurer, as having charge of the relics and valuables of the Church. He is the Old-English cyrcward and mediaeval perpetual sacristan, and now represented by the. humbler sexton. Every necessary for the Church and divine service was furnished by him. The old title of custos descended before the 13th century to his church-service.

In order the treasurer usually succeeded the chancellor, and had a stall appointed to himself. His dignity was founded at York in the 11th century; at Chichester, Lichfield, Wells, Hereford, St. Paul's, in the 12th; and at St. David's and Llandaff in the 13th. It has been commonly preserved and exercised since the Reformation, both in English colleges and cathedrals, but has fallen into disuse at York, Lincoln, and Lichfield, and at Exeter, Llandaff, and Amiens is held by the bishop.

The monastic treasurer, or bursar, received all the rents, was auditor of all the officers accounts, paymaster of wages, and of the works done in the abbey. — Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archceöl. s.v.

## Treasury[[@Headword:Treasury]]

             (usually אוֹצָר, otsar, a collection, often rendered “treasure;” sometimes Heb. גְּנָזַים, genazain [Est 3:9; Est 4:1], or Chald. גַּנְזַין, ginzin [Ezr 5:17; Ezr 6:1; Ezr 7:20, “treasure-house”], a store or deposit). SEE ASUPPIM. In 1Ch 28:11, the treasury of the Temple is called גִּנְזִךְ, ganzak; and means substantially the same as the κορβανᾶς of Mat 27:6, namely, the hoard of money contributed towards the expenses of that edifice. The same thing, or perhaps rather the place where the contribution-boxes for this purpose were kept, is designated in the New  Test. as the γαζοφυλάκιον (Mar 12:41; Luk 21:1; Joh 8:20), and so likewise Josephus (Ant. 19:6,1; War, 5, 5, 2), after the Sept. (Neh 10:37; Neh 13:4-5; Neh 13:8; Est 3:9). According to the rabbins this treasury was in the court of the women, where stood thirteen chests called trumpets from their form or funnel-shaped mouth, into which the Jews cast their offerings (comp. Exo 30:13 sq.). SEE TEMPLE.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born at Milford, Conn., in 1647 (or 1648), and graduated at Harvard College in 1669. He was ordained and settled at Eastham, Plymouth Colony, in 1672. Soon after his settlement he studied the Indian language, and devoted to the Indians-in his neighborhood much of his time and attention. Through his labors many of the savages were brought into a state of civilization and order, and not a few of them were converted to the Christian faith. In 1693 he wrote a letter to Increase Mather, in which he states that there were within the limits of Eastham five: hundred adult Indians, to whom he had for many years imparted the Gospel in their own language. He had under him four Indian teachers, who read in separate villages on every Sabbath, excepting every fourth, when he himself preached the sermons which he wrote for them. He procured schoolmasters, and persuaded the Indians to choose from among themselves six magistrates, who held regular courts. In 1700 he began to serve the new settlement of Truro, and performed parochial duties until a church was established. After having passed near half a century in the most benevolent exertions as a minister of the Gospel, he died, March 18, 1717. He published the Confession of Faith in the Nauset Indian language, and an Election Sermon (1713). See Sprague, Annals of Amer. Pulpit, 1, 183.

## Treat, Selah Burr, D.D[[@Headword:Treat, Selah Burr, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Hartland, Connecticut, February 19, 1804. After studying at Lenox Academy and Hopkins Grammar school, he graduated from Yale College in 1824; in 1826 was admitted to the bar, and began the practice of his profession at East Windsor Hill, removing however, in 1831 to Penn Yan, N.Y. where he became a Christian, and, abandoning the law, graduated from Andover Theological Seminary in 1835. The next year he became pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Newark, N.J. In 1840 he was associated with Reverend Dr. Absalom Peters in editing the Biblical Repository and American Eclectic, in New York. In 1843 he was appointed editor of the Missionary Herald. In 1847 he was elected one of the secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, his special work being the carrying on the correspondence with the missionaries among the North American Indians. In 1859 he was called to take charge of the home department of the board, and continued in this office until a few months before his death, which occurred March 27, 1877. He had continued his editorial labors until 1856, at which time he took a second somewhat extended trip abroad, his first journey having been taken in 1850. See Cong. Quarterly, 19:347, 375. (J.C.S.)

## Treaty[[@Headword:Treaty]]

             SEE ALLIANCE.

## Trecanum[[@Headword:Trecanum]]

             an anthem sung after the communion, before the 6th century, in honor of the Holy Trinity; called by this name in Gaul. Some think it was the Apostles Creed. In the Greek Church there is a confession of the Holy Trinity sung after the Ilagia Hagiois. The latter form is mentioned by Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, and the Mozarabic and Gallican liturgies.

## Trechsel, Friedrich, D.D[[@Headword:Trechsel, Friedrich, D.D]]

             a German scholar, was born at Berne, Switzerland, November 30, 1805; studied at Berne, Paris, Gottingen, Halle, and Berlin; in 1829 became chaplain of the city hospital at Berne and privatdocent in the academy; pastor at Vechigen in 1837; of the minster at Berne in 1859; retired on a pension in 1876; and died January 30, 1885. He was the author of several works, and of several articles in Herzog's Real, Encyklopadie.

## Tredischi, Nicholas[[@Headword:Tredischi, Nicholas]]

             an eminent ecclesiastic, was a native of Sicily, born towards the close of the 14th century, and became one of the most celebrated canonists of his time. He was present at the Council of Basle, in which he took a prominent part, and was made a cardinal by Felix V in 1440.

## Tree[[@Headword:Tree]]

             prop. עֵוֹ, ets (δένδρον), which also signifies wood (ξῦλον); in Jer 6:6, the fern. עֵצָה, etsah, is used. Besides this generic term, there also occur peculiar words of a more distinct signification, e.g. אֵשֵׁל, eshel (1Sa 22:6; 1Sa 31:13; “grove” [q.v.] in Gen 21:33), which is thought to denote the tamarisk or else the terebbinth; אֵיל, eyl (Isa 61:3; Eze 31:14); Chald, אַילָן, ildan (Dan 4:10 sq.), prob. the oak (q.v.); עֵוֹ הָדָר, ets hadar (“goodly tree,” Lev 23:40), עֵוֹ אָבֹת, nis aboth (“thick tree,” Lev 23:40; Neh 8:15), and

צֶאֶל, tsel (“shady tree,” Job 40:21-22), which designate rather vigorous trees in general than specific varieties. SEE TABERNACLES, FESTIVAL OF. For a list of all the kinds of trees (including shrubs, plants, fruits, etc.) mentioned in the Bible, SEE BOTANY. See Taylor, Trees of Scripture (Lond. 1842).

In Eastern countries trees are not only graceful ornaments in the landscape, but essential to the comfort and support of the inhabitants. The Hebrews were forbidden to destroy the fruit-trees of their enemies in time of war, “for the tree of the field is man's life” (Deu 20:19-20). Trees of any kind are not now very abundant in Palestine. Some trees are found, by an examination of the internal zones, to attain to a very long age. There are some in existence which are stated to have attained a longevity of three thousand years, and for some of them a still higher antiquity is claimed. Individual trees in Palestine are often notable for historical and sacred associations (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 151). SEE ALLON-BACHUTH; SEE MEONENIM.

## Tree Of Life[[@Headword:Tree Of Life]]

             etc. Whatever may have been the frame and texture of Adam's body while in Eden, it is certain that, being “of the earth, it was earthy,” and was thus liable to disease and exposed to decay; just as his soul; at the same time, was liable to the greater evil of temptation by being exposed to the power of the tempter. Hence, while “every tree of the garden was given for food,” the tree of life, in the midst of the garden, was provided by Infinite Wisdom as the appointed antidote of disease or decay of the body while, at the same time, the enjoyment of spiritual life, or the indwelling of the spirit of God, and the right of access to the tree of life, thus securing immortality, were conditioned on our first parents not eating the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge (Gen 2:9-17). The various references to the “tree of life” evidently consider it to have been the divinely appointed medium for securing the immortality of our first parents (Pro 3:18; Pro 11:30; Eze 47:12; Rev 2:7; Rev 22:2; Rev 22:14). See Reineccius, De Arbore Vitae (Weissenf. 1722). SEE LIFE.

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil, of which they were forbidden to eat under penalty of excision from the tree of life, and consequent death, which also occupied a conspicuous place in the garden, was the divinely appointed test of good and evil, the means whereby God would try and prove the faithfulness and obedience of our first parents. It was the test of moral' good and evil, i.e. of holiness and sin, and of consequent happiness or misery (Gen 3:1-24). When, through the instigation of the tempter, the first human pair disregarded the command of their Creator and partook of the fruit of the prohibited tree, they lost the indwelling of the spirit of God, and forfeited the right of access to the tree of life. On that day the sentence of death was awarded to the guilty pair. They were now dead in the eve of the divine law, and the same condemnation passed upon the whole race of man. By partaking of the forbidden tree, they obtained an experimental sense of the distinction between good and evil. Hence their expulsion from Eden and removal from the tree of life was an act of mercy as well as of justice; for, had they been allowed to retain the use of the tree of life, it would, in their condition, have sustained them in an immortality of guilt and misery. See Miller, De Abode Boni et Mali, et Arb. Vitae (Lips. 1755); Journ. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1862; Jan. and Oct. 1864. SEE EDEN.

## Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux, LL.D[[@Headword:Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux, LL.D]]

             an eminent English Biblical scholar, was born at Falmouth, Jan. 30, 1813. After receiving an education at the Falmouth Classical School, he was employed in the iron-works at Neath Abbey, Glamorganshire, 1828-34, and became, in 1836, a private tutor in Falmouth. Devoting himself to the study of the Scriptures, he visited the Continent several times for the purpose of collating the principal uncial MSS. At Rome he was permitted to see the Vatican MS., but not to copy it. He received his degree of LL.D. from St. Andrew's University in 1850, and in 1863 received an annual pension of one hundred pounds. Of Quaker parentage, he became. associated with the Plymouth: Brethren was an active philanthropist, and was appointed a member of the company on the revision of the A. V. of. the Old Test. Dr. Tregelles died at Plymouth, April 24,1875. He published, Englishman's Greek Concordance to the New Test. (1839, imp. 8vo; 2d ed. 1844, imp. 8vo; Index to, 1845, imp. 8vo): — Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance to the Old Test. (1843, 2 vols. imp. 8vo): — Book of Revelation in Greek, etc. (1844, 8vo): — Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old-Test. Scriptures, etc. (1847, 4to; last ed. 1857, 4to): — Remarks on the Prophetic Visions of the Book of Daniel (1847, 8vo; 4th ed. with notes, and Defense of the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel, also published separately, 1852, 8vo): — Book of Revelation, Translated from the Ancient Greek Text (1848, 12mo; 1858, 12mo): — Prospectus of a Critical Edition of the Greek New Test., etc. (Plymouth, 1848, 12mo): On the Original Language of St. Matthew's Gospel (Lond. 1850, 8vo): — The Jansenists: their Rise, etc. (1851, 8vo): Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the Authorship, etc., of the Books of the New Test. (1852, small 8vo):Heads of Hebrew Grammar (1852, 8vo): — An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Test. etc. (1854, 8vo): — The Greek New Test. Edited from Ancient Authorities, etc. (1857-72); this last is considered his most important work: — Codex Zacynthius (1861, small foil.): Canon Muratorianus, earliest catalogue of books of the New Test. (Camb. and Lond. 1868, 4to). For full description of works, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tregury, Michael, D.D[[@Headword:Tregury, Michael, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was a native of the village of Tregury, in Cornwall, and for some time fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. He was consecrated in St. Patrick's Church archbishop of Dublin in 1449. In 1450 he had restitution of the temporalities of his see. In 1467 Tregury assigned a moiety of the parish of Lusk for the treasurer of St. Patrick's, and constituted the rectory of St. Andeon in the city. In 1468 he held a visitation in the chapter-house of St. Patrick's Cathedral. He died in 1471. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 159.

## Trelawney, Sir Harry[[@Headword:Trelawney, Sir Harry]]

             an English baronet, was born in 1756, and was educated at Christ Church College, Oxford. He was in succession a preacher among the Methodists, then served a Presbyterian congregation at West Loo, Cornwall, and  afterwards seceded to the Rational Dissenters; Returning to the Church of England, he obtained a rectory in the west of England, and was made prebendary of Exeter in 1789. According to Allibone, he died a Roman Catholic, at Laverno, Italy, in 1834. He published a sermon on 1Co 3:9, Ministers Laborers together with God (Lond. 1778, 4to). See Lond. Gent. Mag. 1834, 1, 652; Allibone, Dict, of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog., s.v.

## Trelawney, Sir Jonathan[[@Headword:Trelawney, Sir Jonathan]]

             an English baronet and prelate, born in 1648, was ordained bishop of Bristol in 1685, translated to Exeter in 1689, and to Winchester in 1707. He was one of the seven bishops committed to the Tower in the reign of James II. His death occurred in 1721. He published a sermon on Jos 23:8-9, Thanksgiving for Victory (Lond. 1702, 4to): Caution against False Doctrine (1704, 12mo). See Lond. Gent. Mag. 1827, 2, 409; State Trials (Howell's ed.), 12:182, 187; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and: Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Tremellius, Emmanuel[[@Headword:Tremellius, Emmanuel]]

             a learned Protestant divine, was born at Ferrara in 1510. By birth a Jew, he was educated in the Jewish faith; but he was converted to Christianity by the teaching, it is said, of cardinal Pole and M. A. Flaminio. Through the influence of Peter Martyr he soon after joined the Reformation party, and became an active propagator of their views. Having left Italy, he visited Germany and England, where he lived in. intimacy with archbishops Cranmer and Parker, and for some time supported himself by teaching Hebrew at Cambridge. On the death of Edward VI he returned to Germany, where he remained teaching Hebrew at Hornbach and Heidelberg. He was next invited to occupy the Hebrew chair at Sedan, where he died in 1580. His works are: Rudimenta Lig. Heb. (Wittenb, 1541): — הנו ִבחירי יה, Initiatio Electorum Domini, a catechism in Hebrew (Par. 1551,1552; Strasb. 1554; Leyd. 1591): — Gam. Chald. et Syr., prefixed to Interpretatio ‘Syr. N.T. Hebraicis Typis Descripta (Par. 1569): — Biblia Sacra, sive Libb. Canon. Latini recens ex leb. Facti (Francof. 1579; Lond. 1580). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 443; Kitto, Cyclop. . 5.; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handbuch, p. 140; Kalkar, Israel und (lie Kirche, p. 73 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. I, 3, 4, No. 1797; Butters, Emmanuel Tremellius (Zweibricken, 1859); Delitzsch, Saat auf Hoffnung (Erlangen,  1865), 4:28 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 469 sq.; Adams, History of the Jews, 2, 71. (B. P.)

## Trench[[@Headword:Trench]]

             (prop. תַּעָלָה, tealah, 1Ki 18:32; 1Ki 18:35; 1Ki 18:38, a channel, or “conduit,” as elsewhere), a kind of ditch cut into the earth for the purpose of receiving and draining the water from adjacent parts. Something of this kind was the trench cut by the prophet Elijah to contain the water which he ordered to be poured on his sacrifice (1Ki 18:32), and which, when filled to the brim. with water, was entirely exhausted, evaporated, by the fire of the Lord which consumed the sacrifice. SEE ELIJAH.

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

             (חֵיל, cheyl, 2Sa 20:15, a wall, rampart, or bulwark, as elsewhere rendered; מִעגָּל, magal, 1Sa 26:5; 1Sa 26:7; or מִעַגָּלָה, magaldh, 17:20, a wagon-rut, hence a defense formed by the vehicles of an army; χάρξ, Luk 19:43, a mound [Lat. vallum] for blockading a besieged city, formed of the earth thrown out of a moat and stuck with sharp sticks or palisades) is also a military term, and denotes one description of the approaches to a fortified town. They were anciently used to surround a town, to enclose the besieged, and to secure the besiegers against attacks from them. Trenches could not be cut in a rock; and it is probable that, when our Lord says of Jerusalem (Luk 19:43), Thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee, meaning, “they shall raise a wall of enclosure,” he foretold what the Jews would barely credit from the nature of the case; perhaps what they considered as impossible: yet the providence of God has so ordered it that we have evidence to this fact in Josephus, who says that Titus exhorting his soldiers, they surrounded Jerusalem with a wall in the space of three days, although the general opinion had pronounced it impossible. This circumvolution prevented any escape from the city, and deterred from all attempts at relief by succors going into it. SEE SIEGE.

## Trench, Hon. Power Le Poer, D.D[[@Headword:Trench, Hon. Power Le Poer, D.D]]

             a prelate of the Irish Episcopal Church, was born June 10, 1770, and educated at Dublin University. His first preferment on being ordained was  the union of Creagh, in the diocese of Clonfert. He was consecrated bishop of Waterford, November 21, 1802; in 1810 translated to the see of Elphin; and in 1819 appointed to the archbishopric of Tuam, which he held till his death, March 21, 1839. Archbishop Trench was a fine scholar, a profound theologian, a devout Christian, a brilliant orator, and diligent in the performance of all life's duties. See The (Lond.) Church of Englanzd Magazine, June 1841, page 380; The (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer, May 1839, page 315.

## Trench, Richard Chenevix, D.D[[@Headword:Trench, Richard Chenevix, D.D]]

             a prelate of the Irish Church, was born in Ireland, September 9, 1807. He was educated at Harrow and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and took his degree in 1829. He was shortly afterwards ordained as curate to Hugh James Rose of Hadleigh. At this time Trench joined the High Church party, without having the smallest leaning Romewards. He had a tolerance for, though not intellectual sympathy with, the broad school. While holding a small incumbency in Hampshire, Trench became acquainted with the Reverend Dr. (afterwards bishop) Wilberforce, whose curate he became. In 1845 Wilberforce was made dean of Westminster, and Trench became rector of Itchenstoke, a small village near Winchester, joining to his work there, as soon as Wilberforce became bishop, that of examining chaplain, and soon after that of theological professor at King's College. In 1856 Trench was made dean of Westminster, a position which he held to the end of 1863. On January 1, 1864, he was consecrated archbishop of Dublin. He resigned his office in 1885, and died March 28, 1886. As a writer, Trench is known beyond the confines of his own country. He was poet, philologist, and theologian. Of his many writings the best known are, On the Authorized Version of the New Testament (N.Y: 1858): — Synonyms of the New Testament (8th ed. revised, Lond. 1876): — Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, etc. (3d ed. 1869): — Studies in the Gospels (1870): — The Star of the Wise Men (1850): — Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia, Revelation 2, 3 (1864): — Notes on the Parables of Our Lord (1871): — Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord (eod.): — On the Lessons in Proverbs (1865): — Lectures on Mediceval Church History (1878): — Sermons Preached before the University of Cambridge (1866): — Sermons Preached in Westminster Abbey (1861): — The Hulsean Lectures for 1845 and 1846 (1860): — Sermons Preached for the Most Part in Ireland (1873): — Sacred Latin Poetry (1864): — English, Past and Present (7th ed. 1871): — A Select Glossary of English Words (1872): — On the Study of Words (1868): — Brief Thoughts and Meditations on Passages of Holy Scripture (1884). Trench was also a member of the English Company for the Revision of the New Test. (B.P.)

## Trendelenburg, Friedrich Adolf[[@Headword:Trendelenburg, Friedrich Adolf]]

             a German philosopher, was born at Eutin, near Lubeck, Nov. 30, 1802; and was educated at the gymnasium of his native town, and at the universities of Kiel, Leipsic, and Berlin. From 1826 to 1833 he was private tutor in the family of postmaster-general Von Nagler, and in the latter year  was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy at Berlin. This position was exchanged, in 1837, for that of professor in ordinary. He was elected a member of the Berlin academy in 1846, and was its secretary in the “historico-philosophical” section from 1847 until his death, Jan. 24, 1872. “On that very day the journals announced his decoration by the king as a knight of the Order of Merit, for his eminence in science and art.” “The foundation of Trendelenburg's doctrine is essentially Platonic and Aristotelian.” He terms his philosophy the “organic view” of the world; and according to it each lower stage in existence is the basis of the higher stages, and necessarily involved in the higher. The soul is the self-realizing idea of man. God is the unconditioned, not directly demonstrable, but implied, with logical necessity, in the whole fabric of the universe and of human thought. Among Trendelenburg's works are, Elementa Logices Aristotelice (Berlin, 1837; 6th ed. 1868): — Logische Untersuch ungen (ibid. 1840; 3d ed. 1870): — Erl1uterungen zu den Elementen der z aistotelischen Logik (2d ed. 1861): — Naturrecht auf dem Grunde der Ethik (2d ed. 1868). See Bonitz, Zur Erinnerung an F. A. Trendelenburg (Berlin, 1872); Bratuschek, Adolf Trendelenburg (ibid. 1873); Prantl, Geddchtnissrede auf F. A. Trendelenburg (Munich, 1873); Ueberweg, Hist. of Modern Phil. (see Index).

## Trendelenburg, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Trendelenburg, Johann Georg]]

             a German professor of ancient languages, was born Feb. 22,1757. For a number of years he was professor of languages at the academic gymnasium in Dantzic, where he died March 11,1825. He published, Primi Libri Maccabaeorums Graeci, Textus cum Veissione Syriaca Collatio Instituta (reprinted in Eichhorn's Repertoium, 15:59): — Chrestomathia Flaviiana, sire Loci Illustres ex Flavio Josejpho Delecti et Aniadversionibus Illustrati (Lips. 1789): — Chrestomacthia Hexaplaris (ibid. 1794) — Commentatio in Veba Novissima Davidis 2Sa 23:1-7 (Gött. 1779): — Die ersten Azirnngsgründe der hebr. Sprache (Dantzic, 1784). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 443; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur., 2, 807. (B.P.)

## Trent, The Council Of (Concilium Tridentinunm)[[@Headword:Trent, The Council Of (Concilium Tridentinunm)]]

             was held in Trent, a city of Tyrol, Austria, on the left bank of the Adige. It has a cathedral built entirely of marble in the Byzantine style. In the Church of St. Maria Maggiore are the portraits of the members of the council,  which was held in this building. This council was first convoked June 2, 1536, by pope Paul III, to be held at Mantua, May 23, 1537. Subsequently, the duke of Mantua having refused to permit the assembling of the council in that city, the pope prorogued the meeting to November, without naming any place. Afterwards, by another bull, he prorogued it till May. 1538, and named Vicenza as the place of assembly; nominating in the meantime certain cardinals and prelates to look into the question of reform, who, in consequence, drew up a long report upon the subject, in which they divide the abuses needing correction into two heads:

1. Those concerning the Church in general.

2. Those peculiar to the Church of tome. When the time arrived, however, not a single bishop appeared at Vicenza; whereupon the pope again prorogued the council to Easter, 1539, and subsequently forbade its assembling until he should signify his pleasure upon the subject. At last, at the end of three years, in the year 1542. after much dispute between the pope, the emperor, and the other princes in the Roman communion as to the place in which the council should be holden, the pope's proposition that it should take place at Trent was agreed to; whereupon the bull was published, May 22, convoking the council to Trent on Nov. 1 in that year. Subsequently he named, as his legate in the council, cardinal John del Monte, bishop of Palestina; the cardinal-priest of Sainte-Croix, Marcellus Cervinus; and the cardinal-deacon Reginald Pole. However, difficulties arose, which caused the opening of the council to be further delayed, and the first meeting was not held until December, 1545. The great importance of this council in the history of the Reformation, and in Roman Catholic doctrine since, justifies an unusually full treatment of it here.

Session I (Dec. 13, 1545). When the council was opened there were present the three legates, four archbishops, and twenty-two bishops, in their pontifical vestments. Mass was said by the cardinal del Monte, and a sermon preached by the bishop of Bitonte; after which the bull given Nov. 19, 1544, and that of February, 1545, were read, and cardinal del Monte explained the objects which were proposed in assembling the council, viz. the extirpation of heresy, the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline, the reformation of morals, and the restoration of peace and unity.

On Dec. 18 and 22 congregations were held, in which some discussion arose about the care and order to be observed by prelates in their life and behavior during the council.  On Jan. 5 another congress was held, in which cardinal del Monte proposed that the order to be observed in conducting the business of the council should be the same with that at the last Council of Lateran, where the examination of the different matters had been entrusted to different bishops, who for that purpose had been divided into three classes; and when the decrees relating to any matter had been drawn up, they were submitted to the consideration of a general congregation; so that all was done without any disputing and discussion in the sessions. A dispute arose in this congregation about the style to be given to the council in the decrees. The pope had decreed that they should run in this form, “The Holy (Ecumenical and General Council of Trent, the Legates of the Apostolic See presiding;” but the Gallican bishops, and many of the Spaniards and Italians, insisted that the words “representing the Universal Church” should be added. This, however, the legates refused, remembering that such had been the form used in the councils of Constance and Basle, and fearing lest, if this addition were made, the rest of the form of Constance and Basle might follow, viz., “which derives its power immediately from Jesus Christ, and to which every person, of whatever dignity, not excepting the pope, is bound to yield obedience.”

Session 11 (Jan. 7, 1546). — At this session forty-three prelates were present. Abul was read prohibiting the proctors of absent prelates to vote; also another, exhorting all the faithful then in Trent to live in the fear of God, and to fast and pray. The learned were exhorted to give their attention to the question how the rising heresies could be best extinguished. The question about the style of the council was again raised.

In the following congregation, Jan. 13, the same question was again debated. Nothing was settled in this matter, and they then proceeded to deliberate upon which of the three subjects proposed to be discussed in the council (viz. the extirpation of heresy, the reformation of discipline, and the restoration of peace) should be first handled. Three prelates were appointed to examine the procuration papers and excuses of absent bishops.

In the next congregation the deliberations on the subject to be first proposed in the council were resumed. Some wished that the question of reform should be first opened; others, on the contrary, maintained that questions relating to the faith demanded immediate notice. A third party, among whom was Thomas Campeggio, bishop of Feltri, asserted that the  two questions of doctrine and reformation were inseparable, and must be treated of together. This latter opinion ultimately prevailed, but at the moment the sense of the assembly was so divided that no decision was arrived at.

In the congregation held Jan. 22, the party in favor of entering at once upon the subject of reform was much increased, but the three legates continued their opposition to their scheme. Subsequently, however, they proposed that they should always take into consideration together one subject relating to the faith and one relating to reform, bearing one upon the other.

On the 24th a curious dispute arose about the proper seal for the use of the council. Some desired that a new seal should be made; but the legates succeeded in having the seal of the first legate attached to the synodal letters.

Session III (Feb. 4, 1546). — In this session nothing was done except to recite the Creed, word for word.

In a congress held Feb. 22, the legates proposed that the council should enter upon the subject of the Holy Scriptures; and four doctrinal articles were presented, extracted by the theologians from the writings of Luther upon the subject of Holy Scripture, which they affirmed to be contrary to the orthodox faith.

1. That all the articles of the Christian faith necessary to be believed are contained in Holy Scripture; and that it is sacrilege to hold the oral traditions of the Church to be of equal authority with the Old and New Test.

2. That only such books as the Jews acknowledged ought to be received into the canon of the Old Test.; and that the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse should be erased from the canon of the New Test.

4. That Holy Scripture is easy to be understood, and clear, and that no gloss or commentary is needed, but only the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

The first two articles were debated in the four following congregations. As to the first article, the congregation came to the decision that the Christian  faith is contained partly in Holy Scripture and partly in the traditions of the Church. Upon the second article much discussion arose. All agreed in receiving all the books read in the Roman Church, including the Apocryphal books, alleging the authority of the catalogues drawn up in the councils of Laodicea and Carthage, and those under Innocent I and Gelasius I; but there were four opinions as to the method to be observed in drawing up the catalogue. One party wished to divide the books into two classes-one containing those which have always been received without dispute, the other containing those which had been doubted. The second party desired a threefold division: 1. Containing the undoubted books; 2. Those which had been at one time suspected, but since received; 3. Those which had never been recognized, as seven of the Apocryphal books, and some chapters in Daniel and Esther. The third party wished that no distinction should be made; and the fourth that all the books contained in the Latin Vulgate should be declared to be canonical and inspired.

The discussion was resumed on March 8, but not decided; the members, however, unanimously agreed that the traditions of the Church are equal in authority to Holy Scripture.

In the following congregation it was decided that the catalogue of the books of Holy Scripture should be drawn up without any of the proposed distinctions, and that they should be declared to be all of equal authority.

The authority of the Latin Vulgate (declared in the third article to be full of errors) came under consideration in subsequent congregations, and it was almost unanimously declared to be authentic. With regard to the fourth article, it was agreed that in interpreting Scripture men must be guided by the voice of the fathers and of the Church.

Session IV (April 8,1546). — Between sixty and seventy prelates attended this session. Two decrees were read: 1. Upon the canon of Scripture, which declares that the holy council receives all the books of the Old and New Test. as well as all the traditions of the Church respecting faith and morals, as having proceeded from the lips of Jesus Christ himself, or as having been dictated by the Holy Spirit and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continued succession; and that it looks upon both the written and unwritten Word with equal respect. After this the decree enumerates the books received as canonical 5 the Church of Rome, and as they are found in the Vulgate, and anathematizes all who refuse to acknowledge them as such. The second decree declares the authenticity of the Vulgate,  forbids all private interpretation of it, and orders that no copies be printed or circulated without authority, under penalty of fine and anathema.

In another congregation the abuses relating to lecturers on Holy Scripture and preachers were discussed; also those arising from the non-residence of bishops. After this the question of original sin came under consideration, and nine articles taken from the Lutheran books were drawn up and offered for examination, upon which some discussion took place. Ultimately, however, a decree was drawn up upon the subject, divided into five canons.

1. Treats of the personal sin of Adam.

2. Of the transmission of that sin to his posterity.

3. Of its remedy, i.e. holy baptism.

4. Of infant baptism.

5. Of the concupiscence which still remains in those who have been baptized.

A great dispute arose between the Franciscans and Dominicans-concerning the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin. The Franciscans insisted that she should be specially declared to be free from the taint of original sin; the Dominicans, on the other hand, maintained that, although the Church had tolerated the opinion concerning the immaculate conception, it was sufficiently clear that the Virgin was not exempt from the common infection of our nature. A decree of reformation, in two chapters, was also read.

Session V (June 17, 1546). — In this session the decree concerning original sin was passed, containing the five canons mentioned above, enforced by anathemas. Afterwards the fathers declared that it was not their intention to include the Virgin in this decree, and that upon this subject the constitutions of pope Sixtus IV were to be followed, thus leaving the immaculate conception an open question.

In a congregation held June 18, they proceeded to consider the questions relating to grace and good works. Also the subject of residence of bishops and pastors was discussed. The cardinal del Monte and some of the fathers attributed the heresies and disturbances which had arisen to the non- residence of bishops, while many of the bishops maintained that they were  to be attributed to the multitudes of friars and other privileged persons whom the pope permitted to wander about and preach in spite of the bishops, who, in consequence, could do no good even if they were in residence.

In the congregation held June 30, twenty-five articles, professedly drawn up from the Lutheran writings on the subject of justification, were proposed for examination. Some of these articles seem well to have merited the judgment passed upon them; thus, among others,

5. Declares that repentance for past sin is altogether unnecessary if a man lead a new life.

7. The fear of hell is a sin, and makes the sinner worse.

8. Contrition arising from meditation upon, and sorrow for, past sin makes a man a great sinner.

11. Faith alone is required; the only sin is unbelief; other things are neither commanded nor forbidden.

12. He who has faith is free from the precepts of the law, and has no need of works in order to be saved; nothing that a believer can do is so sinful that it can either accuse or condemn him.

13. No sin separates from God's grace but want of faith.

14. Faith and works are contrary to one another; to teach the latter is to destroy the former, etc. At this time the three ambassadors of the king of France arrived-viz. Durse, LigniBres, and Pierre Danez. The last mentioned delivered a long discourse, in the course of which he entreated the council to suffer no attack to be made upon the privileges of the kingdom and Church of France.

In a congregation held Aug. 20, the subject of justification was again warmly discussed, as well as the doctrine of Luther concerning free-will and predestination. Upon this latter subject nothing worthy of censure was found in the writings of Luther or in the Confession of Augsburg; but eight articles were drawn up for examination from the writings of the Zwinglians. Upon some of these there was much difference of opinion. By the advice of the bishop of Sinagaglia, the canons drawn up embodying the decrees of the council were divided into two sets — one set, which they called the decrees of doctrine, contained the Catholic faith upon the  subjects decided; the others, called canons, stated, condemned, and anathematized the doctrines contrary to that faith. These decrees were mainly composed by cardinal SainteCroix, who bestowed infinite pains upon them; at least one hundred congregations were held upon the subject. Afterwards they returned to the consideration of the reform of the Church, and to the question about episcopal residence. Most of the theologians present, especially the Dominicans, maintained that residence was a matter not merely canonically binding, but of divine injunction. The Spaniards held the same opinion. The legates, seeing that the discussion tended to bring the papal authority and power into question, endeavored to put a stop to it.

Session VI (Jan. 13,1547). — In this session the decree concerning doctrine was read; it contained sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons against heretics.

These chapters declare that sinners are brought into a state to receive justification when excited and helped by grace, and, believing the word of God, they freely turn to God, believing all that he has revealed and promised, especially that the sinner is justified by the grace of God, given to him through the redemptions of Jesus Christ; and when, acknowledging their sinfulness and filled with a salutary fear of God's justice, yet trusting to his mercy, they conceive hope and confidence that God will be favorable to them for the sake of Jesus Christ, and thereupon begin to love him as the only source of all righteousness, and to turn from their sins through the hatred which they have conceived against them, i.e. through that repentance which all must feel before baptism; in sholt, when they resolve to be baptized, to lead a new life, and to follow the commandments of God.

After this the decree explains the nature and effects of justification, saying that it does not consist merely in the remission of sin, but also in sanctification and inward renewal. That the final cause of justification is the glory of God and of Jesus Christ and eternal life; the efficient cause is God himself, who, of his mercy, freely washes and sanctifies by the seal and unction of the Holy Spirit, who is the pledge of our inheritance; the meritorious cause is our Lord Jesus Christ, his beloved and only Son; the instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, without which no one can be justified; and, finally, the formal cause is the righteousness of God given to each, not that righteousness by which he Is righteous in himself, but that by which he makes us righteous; i.e. with which being endued by him, we  become renewed in our hearts, and are not merely accounted righteous, but are made really so by receiving, as it were, righteousness in ourselves, each according to the measure given to us at the will of the Holy Spirit and in proportion to the proper disposition and co-operation of each. Thus the sinner, by means of this ineffable grace, becomes truly righteous, a friend of God, and an heir of everlasting life; and it is the Holy Spirit who works this marvelous change in him by forming holy habits in his heart-habits of faith, hope, and charity — which unite him closely to Jesus Christ and make of him a lively member of his body; but no man, although justified, is to imagine himself exempt from the observation of God's commandments. No man may dare, under pain of anathema, to utter such a rash notion as that it is impossible for ma man, even after justification, to keep God's commandments; since God commands nothing impossible, but with the commandment he desires us to do all that we can, and to seek for aid and grace to enable us to fulfill that which in our natural strength we cannot do.

The decree further teaches upon this subject that no man may presume upon the mysterious subject of predestination so as to assure himself of being among the number of the elect and predestined to eternal life, as if, having been justified, it were impossible to commit sin again, or, at least, as if falling into sin after justification, he must of necessity be raised again; that, without a special revelation from God, it is impossible to know who are those whom he has chosen. It also teaches the same of perseverance, concerning which it declares that he who perseveres to the end shall be saved; that no one in this life can promise himself an absolute assurance of perseverance, although all ought to put entire confidence in God's assistance, who will finish and complete the good work which he has begun in us by working in us to will and to do, if we do not of ourselves, fail of his grace.

Further, they who by sin have fallen from grace given, and justification, may be justified again when God awakens them; and this is done by means of the sacrament of penance, in which, through the merits of Jesus Christ, they may recover the grace which they have lost; and this is the proper method of recovery for those who have fallen. It was for the benefit of those who fall into sin after baptism that our Lord Jesus Christ instituted the sacrament of penance, saying, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained. Hence it follows that the repentance of a- Christian fallen into sill after baptism is to be clearly distinguished from the  repentance required at holy baptism; for it not alone requires him to cease from sin, and to view his vileness with horror— i.e. to have all humble and contrite heart-but it also implies the sacramental confession of his sin, at least in will, and the absolution of the priest, together with such satisfaction as he can make by means of fasting, alms-giving, prayer, etc. Not that anything that he can do can help towards obtaining the remission of the eternal punishment due to sin, which is remitted together with the sin by the sacrament of penance (or by the desire to receive that sacrament where it cannot be had), but such satisfaction is necessary to attain remission of the temporal penalties attached to sin, which are not always remitted in the case of those who, ungrateful to God for the blessing which they have received, have grieved the Holy Spirit and profaned the temple of God. This grace of justification may be lost, not only through the sin of infidelity, by which faith itself is lost, but also by every kind of mortal sin, even though faith be not lost.

These chapters were accompanied by thirty-three canons, which anathematize those who hold the opinions specified in them contrary to the tenor of the doctrine contained in the chapters.

Besides this decree, another was published in this session, relating to the Reformation, containing five chapters upon the subject of residence.

It renews the ancient canons against non-resident prelates, and declares that every prelate, whatever be his dignity, being absent for six months together from his diocese, without just and sufficient cause, shall be deprived of the fourth part of his revenue;. and that if he remain away during the rest of the year, he shall lose another' fourth; that if his absence be prolonged beyond this, the metropolitan shall be obliged, under pain of being interdicted from entering the church, to present him to the pope, who shall either punish him for give his church to a more worthy shepherd; that if it be the metropolitan himself who is in fault, the oldest of his suffragans shall, be obliged to present him.

The decree then goes on to treat of the reform of ecclesiastics, both secular and regular; of the visitation of chapters by the ordinary; and declares that bishops may not perform any episcopal function whatever out of their own dioceses without the consent of the bishop of the place.

Before the seventh session a congregation was held, in which it was agreed to treat in the next, place of the sacraments; and thirty-six articles, taken  from the Lutheran books, were proposed for examination, after which thirty canons on the subject were drawn up— viz. thirteen on the sacraments in general, fourteen on baptism, and three on confirmation. They relate to their number, their necessity, excellence, the manner in which they confer grace, which they declared to be ex opere operato, i.e. that the sacraments confer grace upon all those recipients who do not, by mortal sin, offer a bar to its reception; e.g. grace is conferred by baptism upon infants, although they bring with them no pious affections. They also drew up a decree declaring that the sacraments ought always to be administered gratuitously.

After this the question of reformation was discussed; among other things, it was debated whether a plurality of benefices requiring residence is forbidden by the divine law.

Session VII (March 3, 1547). — In this session the thirty canons above noted relating to the sacraments were read, together with the accompanying anathemas. Among the thirteen on the sacraments in general were the following:

1. Anathematizes those who maintain that the seven sacraments were not all instituted by Jesus Christ.

3. Anathematizes those who maintain that any one sacrament is of more worth than another.

8. Anathematizes those who deny that the sacraments confer grace ex opere operato, i.e. by their own proper virtue.

9. Anathematizes those who deny that baptism, orders, and confirmation imprint an ineffaceable character.

10. Anathematizes those who maintain that all Christians, male and female, may preach God's word and administer the sacraments.

11. Anathematizes those who deny that the intention of the minister to do what the Church does is necessary to the effectual administration of the sacraments.

12. Anathematizes those who maintain that the sin of the minister invalidates the sacrament,

13. Anathematizes those who maintain that the minister may ‘change the prescribed form.

Among the fourteen canons on baptism:

2. Anathematizes those who assert that real and natural water is not necessary in baptism.

3. Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church of Rome does not teach the true doctrine on the subject of baptism.

4. Anathematizes those who deny the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, in the name of the blessed Trinity, and with the intention to do what the Church does.

5. Anathematizes those who maintain that baptism is not necessary to salvation.

7. Anathematizes those who maintain that the baptized need only believe, and not keep the law of God.

10. Anathematizes those who maintain that sin after baptism is remitted by faith.

11. Anathematizes those who maintain that apostates from the faith should be again baptized.

12. Anathematizes those who maintain that no one ought to be baptized until he is of the age at which our. Lord was baptized, or at the point of death.

13. Anathematizes those who deny that baptized infants are not to be reckoned among the faithful.

14. Anathematizes those who maintain that persons baptized in infancy should, when they come of age, be asked whether they are willing to ratify the promise made in their name.

Secondly, the decree of reformation, containing fifteen chapters, relative to the election of bishops, pluralities, etc., was passed.

In a congregation which followed, the question of transferring the council to some other place was discussed, a report having been circulated that a contagious disease had broken out in Trent.  Session VIII (March 11, 1547). — In this session a decree was read transferring the council to Bologna, which was approved by about two thirds of the assembly; the rest, who were mostly Spaniards or other subjects of the emperor, strongly opposed the translation. The emperor complained much of the transfer of the council, and ordered the prelates who had opposed it to remain at Trent, which they did.

Session IX (April 21, 1547). — In the first session held at Bologna, the legates and thirty-four bishops were present. A decree was read postponing all business to the next session, to be held on June 2 ensuing, in order to give time for the prelates to arrive.

Session X (June 2, 1547). — At this session, however, there were but six archbishops, thirty-six bishops, one abbot, and two generals of orders present; the rest continuing to sit at Trent. It was deemed advisable to prorogue the session to Sept. 15 ensuing; but the quarrel between the pope and the emperor having now assumed a more serious aspect, the council remained suspended for four years in spite of the solicitations. made by the German bishops to the pope that the sessions of the council might continue.

In 1549, Paul III died, and the cardinal del Monte having been elected in his place, under the name of Julius III, he issued a bull, dated March 14, 1551, directing the re-establishment of the Council of Trent, and naming as his legates, Marcellus Crescentio; cardinal; Sebastian Pighino, archbishop of Siponto; and Aloysijus Lipomanes, bishop of Verona.

Session XI (May 1, 1551). — The next session was held at Trent, when cardinal Crescentio caused a decree to be read to the effect that the council was reopened, and that the next session should be held on Sept. 1 following—

Session XII (Sept. 1, 1551). — In this session, an exhortation was read in the name of the presidents of the council, in which the power and authority of ecumenical councils were extolled; then followed a decree declaring that the subject of the Eucharist should be treated of in the next session. Afterwards, the earl of Montfort, ambassador from the emperor, demanded to be admitted to the council, which was agreed to. James Amyot, the ambassador of Henry II of France, presented a letter from his master, which, after some opposition, was read; it explained why no French bishop had been permitted to attend the council. Afterwards, Amyot, on the part  of Henry, made a formal protest against the Council of Trent, in which he complained of the conduct of Julius III.

In the congregation following, the. question of the Eucharist was treated of, and ten articles selected from the doctrine of Zwingli and Luther were proposed for examination.

1. That the body and blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist only in a figure, not really.

2. That the Lord's body is eaten, not sacramentally, but only spiritually and by faith.

3. That no transubstantiation takes place in the Eucharist, but a hypostatic union of the human nature of Christ with the bread and wine.

4. That the Eucharist was instituted for the remission of sins only.

5. That Jesus Christ in the Eucharist is not to be adored, and that to do so is to commit idolatry.

6. That the holy sacrament ought not to be kept; and that no person may communicate alone.

7. That the body of Christ is not in the fragments which remain after communion; but it is so present only during the time of receiving, and not afterwards.

8. That it is sin to refuse to the faithful the communion in both kinds.

9. That under one species is not contained the same as under both.

10. That faith alone is required in order to communicate; that confession ought to be voluntary, and that communion at Easter is not necessary.

In another congregation the question of reform was discussed, the subject of episcopal jurisdiction was brought forward, and a regulation drawn up concerning appeals. No appeal from the judgment of the bishop and his officials was allowed, except in criminal cases, without consulting with civil judgments; and even in criminal cases it was not permitted to appeal from interlocutory sentences until a definitive sentence had been passed. The ancient right of the bishops to give sentence in the provincial synods was not, however, restored. The power was left to the pope of judging by means of commissioners delegated in partibus.  Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551). — The decree concerning the Eucharist was read Sept. 13, and was contained in eight chapters.

1. Declares that after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, very God' and very again, is verily, really, and substantially contained under the species of these sensible objects; that it is a sin to endeavor to put a metaphorical sense upon the words in which our Lord instituted the holy sacrament; that the Church has always believed the actual body and the actual blood, together with his soul and his divinity, to be present under the species of bread and wine after consecration.

3. That each kind, contains, the same as they both together do, for Jesus Christ is entire-under the species of bread, and under the smallest particle of that species, as also under the species of wine, and under the smallest portion of it.

4. That in the consecration of the bread and wine there is made a conversion and change of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of our Lord's body, and a change of the whole substance of the wine into that of his blood, which change has been fitly and properly termed “transubstantiation.”

5. That the worship of Latria is rightly rendered by the faithful to the holy sacrament of the altar.

8. That there are three modes of communication- (1) sacramentally, as in the case of sinners; (2) spiritually, as they do who receive only in will and by faith; (3) both sacramentally and spiritually, as they do who actually receive, and with faith and proper dispositions. To this decree there were added eleven canons, anathematizing those who held certain heretical doctrines on the subject of the holy Eucharist, and especially those contained in the ten articles proposed for examination in the congregation held Sept. 2.

Thus, Song of Solomon 1 condemns the opinion contained in the first of those articles; Song of Solomon 2, that contained in art. 3; Song of Solomon 3, that contained in art. 9; Song of Solomon 4, that contained in art. 7; Song of Solomon 5, that contained in art. 4; Song of Solomon 6, that contained in art. 5; Song of Solomon 7, that contained in art. 6; Song of Solomon 8, that contained in art. 2; can. 9, that contained in art. 10; can. lo condemns those who deny that the priest may communicate alone; and can. 11 condemns those who maintain that faith alone, without confession, is a sufficient preparation for the  communion.' Afterwards, a decree of reformation, containing eight chapters, was read; the subject of it was the jurisdiction of bishops.

In a congregation held after this session, twelve articles on the subjects of penance and extreme unction were examined, taken from the writings of Luther and his disciples. In a subsequent congregation the decrees and canons upon the subject were brought forward, together with a decree in fifteen chapters on reform.

Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551). — In this session the decree upon penance; in nine chapters, was read.

1. States that our Lord chiefly instituted the sacrament of penance when he breathed upon his disciples, saying, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” etc.; and the council condemns those who refuse to acknowledge that by these words our Lord communicated to his apostles and to their successors the power of remitting or retaining sins after baptism.

2. That in this sacrament the priest exercises the function of judge.

3. That the form of the sacrament, in which its force and virtue resides, is contained in the words of the absolution pronounced by the priest, “Ego te absolve,” etc.; that the penitential acts are contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are, as it were, the matter of the sacrament.

4. The council defines contrition to be an inward sorrow for, and hatred of, the sin committed, accompanied by a firm resolution to cease from it in future. With respect to imperfect contrition, called attrition, arising merely from the shame and disgracefulness of sin, or from the fear of punishment, the council declares that if it be accompanied by a hope of forgiveness, and excludes the desire to commit sin, it is a gift of God and ‘a motion of the Holy Spirit; and that,' fair from rendering a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, it disposes him (disponit) to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of penance.

5. The decree then goes on to establish the necessity of confessing every mortal sin which, by diligent self-examination, can be brought to remembrance. With regard to venial sins, it states that it is not absolutely necessary to confess them, and that they may be expiated in many other ways.

6. As to the minister of this sacrament, it declares that the power of binding and loosing is, by Christ's appointment, in the priest only; that this power consists not merely in declaring the remission of sins, but in the judicial act by which they are remitted.

7. As to the reserved cases, it declares it to be important to the maintenance of good discipline that certain atrocious crimes should not be absolved by every priest, but be reserved for the first-order.

9. That we can make satisfaction to God by self-imposed inflictions, and by those which the priest prescribes, as well as by bearing patiently and with a penitential spirit the temporal sorrows ‘and afflictions which God sends to us. In conformity with this decree, fifteen canons were published, condemning those who maintained the opposite doctrines. After this, the decree upon the subject of extreme unction, in three chapters, was read.

It stated that this unction was appointed by our Lord Jesus Christ as a true sacrament of the New Test.; that it is plainly recommended to the faithful by James, and that the use of it is insinuated by Mark. That the matter of the sacrament is the oil consecrated by the bishop, and that its form consists in the words pronounced when the unction is applied; that its effect is to wipe out the remains of sin, and to reassure and comfort the soul of the sick person by exciting within him a full confidence in God's mercy, and sometimes to restore the health of the body, when such renewed health can advantage the salvation of the soul. That bishops alone may administer this sacrament. That this sacrament ought to be given to those who are in danger of death; but that if they recover, they may receive it again. The council then agreed upon four canons on the subject, with anathemas.

1. Anathematizes those who teach that extreme unction is not a true sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ.

2. Anathematizes those who teach that it does not confer grace, nor remit sin, nor comfort the sick.

3. Anathematizes those who teach that the Roman rite may be set at naught without sin.

4. Anathematizes those who teach that the πρεσβύτεροι, of whom James speaks, are old persons, and not priests.  After this the question of reform came before them, and fourteen chapters upon the subject of episcopal jurisdiction were published.

1. Forbids the granting of dispensations and permissions by the court of Rome to the prejudice of the bishop's authority.

2. Forbids bishops in partibus infidelitum, upon the strength of their privileges, to ordain any one under any pretext without the express permission of, or letter dismissory from, the ordinary.

3. Gives bishops power to suspend clerks ordained without proper examination or without their license.

4. Orders that all secular clerks whatever, and all regulars living out of their monasteries, shall be always, and in all cases, subject to the correction of the bishop in whose diocese they are, notwithstanding any privileges, exemption, etc., whatsoever.

5. Relates to the conservators.

6. Orders all clerks, under pain of suspension and deprivation, to wear the habit suited to their order, and forbids them the use of short garments and green and red stockings.

7. Enacts that a clerk guilty of voluntary homicide shall be deprived of all ecclesiastical orders, benefices, etc.

8. Checks the interference of prelates in the dioceses of others.

9. Forbids the perpetual union of two churches situated in different dioceses.

10. Directs that benefices belonging to the regulars shall be given to regulars only.

11. Directs that no one shall be admitted to the religious life who will not promise to abide in the convent in subjection to the superior.

12. Declares that the right of patronage can be given only to those who have built a new church or chapel, or who endow one already built.

13. Forbids all patrons to make their presentation to any one but to the bishop, otherwise the presentation to be void.  In a congregation held Dec. 23 the sacrament of orders was considered, and twelve articles taken from the Lutheran writings were produced for examination. Subsequently eight canons were drawn up condemning as heretics those who maintained the following propositions:

1. That orders is not a true sacrament.

2. That the priesthood is the only order.

3. That there ought to be no hierarchy.

4. That the consent of the people is necessary to the validity of orders.

5. That there is no visible priesthood.

6. That unction is unnecessary.

7. That this sacrament does not confer the Holy Spirit.

8. That bishops are not by divine appointment nor superior to priests.

Session XV (Jan. 25,1552). — In this session a decree was read to the effect that the decrees upon the subject of the sacrifice of the mass and the sacrament of orders, which were to have been read in this session, would be deferred until March 19 under the pretence that the Protestants, to whom a new safe-conduct had been granted, might be able to attend.

In the following congregation the subject of marriage was treated of, and thirty-three articles thereon were submitted for examination.

The disputes which arose between the ambassadors of the emperor and the legates of the pope produced another cessation of the council. The Spanish bishops and those of the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, as well as all who were subjects of the emperor, wished to continue the council; but those, on the other hand, who were in the interests of the court of Rome did all they could to prevent its continuance, and were not sorry when the report of a war between the emperor and Maurice, elector of Saxony, caused most of the bishops to leave Trent. In the meantime some Protestant theologians arrived, and urged the ambassadors of the emperor to obtain from the fathers of the council an answer to certain propositions, and to induce them to engage in a conference with them; both of which, however, the legates, upon various pretexts, eluded.  Session XVI (May 28,1552). — The chief part of the prelates having then departed, the pope's bull declaring the council to be suspended was read in this session. This suspension lasted for nearly ten years; but on Nov. 29,1560, a bull was published by Pins IV (who succeeded to the papacy: upon the death of Julius III, in 1555) for the reassembling of the council at Trent on the following Easter-day; but from various causes the reopening of the council did not take place until the year 1562.

Session XVII (Jan. 18, 1562). — One hundred and twelve bishops and several theologians were present. The bull of convocation and a decree for the continuation of the council were read; the words “proponentibus legatis” inserted in it passed in spite of the opposition of four Spanish bishops, who represented that the clause, being a novelty, ought not to be admitted, and that it was, moreover, injurious to the authority of ecumenical councils.

In a congregation held Jan. 27 the legates proposed the examination of the books of heretics and the answers to them composed by Catholic authors, and requested the fathers to take into their consideration the construction of a catalogue of prohibited works.

Session XVIII (Feb. 26, 1562). — In this session the pope's brief was read, who left to the council the care of drawing up a list of prohibited books. After this a decree upon the subject of the books to be prohibited was read, inviting all persons interested in the question to come to the council, and promising them a hearing.

In congregations held on March 2, 3, and 4, they deliberated about granting a safe-conduct to the Protestants, and a decree upon the subject was drawn up.

On March 11 a general congregation was held, in which twelve articles of reform were proposed for examination, which gave rise to great dispute and were discussed in subsequent congregations.

Session XIX (May 14,1562). — In this session nothing whatever passed requiring notice, and the publication of the decrees was postponed to the following session. Immediately after this session the French ambassadors arrived, and their instructions were curious, and to the following effect:

That the decisions which had taken place should not be reserved for the pope's approval, but that the pope should be compelled to submit to the  decision of the council. That they should begin with the reform of the Church in its head and in its members, as had been promised at the Council of Constance, and in that of Basle, but never completed. That annates should be abolished; that all archbishops and bishops should be obliged to residence; that tie council should make arrangements with respect to dispensations, so as to remove the necessity of sending to Rome. That the sixth canon of Chalcedon should be observed, which prohibits bishops to ordain priests without appointing them to some specific charges, so as to prevent the increase of useless ministers, etc.

On May 26 a congregation was held to receive the ambassador of France. The Sieur de Pibrac, in the name of the king his master, in a long discourse, exhorted the prelates to labor at the work of reformation, promising that the king would, if needful, support and defend them in the enjoyment of their liberty.

Session XX (June 4,1562). — In this session the promoter of the council replied to the discourse delivered by Pibrac in the last congregation; after which a decree was read proroguing the session to July 16.

In the following congregation five articles upon the subject of the holy Eucharist were proposed for examination.

1. Whether the faithful are, by God's command, obliged to receive in both kinds?

2. Whether Jesus Christ is received entire under one species as under both?

3. Whether the reason which induced the Church to, give the communion to the laity under one kind only still obliged her not to grant the cup to any one?

4. Upon what conditions the cup should be permitted to any persons, supposing it to be advisable to grant it?

5. Whether the communion is necessary to children under years of discretion? The question about the obligation of residence was also again mooted; but the cardinal of Mantua objected to its discussion as entirely alien from the subject before them, promising, at the same time, that it should be discussed at a fitting season.

In subsequent congregations held from the 9th to the 23d of June the subject of the five articles was discussed.  In a congregation held July 14 the decree in four chapters on the communion was examined.

Session XXI (July 16,1562). — The four chapters on doctrine were read, in which the council declared:

That neither laymen nor ecclesiastics (not consecrating) are bound by any divine precept to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds; that the sufficiency of communion in one kind cannot be doubted without injury to faith. Further, that the Church has always possessed the power of establishing and changing in the dispensation of the sacraments (without, however, interfering with essentials) according as she has judged to be most conducive to the honor due to the holy sacrament, and to the good of the recipients, taking into account the diversities of place and conjuncture that, although Jesus' Christ instituted and gave to his apostles the sacrament under two kinds, it is necessary to believe that under either kind Jesus Christ is received whole and entire; and that no diminution is experienced in any of the graces conveyed by the sacrament. Lastly, that children not arrived at years of discretion are not obliged to receive the Eucharist.

Four canons in conformity with this doctrine were then read:

1. Against those who maintain that all the faithful are under obligation to receive in both kinds.

2. Against those who maintain that the Church has not sufficient grounds for refusing the cup to the laity.

3. Against those who deny that our Lord is received entire under each species.

4. Against those who maintain that the Eucharist is necessary to children before they come to the exercise of their reason. Subsequently nine chapters on reform were read, having regard to the duties of bishops, education of clerks, etc.

A few days after this session the Italian bishops received a letter from the pope, in which he declared that he was far from wishing to hinder the discussion of the question concerning the nature of the obligation to residence; that he desired the council to enjoy entire freedom, and that every one should speak according as his conscience directed him; at the  same time, however, he wrote to his nuncio, Visconti, bidding him take secure measures for stifling the discussion, and for sending it to the holy see for decision.

In the congregations held after the twenty-first session, the question was concerning the sacrifice of the mass; and all the theologians agreed unanimously that the mass ought to be regarded as a true sacrifice under the new covenant, in which Jesus Christ is offered under the sacramental species. One of their arguments was this, that Jesus Christ was priest after the order of Melchizedek; the latter offered bread and wine; and that, consequently, the priesthood of Jesus Christ includes a sacrifice of bread and wine.

In a congregation held about Aug. 18, the archbishop of Prague presented a letter from the emperor, in which he made earnest entreaties that the cup might be conceded to the laity. This delicate subject was reserved for special consideration in a subsequent congregation.

The decree on the subject of the sacrifice of the mass being now completed, the members began next to consider the subject of communion in both kinds. Three opinions principally prevailed among the prelates:

1. To refuse the ‘cup' entirely;

2. To grant it upon certain conditions to be approved of by the council;

3. To leave the settlement of the matter to the pope.

The Spanish and Venetian bishops supported the first opinion. Among those who were inclined to grant the cup were cardinal Madrucio, the bishop of Modena, and Gaspard Capal, bishop of Leira. But among the strongest advocates for granting the petition was the bishop of the Five Churches, who implored the prelates to have compassion on the churches, and to pay some regard to the pressing entreaties of the emperor. On the other hand, the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, and the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, were in favor of refusing; the latter maintained that by giving way to them the people would be rather confirmed in the error of supposing that the body only of our Lord is contained under the species of bread, and the blood only under that of wine; that if they gave way now, other nations would require the same, and they would go further, and would next require the abolition of images, as being an occasion of idolatry to the people. Other bishops, supporting this opinion, reminded the  assembly that the Church had been led to forbid the use of the cup from a fear lest the consecrated wine should be spilled or turn sour, and that the former accident could hardly be prevented when the holy sacrament was carried long distances and by bad paths. The archbishop of Rossano, the bishops of Cava, Almeria, Imola, and Rieti, with Richard, abbot of Preval, at Genoa, were also among those who spoke in favor of absolutely refusing the cup. On the eve of the twenty-second session a decree passed by which it was left to the pope to act as he thought best in the matter, the numbers being ninety-eight for the decree and thirty-eight against it. The discussion lasted altogether from Aug. 15 to Sept. 16.

Session XXII (Sept. 17, 1562). — One hundred and eighty prelates, with the ambassadors and legates, were present at this session. The doctrinal decree touching the sacrifice of the mass, in nine chapters, was published. It was to the following effect:

1. Although our Lord once offered himself to God the Father by dying upon the altar of his cross, in order to obtain thereby eternal redemption for us, nevertheless, since his priesthood did not cease at his death, in order that he might leave with his Church a visible sacrifice (such as the nature of man requires), by means of which the bloody sacrifice of the cross might be represented at the last supper, on the same night that he was betrayed, in the execution of his office as a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek, he offered his body and blood to the Father under the species of bread and wine, and gave the same to his apostles; and by these words, “This do in remembrance of me,” he commanded them and their successors to offer the like sacrifice, as the Catholic Church has always believed and taught.

2. As. the same Jesus Christ who once offered himself upon the cross with the shedding of his blood is contained and immolated without the effusion of blood in the holy sacrifice of the mass, this latter sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by it we obtain mercy and forgiveness; since it is the same Jesus Christ who was offered upon the cross who is still offered by the ministry of his priests, the only difference being in the manner of offering. And the mass may be offered, not only for the sins and wants of the faithful who are alive, but also for those who, being dead, are not yet made pure.

3. Although the Church sometimes celebrates masses in honor and ill memory of the saints, the sacrifice is still offered to God alone, for she only implores their protection.

4. The Church for many ages past has established the sacred canon of the mass, which is pure and free from every error, and contains nothing which is not consistent with holiness and piety, being in truth composed from our Lord's words, the traditions of the apostles, and the pious institutions of the holy popes.

5. The Church, in order the better to set forth the majesty of so great a sacrifice, has established certain customs-such as saying some things at mass in a low voice, others aloud; and has introduced certain ceremonies- as the benediction, lights, incense, ornaments, etc., after the tradition of the apostles.

6. Although it is to be desired that at every mass all the faithful should communicate, not only spiritually, but also sacramentally, nevertheless the council does not condemn private masses in which the priest only communicates, but, on the contrary, approves and authorizes them, for they are celebrated by the proper minister in behalf of himself and the faithful.

7. The Church has ordained that the priest shall mix water with the wine, because there is reason to believe that our blessed Lord did so, and because both blood and water issued from his side; which sacred mystery, by the use of this mixture, is remembered.

8. Although the mass contains much to edify the people, the fathers did not judge it right that it should be celebrated in the vulgar tongue, and the Roman Church has preserved the use; nevertheless, the clergy should at times, and especially on festivals, explain to the people some part of what they have read to them.

9. Anathematizes, in nine canons, all those who deny the affirmative of twelve of the thirteen articles proposed in the congregation following the twenty-first session, viz. the 1James , 3 rd, 13th, and 4th, 2rd, 10th, 7th, 11th, 5th, 8th, 9th, and 6th (which see). Then followed a decree concerning what should be observed or avoided in the celebration of mass:

Bishops were ordered to forbid, and abolish everything which had been introduced through avarice, irreverence, or superstition, such as pecuniary  agreements for the first masses, and forced exactions made under the name' of alms; vagabond and unknown priests were forbidden to celebrate, also those who were notorious evil livers; no masses were to be said in private houses; all music of an impure and lascivious character was forbidden in. churches, and all Worldly conversation, profane actions, walking about, etc. Priests were forbidden to say mass out of the prescribed hours, and otherwise than Church form prescribed. It was also ordered to warn the people to come to church on Sundays and holidays at least. In the third place, the decree of reformation was read, containing eleven chapters:

1. Orders that all the decrees of the popes and the councils relating to the life, morals, and acquirements of the clergy should be in future observed, under the original and even greater penalties.

2. Enacts that bishoprics shall be given only to those persons who possess the qualifications required by the canons, and who have been at least six months in holy orders.

3. Permits bishops to appropriate the third part of the revenue of the prebends-in any cathedral or collegiate church for daily distributions.

4. Declares that no one under the rank of subdeacon shall have any voice in the chapter; that all the members shall perform their proper offices.

5. Enacts that dispensations extra curium (i.e. granted anywhere out of the court of Rome) shall be addressed to the ordinary, and shall have no effect until he shall have testified that they have not been obtained surreptitiously.

6. Treats of the care to be observed in proving wills.

7. Orders that legate's, numcios, patriarchs, and other superior judges shall observe the constitution of Innocent IV beginning “Romona,” whether in receiving appeals or granting prohibitions.

8. Orders that bishops, us the delegates of the holy see, shall be the executors of all pious gifts, whether by will or otherwise; that to them it appertains to visit hospitals and other similar communities, except those under the immediate protection of the king.

9. Directs that those to whom the care of any sacred fabric is entrusted whether laymen or clerks, shall be held bound to give account of their  administration yearly to the ordinary, unless the original foundation require them to account to any other.

10. Declares that bishops may examine notaries, and forbid them the exercise of their office in ecclesiastical matters.

11. Enacts penalties against those who usurp or keep possession of the property of the Church, and pronounces anathemas against them.

With respect to the concession of the cup to the laity, the council declared, by another decree, that it judged it convenient to leave the decision to the pope, who would act in the matter according as his wisdom should direct him.

In a congregation certain articles relating to the reformation of morals were discussed, and the theologians were instructed to examine eight articles on the subject of the sacrament of orders. This occupied many congregations, in one of which a large number” of the prelates, chiefly Spaniards, demanded that there should be added to the seventh canon, concerning the institution of bishops, a clause declaring the episcopate to be of divine right. An attempt was made to stifle the discussion, but John Fonseca, a Spanish theologian, among others entered boldly upon the subject, declaring that it was not, and could not be, forbidden to speak upon the matter. He maintained that bishops were instituted by Jesus Christ, and thus by divine right, and not merely by a right conferred by tile pope. The discussion of this question proved highly disagreeable at Rome, and the legates received instructions on no account to permit it to be brought to a decision. However, in subsequent congregations the dispute was renewed with warmth; in the congregation of Oct. 13, the archbishop of Granada insisted upon the recognition of the institution of bishops, and their superiority to priests, jure divino. The same view was taken in the following congregation by the archbishop of Braga and the bishop of Segovia; and no less than fifty-three prelates, out of one hundred and thirty-one present, voted in favor of the recognition of the divine institution and jurisdiction of bishops. According to Fr. Paolo, the number amounted to fifty-nine. The dispute was, however, by no means ended. On the 20th the Jesuit Lainez, at the instigation of the legates, delivered a powerful speech in opposition to the view taken by the Spanish bishops, denying altogether that the institution and jurisdiction of bishops were of divine right. However, powerful as was his speech, he was answered by the bishop of Paris so effectually that the legates, to their great discomposure,  saw the views of the Spanish prelates gain ground. The latter then declared formally that unless their demand were granted, and the order and jurisdiction of bishops declared in the canon to be jure divino, they would thenceforth absent themselves from all the congregations and sessions.

In the meantime the cardinal of Lorraine arrived at Trent with several French prelates, and was received with honor. In a congregation held Nov. 23, he read the letter of the king of France to the council, in which he strongly urged them to labor sincerely to bring about a sound reformation of abuses, and to restore its pristine glory to the Catholic Church by bringing backs all Christian people to one religion. After the letter was finished the cardinal delivered a speech, strongly urging: the necessity of proceeding speedily with the work of reformation, in which he was followed by Du Ferrier, the king's ambassador, who spoke his mind freely.

All this time so little progress had been. made with the canons and decrees that when Nov. 26, the day fixed for holding the twenty-third session, arrived, it was found necessary to prorogue it. After this, in the following congregations, the subject of the divine right of bishops was again discussed, when the French bishops declared in favor of the views held by the Spaniards.

At the beginning of the year 1563 the French ambassadors presented their articles: of reformation under thirty-two heads. Their principal demands were as follows:

6. That no person should be appointed bishop unless he were of advanced age, and of good character and capacity.

7. That no curates should be nominated unless they were of good character and abilities.

9. That bishops, either personally or by deputy should preach on every Sunday and festivals, besides Lent and Advent.

10. That all curates should do the same when they had a sufficient audience.

12. That incapable bishops, abbots, and curates should resign their benefices, or appoint coadjutors.

14. That all pluralities whatever should be abolished, without any consideration of compatibility or incompatibility.

16. That steps should be taken to provide every beneficed clerk with a revenue sufficient to maintain two curates and to exercise hospitality.

17. That the gospel should be explained to the people at mass, and that after mass the priest should pray with the people in the vulgar tongue.

18. That the ancient decretals of pope Leo and Gelasins on communion in both kinds should be re-established.

19. That the efficacy of the sacraments should also be explained to the people before their administration.

20. That benefices should be conferred by bishops within six months; after which time they should devolve to the immediate superior, and so gradually to the pope.

21. That they should abolish, as contrary to the canons, all expectatives, regressions (returning to a benefice which has been once resigned), resignations, etc.

23. That simple priories should be reunited to the cure of souls, originally intended by the foundation, which had been separated from them, and assigned to perpetual vicars with miserable pittances.

27. That bishops should take in hand no matter of importance without the advice of their chapters; and that canons should be compelled to continual residence.

31. That no sentence of excommunication should be passed until three monitions had been issued, and then only for grievous faults. That bishops should be desired to give benefices rather to those who drew back from receiving than to such as sought for them.

32. That diocesan synods should be assembled at least once a year, provincial synods every three years, and general councils every ten years.

The pope, in order to elude the difficulty in which he was placed by the demand of the Spanish and French bishops that the divine right of bishops should be inserted in the seventh chapter, sent a form for the approval of the council, in which it was declared that “bishops held the principal place in the Church, but in dependence upon the pope.” This, however, did not meet with approval, and, after a long contest, it was agreed to state it thus, that “they held the principal place in the Church under the pope,” instead  of in dependence upon him. However, a still warmer contest arose upon the chapter in which it was said that the pope had authority to feed and govern the Universal Church. This the Gallican and Spanish bishops would by no means consent to, alleging that the Church is the first tribunal under Christ. Accordingly, they insisted that the words universas ecclesias, “all churches,” should be substituted for Universam Ecclesinam. The Gallicans even more strenuously denied that “the pope possessed all the authority of Jesus Christ,” notwithstanding all the limitations and explanations which were added to it.

On Feb. 5 the legates proposed for consideration eight articles on the subject of marriage, extracted from so-called heretical books:

1. That marriage is not a sacrament instituted by God.

2. That parents may annul marriages contracted by their children clandestinely.

3. That a man may marry again during the life of his first wife, divorced on account of fornication.

4. That polygamy is allowed to Christians, and that to forbid marriages at certain seasons is a heathen superstition.

5. That marriage is to be preferred to the state of virginity.

6. That priests in the Western Church may marry, notwithstanding their vow.

7. That the decrees of consanguine down in Leviticus 18 are to be observed, and no others.

8. That the cognizance of causes relating to marriages belongs to the secular princes. These articles were discussed in several congregations. The sixth article came under consideration March 4; all agreed in condemning it as heretical, but they were divided upon the grounds of their opinion. The question was afterwards discussed whether it was advisable, under the circumstances of the times, to remove the restriction laid upon the clergy not to marry; this was in consequence of a demand to that effect made by the duke of Bavaria. Strong opposition was made to this demand, and many blamed the legates for permitting the discussion, and maintained that if this license were granted the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy would fall to pieces, and the pope be reduced to the simple condition of bishop of Rome,  since the clergy, having their affections set upon their families and country, would be inevitably detached from that close dependence upon the holy see in which its present strength mainly consists.

In the meantime, the cardinal of Mantua had died, and the pope dispatched two new legates to the council cardinal Morone and cardinal Navagier. The French continued their importunities on the subject of reformation, and were as constantly put off upon one pretext or another by the legates, and, thus much time was wasted.

In a congregation held May 10, a letter from the queen of Scots was read, in which she expressed her sorrow that she had not one Catholic prelate in her dominions whom she could send to the council, and declared her determination, should she ever attain to the crown of England, to do all in her power to bring that kingdom, as well as Scotland, back to the Roman obedience.

All this time the contests about the institution and jurisdiction of bishops, and the divine obligation of residence, continued; and at last, in order to accommodate matters, and bring things to an end, it was resolved to omit altogether all notice of the institution of bishops and of the authority of the pope, and to erase from the decree concerning residence whatever was obnoxious to either party. They then fell to work upon the decree concerning the reformation of abuses.

Session XXIII (July 15, 1563). — At this session 208 prelates, besides the legates and other ecclesiastics, were present, with the ambassadors of France, Spain, Portugal, etc. The sermon was preached by the bishop of Paris, who seems to have contrived in it to give offence to all parties. After the sermon, the bulls authorizing Morone and Navagier to act as legates for the pope were read, together with the letters of the king of Poland, the duke of Savoy, and the queen of Scotland. Lastly, the decrees and canons drawn up during the past congregation were brought before the council. The decree upon the sacrament of orders, in four chapters, was read, and eight canons on the sacrament of orders were published, which anathematized,

1. Those who deny a visible priesthood in the Church.

2. Those who maintain that the priesthood is the only order.

3. Those who deny that ordination is a true sacrament.

4. Those who deny that the Holy Spirit is conferred by ordination.

5. Those who deny that the unction given at ordination is necessary.

6. Those who deny that there is a hierarchy composed of bishops, priests, and ministers in the Catholic Church.

7. Those who deny the superiority of bishops to priests, or that they alone can perform certain functions which priests cannot, and those who maintain that orders conferred without the consent of the people are void.

8. Those who deny that bishops called by the authority of the pope (qui auctoritate Romani pontificis assumuntur) are true and lawful bishops. After this the decree of reformation was read, containing eighteen chapters, on the residence of bishops, and on other ecclesiastical affairs.

In the following congregations the decrees concerning marriage were discussed, and it was unanimously agreed that the law of celibacy should be continued binding upon the clergy.

Moreover, twenty articles of reformation, which the legates proposed, were examined; and during the discussion letters were received from the king of France, in which he declared his disappointment at the meager measure of ecclesiastical reform proposed in these articles, and his extreme dissatisfaction at the chapter interfering with the rights of princes. Shortly after, nine of the French bishops returned home, so that fourteen only remained.

On Sept. 22 a congregation was held, in which the ambassador Du Ferrier spoke so warmly of the utter insufficiency of the articles of reform which the legates had proposed, and of their conduct altogether, that the congregation broke up suddenly in some confusion.

To fill up the time intervening before the twenty-fourth session, the subjects of indulgences, purgatory, and the worship of saints and images were introduced for discussion, in order that decrees on these matters might be prepared for presentation in the twenty-fifth session.

Session XXIV (Nov. 11, 1563). — In this session the decree of doctrine and the canons relating to the sacrament of marriage were read.

After establishing the indissolubility of the marriage tie by Holy Scripture, it adds that Jesus Christ by his passion, merited the grace necessary to  confirm and sanctify the union betwixt man and wife. That the apostle means us to understand this when he says, “Husbands, love your wives, as Jesus Christ loved the Church;” and, shortly after, “This sacrament is great: I speak of Jesus Christ and the Church.” Marriage, under the Gospel, is declared to be a more excellent state than that of marriage under the former dispensation, on account of the grace conferred by it, and that, accordingly, the holy fathers, councils, and universal tradition rightly teach us to reckon marriage among the sacraments of the new law. There are twelve canons, with anathemas, upon the subject.

1. Anathematizes those who maintain that marriage is not a true sacrament.

2. Anathematizes those who maintain that polygamy is permitted to Christians.

3. Anathematizes those who maintain that marriage is unlawful only within the degrees specified in Leviticus.

4. Anathematizes those who deny that the Church has power to add to the impediments to marriage.

5. Anathematizes those who maintain that the marriage tie is broken by heresy, ill-conduct, or voluntary absence on either side.

6. Anathematizes those who deny that a marriage contracted, but not consummated, is annulled by either of the parties taking the religious vows.

7. Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church errs in holding that the marriage tie is not broken by adultery.

8. Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church errs in separating married persons for a time in particular cases.

9. Anathematizes those who maintain that men in holy orders, or persons who have taken the religious vow, may marry.

10. Anathematizes those who maintain that the married state is preferable to that of virginity.

11. Anathematizes those who maintain that it is superstitious to forbid marriages at certain seasons.

12. Anathematizes those who maintain that the, cognizance of matrimonial causes does not belong to the ecclesiastical authorities.  After this a decree of reformation was published relating to the same sacrament, containing ten chapters.

1. Forbids clandestine marriages; orders curates to publish the names of the parties about to contract marriage on three consecutive festivals in church during the solemn mass; orders that two or three witnesses be present at the marriage, and declares all marriages to be null which are not solemnized in the presence of the clergyman of the parish, or of some other priest, having his permission or that of the ordinary.

2. Treats of the impediments to marriage, which were in some respects relaxed, i.e. the impediments to marriage between a godparent and godchild and the parents of the godchild was removed; also that between the person administering baptism and the person baptized, or his or her parents.

3 and

4. Also refer to the relaxation of the impeder.

5. Those who willfully contract marriage within the prohibited degrees are sentenced to be separated without any hope of obtaining a dispensation.

6. No marriage to be allowed between a ravisher and the woman ravished while she remains in his power; if, however, when at liberty, she consents, they may be married, the ravisher, and all aiding and abetting, to be nevertheless excommunicated.

7. Care to be used in permitting wanderers to receive the sacrament of marriage.

8. Fornicators, whether married or single, to be excommunicated, unless they will put away their mistresses after three monitions. The women, after three monitions, to be driven out of the diocese unless they obey.

9. Forbids all masters, magistrates, etc., under anathema, to compel those under their control to marry against their own inclinations.

10. Confirms the ancient prohibitions to celebrate marriages between Advent and Epiphany, and between Ash Wednesday and the octave of Easter. After this a decree containing twenty-one articles, upon the reform of the clergy was read, setting forth the duty of bishops to visit their dioceses; to preach in person or by deputy; relating to dispensations, sacraments, visitations, pluralities, etc.  Session XXV and last (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563). — At this session the decrees concerning purgatory, the invocation of saints, and the worship of images and relics were read.

1. Of Purgatory. Declares that the Catholic Church, following Holy Scripture and tradition has always taught, and still teaches, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls which are detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful and by the sacrifice of the mass. Orders all bishops to teach, and to cause to be taught, the true doctrine on this subject.

2. Of the Invocation of Saints. Orders bishops and others concerned in. the teaching of the people to instruct them concerning the invocation of saints, the honor due to their relics; and the lawful use of images, according to the doctrine of the Church, the consent of the fathers, and the decrees of the councils; to teach them that the saints offer up prayers for men, and that it is useful to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers and help. It further condemns those who maintain that the saints in rest ought not to be invoked, that they do not pray for men, that it is idolatry to invoke them; that it is contrary to Holy Scripture, etc., and that their relics and their tombs ought not to be venerated.

On the subject of images, the council teaches that those of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and of the saints are to be placed in churches; that they ought to receive due veneration, not because they have any divinity or virtue in them, but because honor is thus reflected upon those whom they represent. By means of these representations the people are instructed in the mysteries of the faith, and, by thus seeing the good deeds of the saints, are led to bless God, and endeavor themselves to do likewise.

The council then proceeds to anathematize all who hold or teach any contrary doctrine.

Lastly, in order to remedy abuses, it declares that if in any scriptural painting the Divinity is represented under any figure, the people should be warned that it is not intended that the Divinity can be seen by mortal eyes; further, that all things tending to superstition in the invocation of saints, the worship of their relics, and the right use of images should be done away with; that care should be taken not to profane the festivals of the saints, etc.; that no new miracles or relics should be admitted without the bishop's consent, and that any other abases should be rectified by the bishop and provincial council.  These decrees were followed by one of reformation, consisting of twenty- two chapters, which relate to the regular clergy. After this another decree, in twenty-one chapters, on general reformation, was read.

A decree was also published upon the subject of indulgences to this effect, that the Church, having received from Jesus Christ the power to grant indulgences, and having, through all ages, used that power, the council declares that their use shall be retained as being very salutary to Christian persons and approved by the holy councils. It then anathematizes all who maintain that indulgences are useless, or that the Church has no power to grant them. At the same time, it desires that the ancient custom of the Church be adhered to, and that they be granted with care and moderation, forbidding all trafficking in them.

Further, the council exhorted all pastors to recommend to the observance of all the faithful whatever had been ordered by the Church of Rome, established in this or in any one of the ecumenical councils, and to impress upon them especially the due observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church.

The list of books to be proscribed was referred to the. pope, as also were the catechism missal, and breviaries.

Then the secretary, standing tip in the midst of the assembly, demanded of the fathers whether they were of opinion that the council should be concluded, and that the legates should request the pope's confirmation of the decrees, etc. The answer in the affirmative was unanimous with the exception of three. The cardinal president Morone then dissolved the assembly amid loud acclamations.

In a congregation held on the following Sunday, the fathers affixed their signatures to the number of two hundred and fifty-five-viz. four legates, two cardinals, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight bishops, thirty-nine proctors, seven abbots and several generals of orders.

The acts of the council were confirmed by a bull bearing date Jan. 6, 1564. The Venetians were the first to receive the Tridentine decrees. The kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Poland also received them in part; and they were published and received in Flanders, in the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, in part of Germany, in Hungary, Austria, Dalmatia, and some part. of, South America, also among the Maronites. The Churches of England,  Ireland, Scotland, Russia, Greece, Syria, Egypt, etc., reject the authority of this council.

In France the Council of Trent is received generally as to doctrine, but not altogether as to discipline. Various regulations which were deemed incompatible with the usages of the kingdom, the liberties of the Gallican Church, the concordat, and the just authority of the king, were rejected (see Mansi, Concil. 14, 725; Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.).

Literature. — The history of the Council of Trent was written chiefly by two able and learned Catholics — Fra Paolo Sarpi, of Venice, an almost semi-Protestant monk, Istoria del Concilio Tridentino (Lond. 1619; translations in French and German; Engl. transl. by Brent, ibid. 1676), in opposition to the papal court, and (against him) cardinal Sforza Pallavicino, Istoria del Concilio di Trento (Rome, 1656-57, 2 vols. fol.).

The canons and decrees of the council were first published by Paul Manutius (Rome, 1564), and often since in different languages. The best Latin edition is by Le Plat (1779), and by Schulte and Richter (Leips. 1853); and the best English edition is by Rev. J. Waterworth, with a History of the Council (Lond. 1848). The Catechism, an authorized summary of the faith drawn up by order of the council, appeared at Rome in 1566. The original acts and debates of the council, as prepared by its general secretary, bishop Angelo Massarelli (6 vols. large fol.), were deposited in the Vatican Library, and remained there unpublished for more than three hundred years, until they were brought to light, though only in part, by Aug. Theiner, in Acta Genuina SS. AEcum. Concilii Tridentini nunc primum integre edita (Lips. 1874. 2 vols.). The most complete collection of the official documents and private reports bearing upon the council is that of Le Plat, Monum. ad Histor. Cone. Trident. (Lovan. 1781- 87, 7 vols.). New materials were brought to light by Mendham (1834 and 1846) from the MS. history by cardinal Paleotto; by Sickel, Actensthücke aus osterreichischen Archiven (Vienna, 1872); and by Dr. Döllinger, Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Cone. von Trient (Nordlingen, 1876, 2 pts.). Among Protestant historians of the Council of Trent are Salig (1741-45, 3 vols.); Danz (1846); Buckley (Lond. 1852); and Bungener (Paris, 1854; Engl. transl. N. Y. 1855). On the Tridentine standards see Schaff, History of the Creeds of Christendom (1876), 1, 90 sq. See, in general, also Cunningham, Hist. Theol. (see Index); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Mosheim, Eccles. Hist.  vol. 3 (Index). In particular see. The Council of Trent and its Proceedings (Presb. Board of Publication, Phila. 1835, 18mo); Pallavicino, Hist. du Cone de Trente (Montrouge, 1844, 3 vols. 8vo); Dupin, Hist. dui Conc. de Trente (Brussels, 1721, 2 vols. 4to); Salig, Vollst. Hist. des Tr. Cone. (Halle, 1741, 3 vols. 4to); Courayer. Hist. de la Reception du Cone. de Trente (Amst. 1756). SEE COUNCILS.

## Trental[[@Headword:Trental]]

             an office for the dead in the Latin Church consisting of thirty masses on thirty consecutive days.

## Trepalium[[@Headword:Trepalium]]

             a name given to the rack used for examining witnesses by torture. According to canon 33, Council of Tarragona, presbyters and deacons were forbidden to stand at the Trepalium while persons were tortured. See Bingham, Christ. Anti. bk. 18:ch. v, § 34.

## Tresenreuter, Johann Ulrich[[@Headword:Tresenreuter, Johann Ulrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 31, 1710, and studied at Altdorf and Leipsic. In 1733 he commenced his academical career at Altdorf, was preacher at Coburg in 1738, and died March 31, 1744. He published, De Rababe contra jus Naturae Juste Agente (Altdorf, 1733): — De Paradiso Igne Deleto (1735): — De Persona Christi (1738): — De Signo, quod Deus Caino Dedit (cod.): — De Vaticinatione Henochi in Epistola Judae (1739): — De Libro, qui Quartus Esrae Vulgo Inscribitur (1742): — De Sectis Judaeorum in Genere (1743): — De Esseorum Norime (eod.), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Trespass[[@Headword:Trespass]]

             (אָשָׁם, guilt; παράπτωμα) is an offence committed, a hurt, or wrong done to a neighbor; and partakes of the nature of an error or slip rather than of deliberate or gross sin. Under the law, the delinquent who had trespassed was of course bound to make satisfaction; but an offering or oblation was allowed him to reconcile himself to the Divine Governor (Lev 6:15). Our Savior teaches us that whoever does not forgive the trespasses of a fellow-man against himself is not to expect that his Father in heaven will forgive his trespasses (Mat 6:14-15).

## Trespass-offering[[@Headword:Trespass-offering]]

             (אָשָׁם, asham, once [Lev 6:5] fern. אִשְׁמָה, which properly denotes the act of trespass, as elsewhere). This sacrifice was offered for individuals only, and chiefly for such transgressions as were not punishable by the laws of the State (Lev 7:19). The victim sacrificed was different on different occasions.

1. A trespass-offering was brought when a person did not inform of a crime committed by another (Lev 5:1); when a person had touched any unclean object, and had omitted the sacrifice of purification (Lev 5:2-3); when a person had, through forgetfulness, neglected to fulfill his rash vow.  In each of these cases the offering was a ewe or a she-goat; or, if the sacrificer were poor, it might consist of doves or fine flour, without oil and incense (Lev 5:4-13).

2. When a person had, through mistake, applied to a common purpose anything which had been consecrated to a holy use (Lev 5:10; Lev 5:16; Lev 22:14), or had in any way violated an engagement, or denied stolen property, or concealed any lost thing which he had found. In these cases the offering was a ram, and the restoration of the alienated property, with one fifth of the value; in the former case to the priest, in the latter to the owner or his heirs (Lev 6:2-7).

3. When any person had, through ignorance, done something forbidden, the victim was a ram (Lev 5:17-18).

4. When a man had a criminal connection with a betrothed female slave (Lev 19:20-22), or had, in later times, contracted an idolatrous marriage, the victim was a ram (Ezr 10:19). So also a Nazarite who had contracted defilement by touching a dead body (Num 6:9-12), and a leper who had been healed, were to bring a lamb for a trespass- offering (Lev 14:12; Lev 14:24). In this offering the victim was slain on the north side of the altar, the blood sprinkled round it, and the pieces of fat burned upon it. SEE SIN-OFFERING.

Among the Hebrews trespass-offerings, like all other expiatory sacrifices, were symbolical representations of the great work, for the effecting of which the Messiah was promised to fallen man (Psa 40:6; Psa 40:8; Heb 8:3; Heb 9:14; Heb 9:26; Heb 9:28; Heb 10:5; Heb 10:10). As it was the design of the Mosaic law to remind the Hebrews that they were guilty of sin and liable to death, so every sacrifice was a memorial of this mournful truth, as well as a type of the work of our Redeemer. When a Hebrew had committed a trespass against the divine law, providing the transgression: was such as admitted an expiation, he had to offer the requisite sacrifices before he could be restored to his civil privileges. With this a mere worldly-minded Hebrew was content; but, as no mere animal sacrifice could make atonement for sin, to the sincere believer the sacrifice was only the symbol and type of something spiritual. It reminded him that his sins had not only excluded him from the divine favor, but that he deserved death and subsequent agony; it directed him to the need of a sacrifice for sin ere God would forgive his transgression; and it assured him that, just as by sacrifice he had been restored to his civil and political rights, so by faith in the great  sacrifice for sin on the part of the lamb of God might he be restored to the divine favor, and to a place in that spiritual kingdom of which the Hebrew nation was the type. SEE PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES.

## Trestrail, Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Trestrail, Frederick, D.D]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born July 1, 1803, at Falmouth, Cornwall. He studied at the Academy at Stoke's Croft, Bristol. He became pastor, serving various places until 1844, when he became secretary of the Irish Mission, and in 1849 one of the secretaries of the Baptist Missionary Society, acting in that capacity for twenty-one years. He was again in the  pastorate for the next twelve years. In 1880 he became president of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland. He died November 4, 1890. See (English) Baptist Hand-book, 1891, page 160 A-D.

## Treuenfels, Abraham[[@Headword:Treuenfels, Abraham]]

             a Jewish rabbi and doctor of philosophy of Germany, was born at Detniold in the year 1818. After visiting the gymnasium of that place, lie went, in 1837, to Hanover, where he studied under Dr. Adler (now chief rabbi of England). In 1839 he pursued a course of studies at the Bonn University, and completed his Rabbinical education at Frankfort. In 1844 he was appointed rabbi at Weilburg, in Nassau, and in 1860 he was called to Stettin, where he died, Jan. 30,1879. He published, בראשית זוטא, oder die leine Genesis und die noch vorhandenenm Bruchstiicke derselbean griechisch und deutsch, end mit Amerkungen, in the Literaturblatt des Orients, 1846, No. 129: — Ueber den Bibelcanon des Flavius Josephus (1849). But his literary activity was chiefly displayed in the Israelitische Wochenschr-iJt, which he published in connection with Dr. M. Rahmer. (B. P.)

## Treves, Councils Of (Concilium Trevirense)[[@Headword:Treves, Councils Of (Concilium Trevirense)]]

             take their name from Treves, a town of Rhenish Prussia, in which they were held. The town is situated on the right bank of the Moselle, and had in 1871 a population of 21,442. It is a decayed place, noted for its ultramontanism. The cathedral contains many relics-the principal one being the Holy Coat of Treves-and Roman remains. It has a priestly seminary, a gymnasium, a library of 100,000 volumes, a museum full of valuable antiquities-including the famous Codex Aureus, or MS. of the Gospel in gold letters, presented to the Abbey of St. Maximin by Ada, sister of Charlemagne.

I. The First Council was held in 948. The legate Marinus, the archbishop of Treves, and several bishops here excommunicated Hugo, count of Paris, and two pretended bishops, made by Hugo, the pseudo-archbishop of Rheims. See Mansi, Concil. 9:632. SEE INGELHEIM.

II. The Second Council was held in 1548 by John, count of Isembourg, archbishop of Treves, who presided. Ten chapters, and a decree against the concubinary clergy, were published. See Mansi, Concil. 14:606.

III. The Third Council was held by John, archbishop of Treves, in 1549. Twenty canons were published.

1. Forbids to believe, hold, or teach any other than the Roman doctrine.

2, 3, 4. Of preachers.

6. Orders that the hours be duly said by clerks, and that those who cannot attend at the time in the choir shall say them privately.

9. Of the celebration of the mass.

10. Provides for lessening the number of festivals, and gives a list of those which shall in any case be retained.

11,12. Of the religions and their houses.

15. Of schools.

17,-18. Of the immunity of churches.

19. Of the life and deportment of the clergy.

20. Provides that, the heads of monasteries and colleges, and others of the clergy, shall be supplied with a copy of these canons. See Mansi, 14:705.

## Treves, Holy coat of[[@Headword:Treves, Holy coat of]]

             SEE HOLY COAT OF TREVES.

## Trevett, Russell, D.D[[@Headword:Trevett, Russell, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was a native of New York. He was ordained in 1841, became professor of languages in St. James's College, Maryland, in 1843, and occupied the same position in St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., being elected thereto in 1855. Subsequently he became rector of St. James's Church, North Salem, N.J., a position which he held at the time of his death, March 8, 1865. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. July, 1865, p. 321.

## Trevor, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Trevor, Richard, D.D]]

             a Church of England divine, was born in 1707; became canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1735; was consecrated bishop of St. David's in 1744, translated to the see of Durham in 1752, and died at his home in Tenderden Street, Hanover Square, London, June 9, 1771. He published several sermons. See (Lond.) Annual Register, 1771, page 179; Life (1776).

## Trial[[@Headword:Trial]]

             a term used in Scripture only in the sense of testing (usually some form of

בָּחִן, δοκιμή or δοκίμιον; but once מִסָּה, Job 9:23, elsewhere “temptation” [q.v. ]; and so πεῖρα, Heb 11:36; πύρωσις, “fiery  trial,” 1Pe 4:12, lit. burning, as elsewhere rendered), to denote painful circumstances into which persons are brought by divine Providence with a view to illustrate the perfections of God, bring to light the real character of those who are thus tried, and by the influence of temporal suffering, which shows the transitory nature and uncertain tenure of all earthly advantages, to promote their eternal and spiritual interests. SEE TEMPT.

## Trial Sermon[[@Headword:Trial Sermon]]

             SEE TRIALS.

## Trial, Church[[@Headword:Trial, Church]]

             SEE EXCOMMUNICATION.

## Trial, Forensic[[@Headword:Trial, Forensic]]

             (denoted in Heb. by דַּין, to hold a court, while מַשְׁפָּטis the sentence rendered by the judge, whether favorable or adverse, both terms being usually rendered ‘“judgment” in the A. V.; Gr. κρίσις) Originally the head of the family was the umpire among the Hebrews, with the power of life and death (comp. Deu 1:16). Later the elders (q.v.) succeeded to a similar authority. According to the Mosaic law, there were to be judges in all the cities, whose duty it was to exercise judicial authority over the surrounding neighborhood. Weighty causes were submitted to the supreme ruler. Originally trials were everywhere summary. Moses, in his laws, did not establish any more formal or complicated method of procedure. He was, nevertheless, anxious that strict justice should be administered, and therefore frequently inculcated the idea that God was a witness (Exo 20:21; Exo 23:1-9; Lev 19:15; Deu 24:14-15). In ancient times, the forum or place of trial was in the gates of cities (Gen 23:10; Deu 21:19). In the trial the accuser and the accused appeared before the judge or judges (Deu 25:1), and both the implicated parties stood up. The witnesses were sworn, and in capital cases also the parties concerned (1Sa 14:37-40; Mat 26:63). In order to establish the accusations, two witnesses were necessary, and, including the accuser, three. The witnesses were examined separately, but the accused person had the liberty to be present when they gave their testimony (Num 35:30; Deu 13:1-15). The sentence was pronounced soon after the completion of the examination, and the criminal, without any delay, even if the offence was a capital one, was taken to the place of punishment (Jos 7:22; 1Sa 22:8; 1Ki 2:23). See L'Empereur, De Legibus Hebraeorum  Forensibus (Lugd. 1637); Ziegler, De Juribus Judaeorum (Vitemb. 1684); Benny, Criminal Code of Jews (Lond. 1880,12m-o). SEE JUDGE.

The following remarks respecting certain special instances of judicial proceedings in the New Test. are calculated to set them in their true legal light.

1. The trial of our Lord before Pilate was, in a legal sense, a trial for the offence esce majestatis one which, under the Julian law, following out that of the twelve tables (Digest, 4:1,3), would be punishable with death Luk 23:2; Luk 23:38; Joh 19:12; Joh 19:15). SEE JESUS CHRIST.

2. The trials of the apostles, of Stephen, and of Paul before the high-priest were conducted according to Jewish rules (Act 4:5; Act 4:27; Act 6:12; Act 22:30; Act 23:1). SEE STEPHEN.

3. The trial, if it may be so called, of Patil and Silas at Philippi was held before the duumviri, or, as they are called, στρατηγοί, permetors, on the charge of innovation in religion-a crime punishable with banishment or death (Act 16:19; Act 16:22). SEE SERGEANT.

4. The interrupted trial of Paul before the proconsul Gallio was an attempt made by the Jews to establish a charge of the same kind (Act 18:12-17, see Conybeare and Howson, 1, 492-496).

5. The trials of Paul at Caesarea (Acts 24, 25, 26) were conducted according to Roman rules of judicature, of which the procurators Felixs and Festus were the recognized administrators.

(1.) In the first of these, before Felix, we observe

(a) the employment by the plaintiffs of a Roman advocate to plead in Latin, SEE ORATOR;

(b) the postponement (ampliatic) at the trial after Paul's reply (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. “Judex”);

(c) the free custody in which the accused was kept, pending the decision of the judge (Act 24:23-26).

(2.) The second formal trial, before Festus, was probably conducted in the same manner as the former one before Felix (Act 25:7-8), but it presents two new features:

(a) the appeal, appellatio or provocfio, to Caesar by Paul as a Roman citizen. The right of appeal, adpopulum, or to the tribunes, became, under the empire, transferred to the emperor, and, as a citizen, Paul availed himself of the right to which he was entitled, even in the case of a provincial governor. The effect of the appeal was to remove the case at once to the jurisdiction of the emperor (see Conybeare and Howson, 2, 360; Smith, at s. . s., v. “Appellatio;” Digest, 49:1, 4).

(b) The conference of the procurator with “the council” (Act 25:12). This council is usually explained to have consisted of the assessors, who sat on the bench with the praetor as consiliarii (Sueton. Tib. 3?. Grotius,

On Acts 25; Conybeare and Howson, 2, 358, 361). Bat, besides the absence of any previous mention of any assessors (see below), the mode of expression συλλαλήσας μετὰ τοῦ συμβουλίου seems to admit the explanation of conference with the deputies from the Sanhedrim (τὸ συμβ.). Paul's appeal would probably be in the Latin language, and would require explanation on the part of the judge to the deputation of accusers before he carried into effect the inevitable result of the appeal, viz. the dismissal of the case so far as they were concerned. SEE PAUL.

6. We have, lastly, the mention (Act 19:38) of a judicial assembly which held its session at Ephesus, in which occur the terms ἀγοραῖοι (i.e. ἡμέραι) ἄγονται and ἀνθύπατοι. The former denotes the assembly, then sitting, of provincial citizens forming the conventus, out of which the proconsul, ἀνθύπατος, selected “judices” to sit as his assessors. The ἀνθύπατοι would thus be the judicial tribunal composed of the proconsul and his assessors. In the former case, at Caesarea, it is difficult to imagine that there could be any conventus and any provincial assessors. There the only class of men qualified for such a function would be the Roman officials attached to the procurator; but in Proconsular Asia such assemblies are well known to have existed (Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. “Provincia”).

Early Christian practice discouraged resort to heathen tribunals in' civil matters (1Co 6:1). SEE PUNISHMENT.

## Trials[[@Headword:Trials]]

             the name given in ecclesiastical diction to those discourses delivered before the presbytery by students who have finished their course, and are seeking to be licensed to preach. These discourses are a sermon, a lecture, a homily, an exegesis or exercise with additions, and a thesis. There are also examinations on systematic theology and practical piety, on Church history, and on the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures.

## Triangle Controversy, the[[@Headword:Triangle Controversy, the]]

             was a dispute occasioned by The Triangle, a book by Samuel Whelpley (1816) against limited atonement, inability, and immediate imputation. The controversy led to the trial of Albert Barnes and of Lyman Beecher for alleged heresy and finally to the disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1837. See Hagelnbach, Hist. of Doct. 2, 442.

## Tribe[[@Headword:Tribe]]

             ( מִטָּהand שֵׁבֶט; both originally meaning a rod or branch. φυλή) is the name of the great groups of families into which the Israelitish nation, like other Oriental races, was divided. The modern Arabs the Bedawin, and the Berbers, and also the Moors on the northern shores of Africa, are still divided into tribes. The clans in Scotland are also analogous to the tribes of the ancient Israelites. The division of a nation into tribes differs from a division into castes, since one is a division merely according to descent, and the other super adds a necessity of similar occupations being prevalent among persons connected by consanguinity. There occurs, however, among the Israelites a caste also, namely, that of the Levites. In Genesis 49 the tribes are enumerated according to their progenitors; viz.

1 Reuben, the first-born;

2, Simeon, and

3, Levi, instruments of cruelty;

4, Judah, whom his brethren shall praise;

5, Zebulon, dwelling at the haven of the sea;

6, Issachar, the strong;

7, Dan, the judge;

8, Gad, whom a troop shall overcome, but who shall vanquish at last;

9, Asher, whose bread shall be fat;

10, Naphtali, giving goodly words;

11, Joseph, the fruitful bough;

12, Benjamin, the wolf: all these were originally the twelve tribes of Israel (see Allin, Prophecies of the Twelve Tribes Lond. 1855]).

In this enumeration it is remarkable that the subsequent division of the tribe of Joseph into the two branches of Ephraim and Manasseh is not yet alluded to. After this later division of the very numerous tribe of Joseph into the two branches of Ephraim and Manasseh had taken place, there were, strictly speaking, thirteen tribes. It was, however, usual to view them as comprehended under the number twelve, which was the more natural, since one of them, namely, the caste of the Levites, did not live within such exclusive geographical limits as were assigned to the others after they exchanged their nomadic migrations for settled habitations, but dwelt in towns scattered through all the other twelve tribes. It is also remarkable that the Ishmaelites, as well as the Israelites, were divided into twelve tribes; and that the Persians also, according to Xenophon (Cyclopaedia, 1, 2, 4 sq.), were similarly divided. Among other nations also occur ethnological and' geographical divisions, according to the number twelve.

From this we infer that the number twelve was held in so much favor that, when possible, doubtful cases were adapted to it. An analogous case we find even at a later period, when the spiritual progenitors of the Christian δωδεκάφυλον, or the apostles, who were, after the death of Judas, the election of Matthias, and the vocation of Paul, really thirteen in number, were, nevertheless, habitually viewed as twelve; so that wherever, during the Middle Ages, any division was made with reference to the apostles, the number twelve, and not thirteen, was adopted, whether applied to the halls of theological libraries, or to the great barrels of costly wines in the cellar of the civic authorities at Bremen. Concerning the arrangement of these tribes on their march through the wilderness, in their encampments around the ark, and in their occupation of the land of Canaan, see the cognate articles, such as SEE EXODE; SEE ENCAMPMENT; SEE GENEALOGIES; SEE LEVITES, SEE WANDERING; and the names of the several tribes. We confine ourselves here to two points.

I. The “Lost Tribes.” — This has been an inexhaustible source of theologico-historical charlatanism, on which there have been written so many volumes that it would be difficult to condense the contradictory opinions advanced in them within the limits of a moderate article. Suffice it to say that there is scarcely any human race so abject, forlorn, and dwindling, located anywhere between the Chinese and the American  Indians, who have not been stated to be the ten tribes which disappeared from history during and after the Babylonian captivity. If the books, written on the ten tribes contained much truth, it would be difficult to say where they are not.

The truth, however, of the matter seems rather to be as follows. After the division of the Israelites under Jeroboam and Rehoboam into the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, the believers in whom the feelings of ancient theocratic legitimacy and nationality predominated, and especially the priests and Levites, who were, connected by many ties with the sanctuary at Jerusalem, had a tendency to migrate towards the visible center of their devotions; while those, members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin who had an individual hankering after the foreign fashions adopted in Samaria, and the whole kingdom of Israel, had a tendency externally to unite themselves to a state of things corresponding with their individuality. After the political fall of both kingdoms, when all the principal families connected with the possession of the soil had been compelled to emigrate, most Israelites who had previously little feeling for theocratic nationality gradually amalgamated by marriages and other connections with the nations by which they were surrounded; while the former inhabitants of the kingdom of Judah felt their nationality revived by the very deprivation of public worship which they suffered in foreign lands. Many of the pious members of those tribes which had formerly constituted the kingdom of Israel undoubtedly joined the returning colonies which proceeded, by permission of the Persian monarchs, to the land of their fathers. However, these former members of the other tribes formed so decidedly a minority among the members of the tribe of Judah that henceforth all believers and worshippers of Jehovah were called יהודים, Ι᾿ουδαίοι, Judaei, Jews. Thus it came to pass that the best, although smaller, portion of the ten tribes amalgamated with the Jews, some of whom preserved their genealogies till after the destruction of Jerusalem; while the larger proportion of the ten tribes amalgamated with the Gentiles of Central Asia, to whom they probably imparted some of their notions and customs, which again were, in a state more or less pure, propagated to distant regions by the great national migrations proceeding from Central Asia. We are glad to find that this, our historical conviction, has also been adopted by the most learned among the Jews themselves (see Jost, Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes [Berlin, 1832], 1, 407 sq., 416 sq.). SEE CAPTIVITY.

II. Boundary-lines of the Tribes Identified. — This topic has usually been abandoned by commentators as hopeless. Keil (Comment. on Joshua) is really the only one who has seriously grappled with its difficulties, some of which even he is compelled to pronounce insoluble. See each tribe in its alphabetical place.

1. Reuben. — On the south, being the southern boundary of the trans- Jordanic tribes, beginning at the mouth of the river Arnon (Wady el- Mojeb) on the Dead Sea; thence along the Arnon to Aroer (Ariir) (Jos 13:16); thence along the south-eastern boundary of the trans- Jordanic tribes (which extended as far as the “plain” or tableland stretching eastward from Jordan [Jos 12:1], being that containing Medeba and Dibon [Jos 13:9]) (north-easterly along the Wady Enkheileh to Leflm); thence along the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (east of the ruius of El- Herri); then with an inclination west of north so as to exclude Jazer (Jos 13:25) (Seir), also Rabbath-ammon (2Sa 11:1) (to a point below Jebeiha which was excluded, probably being the Jogbehah of the Gadites, Num 32:35); thence entirely south of Gilead (Jos 13:25) (directly west, down the wadies Naur and Hesban), excluding Beth-haran (Beit-hatran) (Jos 13:27) and Atroth-shophau (near Merjakkeh) (Num 32:35), but including Heshlon (Hesbln), Elealeh (El-Ai), Bamoth (comp. 21:19, 20) (probablly Jebel Humeh), and Nebo (now discovered in Jebel Neba) (32;37; Jos 13:17); thence southerly along the Jordan to the place of beginning (Jos 13:23).

2. Gad. — On the south, following the northern line of Reuben from the Jordan to the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (at Jebeiha); thence north by east along the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (around the northern brow of Jebel Zerka) (to a point opposite Jerash [Gerasa] between Jebel Zerka and Jebel Kafkafka); thence in a north- westerly, direction across the region of Gilead (Jos 13:25; Jos 13:31), passing near Mahaijaimn (Jos 13:26; Jos 13:30) (Mabneh), to the southern extremity of the sea of Cinllereth (sea of Galilee) (Jos 13:27), with the Jordan for the western boundary.

3. Manasseh East. — On the south, following the northern line of Gad to its intersection with the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (at the opening of the valley between Jebel Zerka and Jebel Katafkafka, with the plain lying east of the latter); thence north-easterly along the boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (in a direct line across the last-named plain,  over the northern end of Jebel es-Zumle, and partly across the plain of the Hanran), and again along the same boundary with a northerly and north- westerly curve through the plain of Bashan (Jos 13:30) (i.e. the Hauran), so as to include Edrei (which may be Draa or Dera) (Jos 13:31), and so on north-westerly to the vicinity of Mount Hermon (Jos 13:11) (i.e. Jebel eshSheikh, where the northern line probably followed the present boundaries of the Arab clans along the top of the Hermon range to its junction with Wady el-Teim at Hasbeiyah); where it joined the northern boundary of the cis-Jordanic tribes at the “entrance into Hamath” (Num 34:8); thence southerly along the sources of the Jordan (down Nahr el-Banmias and its brook), through the lake of Merom, the upper Jordan, and the sea of Galilee, to the place of beginning (Num 34:10-12).

4. Judah. On the south, the southerly boundary of Canan, beginning on the border of Edom, at the southern bay of the Dead Sea, southward (along the Ghor) past the ascent of Acrabbim, near the desert of Zin (the Wady el- Jeib or the Arabah), to the vicinity of Kradesh-barnea (Ain-weibeh or Ain- hasb) (Jos 15:1-3; Num 34:2-4); thence westward to Hezron, along the southern boundary of Canaan (perhaps through Wady Fikreh) (where we may assign a location) to Adar of Hazar-addar: thence westerly around (perhaps by wadies Maderah and Marreh) to:Karkaa (perhaps in this latter), then still westerly to Azmon (possibly in the vicinity south of the ancient Elisa); thence north-westerly (perhaps by Wady en- Abiya) to “the river of Egypt” (or El-Arish), and so on to the Mediterranean, which formed the western boundary of Palestine (Jos 15:3-4; Jos 15:12; Num 34:4; Num 34:6). See Quar; Statement of “Pal. Explor. Fund,” p. 68 sq.; April, 1874, p. 68, 82; July, 1874, p. 190.

On the north, beginning at the northern bay of the Dead Sea (which formed the eastern boundary), where the Jordan empties into it (see this whole line in Jos 15:5-12, ad inversely in 18:14-20): obliquely across the plain of the Jordan to Beth-hoglah (Ainl-hajla), thence to Beth-arabah (at first included, but afterwards excluded) (hence situated probably at the present Kusr Hajla); thence to the stone of Bohan (apparently very near the last place, and on the eminences in tile side of Wady Dabus); thence (westerly) in the direction of Delbit (which must therefore be placed on the west side of Wady Dabus [near its head], which last the boundary crossed, as expressed by coming) from the valley of Achor, thence northward towards Gilgalor Geliloth (which is explained as being in front of the ascent to Adummim (apparently lying on the hills skirting the Jordan just west of  Gilgal, to which the access would be by the valley on the south side of Jebel el-Fasca; Adummim [probably at ed-Dem near es-Snmreh] being further described as lying on the south side of the “river,” probably Wady Kelt); thence to the waters of En-shemesh (probably the “fountain of the apostles,” on the road between Bethany and Jericho); thence (across the Mount of Olives by way of Bethany) to En-rogel (the well of Job near Jerusalem); thence around the valley of Hinnom (but at a later date across Mount Moriah, which David purchased, and north of Jebus, which he conquered, and thus acquired both for Judah), through the valley of Gihon to the hill at its northwestern end, bounding the plain or valley of Rephaim west of the city; thence along the ridge of this elevated plain or “hill” to the fountain of Nephtoah (probably Ain Yalo in Wady el-Werd, which last it probably followed after crossing the “giants' plain;” for it must have bent considerably to the south, since it passed near Rachel's sepulcher, now Kubbet Rahil, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem [2Sa 10:2]); thence in the direction of Mount Ephron (lying considerably northward of this vicinity, although among its “cities” may properly have been reckoned Kirjath-jearim; this line being probably carried through Wady Bittir, then by Waldy Sataf, due north) to Kirjath-jearim (otherwise Baalah or Kirjathbaal) (now Kuiryet el-Enab); thence west (across the intervening valley occupied by the Beni-melik in the direction of Yalo) to the ridge of Seir (perhaps indicated by the modern Saris); thence (south-westerly along this mountain) to a more southern spur called Mount Jearim (just across Wady Ghurab), where is located (Kesla, the representative of) Chesalo (or Chesulloth); thence (still keeping south-westerly along the same range of hills, between Zanoah [Zanfia], anld Zorah [Sufra], the last of which was afterwards assigned to Dan, with several other cities on this part of the boundary [Jos 19:41 sq.]) to Enshemesh (or Ir-shemesh) (now Ain- shems); thence (a little south of Waidy Surar) near Timnath (Tibneh. and Ekron (Akir) (the last three towns being finally reckoned as belonging to Dam), and so on to the Mediterranean, passing successively Shicron (perhaps Beit-sit), next Mount Baalah (possibly Tell Hermes), and finally Jabneel (elsewhere Jabneh [now Yebna]) (but eventually deserting the Nahr Rubin a little beyond its junction with Wady Marubah, and runuing thence south-west so as to include Gederah [Gheterah], but exclude Jal)neh and Bene-berak [Burka], reaching the sea by Wady Stimt).

Of Judah only are there any distinct and regular subdivisions given (for Keil's arrangement of the towns of Simeon in four groups according to  Jos 15:21-32 [Comment. ad loc.] is not justified by the parallel passage [Jos 19:2-8], nor by the analogy of enumeration in the case of the other subdivisions of Judah [15:33-62] and Benjamin [18:21-28], nor with the Masoretic punctuation [“and” being omitted only between different designations of the same locality], nor, finally, with the actual juxtaposition of the sites). The southernmost section (stretching apparently entirely across from the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean) constituted the territory of Simeon, including (as appears from a comparison of Jos 15:21-32 with 19:1-8) twenty-nine (strictly twenty-six) cities (namely, Kabzeel, Eder, Jagur, Kinah, Dinmonmah, Adadah, Kedesh [Kadesh- barnea], Hazor, the twofold town Ithnan-Ziph [Zephath] with its neighboring ruins, Hormah [?Hazar-addar], Telem, Shenma or Sheba [Hazar-shual], Moladah, Heshmon o[Azmon], Beth-palet, Beer-sheba, the twin-towns Bealoth or Balah [Ramath-nekeb] and Bizjothjah-baalah or Baalath-beer [Lehi], Iim, Azem, Eltolad, Chesil or Bethul. Ziklag, Madiannlah or Beth-marcabothi, Sansannlah or Hazar-suisah,Lebaoth or Beth-lebaloth, ShiThim or Sharuhen, and the double town Ain-rimnion or Enrimmon), besides three villages dependent upon two of these (namely, Hazor-hadattlah and Kerioth-hezron or Hazor-amam [belonging to Hazor proper], and Hazar-gaddah [to Hazar-shual]), and in addition two of the towns in the plain (namely, Ether and Ashan), with others doubtless not here enumerated.

The plain district or “valley” was again subdivided into four sections-the first comprising (originally) fourteen towns (Gederah and Gederothaim being the same), situated in the north-western corner of the tribe; the second comprising sixteen towns, situated immediately south of this, in the western part of the tribe; the third comprising nine towns (two ‘of which,' as above, were afterwards set off to Simeon, doubtless lying on the southern boundary between the tribes), situated east of the last group and south of the preceding, in the middle of the tribe, east of the road leading from Eleutheropolis to Jerusalem; the fourth comprising the five principal Philistine towns, situated on the extreme west of the tribe along the Mediterranean coast (Ekron being really in Dan, and Gath-mizpeh in the “valley”). The highland district, or “mountains,” was likewise subdivided into five groups-the first containing eleven chief towns, situated along the border of Simeon, in the middle: the second containing nine chief cities, situated immediately north of the foregoing in the southern part of the tribe around Helron: the third containing ten metropolitan towns, situated immediately east of the two preceding; the fourth embracing six principal cities, situated immediately north of the last two groups, as far as  Jerusalem, on the northern boundary; and the fifth containing only two metropolitan towns, situated in the northern medial angle between the last- named group and the valley district. The remaining districts embraced the desert tract or “wilderness” along the Dead Sea, and included six chief towns (Beth-arabah being in Benjamin). The remarkable addition in the Septuagint (at Jos 15:59) of eleven cities (namely, Tekoah, Bethlehem, Phagor, Etam, Kulon, Tatam, Saris, Iareli, Gallim, Bether, and Menuchah), probably real localities (see each in its place), is perhaps entitled to a place in the genuine text; and would indicate a group between the third land fourth above, reaching to Jerusalem (Kulon, Saris, and Gallim being in Benjamin).

5. Simeon. — This tribe had a portion set off from the above bounded territory of Judah (Jos 19:1-8), embracing some seventeen or twenty cities (according as we make several in the list identical or different), of which only two or three have been located with any degree of definiteness, namely, Beer-sheba (probably Bir-es-Saba), Moladah (perhaps el-Miil), and Hormah (or Zephath, possibly represented by the pass es-Sutif); this much only is evident, that they all lay on the extreme south of Judah, and we shall therefore probably be not far from correct if we draw the dividing line between Judah and Simeon west by north from the Dead Sea at Massada, up Wady Sebbeh, thence cross in the same direction front Ehdeit, just south of Arad (Tell Arad) and Jattir (Attir),to the junction of Wady Khamleilifeh with Wady Khulil; thence still in the same direction up the former of these wadies to the summit of the mounts of Judah; thence west by south (along Wady Sheriah) to the Mediterranean, a short distance south of Gaza (Ghuzzeh).

6. Benjamin. — On the north, following the boundary of Ephraim (Jos 16:1-3; Jos 16:6; Jos 18:11-13), beginning at the Jordan opposite Jericho (probably at the mouth of Wady Nuwaimeh); thence (across the plain of the Jordan along this wady) to the northward of Jericho (Jos 18:12) (so as to include Zemaraim [es-Surnrah], Jos 18:22); thence northward (Jos 18:12) by the water east (i.e. north-east) of Jericho (Jos 16:1) (perhaps Ras el-Ain, which discharges its water in that direction) through the mountainous (Jos 18:12) desert (26:1) of Beth-aven (Beni-salim) (Jos 18:12), that extends from Jericho to the hilly region of Beth-el (Jos 16:1)-a description that appears to apply as well as any to the plain northwest of Jebel Kurunntul (Mt. Quarantania), the northern part of which the line would partly traverse, so as to include (Jos 18:23-24) Ophrah (perhaps et-Tayibeh) and O)hni (probably Jifna)  (probably up Wady el-Anjeh) as it ascended Wady Habis, passing Natarah (Jos 16:7, Narath-Naaron) on the way, which lay east of Bethel (1Ch 7:28) (perhaps at el-Nejenieh); from Bethel (now Beitin) (which, being included in Benjamin, the expression “to the side of Luz southward” [Jos 18:13] must be interpreted as indicating that the line ran between Beth-el on the south and the ancient site of Luz a little to the north, the two spots being distinguished in Jos 16:2, although occupying the same vicinity) the line passed (directly south-west naming the Nahlas road, west of Bireh [Beeroth]), passing Alchi (situated perhaps at the ruined Kefr-musr) (Jos 16:2) to Ataroth (called also Ataroth-adar or- Ataroth-addarl), in a lower spot near the hill oil the south side of Beth- horon the lower (Jos 18:13), yet with some interval to the east of this last place (Jos 16:3), and at the southern extremity of this part of the line l between Ephraim and Benjamin (that faced the east), not far from Beth-horton the upper (Jos 16:5), and west of Naiarah on that part of the same line near the Jordan (i.e. facing the south) (Jos 16:7); indications that all point to some site (for one place of the name seems to be designated, since these descriptions [Jos 16:5-6 last clause, 7] are all of parts of the same southern boundary of Ephraim [the first two clauses of Jos 16:6, and the whole of Jos 16:8, however, refer to the northern border as Keil, in his Comment, admits, although he confesses himself unable to clear up the difficulties of the passage], reckoned first [Jos 16:5-6 last clause] westward to Beth-horon, and thence back again [Jos 16:7] more minutely over the same line and eastward e to the Jordan) directly east of Beth-horon (doubtless the Atara, whose ruins are still found at this point, a little north of the road from Jaffa to Jerusalem; and in that case we must locate “the hill south of Beth-horon the nether” among the eminences opposite Belt Ur el-Tahta, on the south side of Wady Suleiman, through which this road runs); from Ataroth the line ran south- westerly along the Wady Suleiman, so as to include Chephirah (Jos 18:26) (probably Keftir, near this road), opposite the hill above described (Jos 18:14, where the expression rendered “compassed the corner of the sea” appears to signify [as some copies of the Sept. translate] a bend from a seaward [i.e. westerly] direction), an a again south-easterly to Kirjathjearimn (thus forming the western side), where it joined the boundary of Judah, which it followed back to the Jordan, and so up to the point of beginning.

The towns of this tribe enumerated in Jos 18:21-28 appear to be classed under two general sections--the twelve in Jos 18:21-24 lying north and east of Jerusalem, while the fourteen others occupy the more southern  and western portion of the territory. At least one of these cities, Kiljath- jearim, was really (eventually) within the limits of the adjoining tribe, Judah (Jdg 18:12).

7. Dan. — This tribe was bounded by the Mediterranean on the west, and by the tribes of Judah on the south, Benjamin on the east, and Ephraim on the north. (The Danites also conquered from the Cananites Leshem or Laish, in the extreme northern part of Palestine, within the bounds of Manasseh east, and retained it under the name of Dan.) The only position unidentified is the northern boundary, which will be considered under Ephraim.

8. Ephraim. — The Mediterranean was the western and the Jordan the eastern boundary. The southern boundary has been already defined from the Jordan westward as far as Ataroth from this point it passed westward (to the Jaffa road), in the vicinity of Japhleti (perhaps situated at Beit-Unia; but this word should probably be rendered “the Japhletites,” i.e. family of Japhlet, a descendant of Asher [1Ch 7:32-33], although it is difficult to explain their existence in this location), to Beth-horon the nether (Jos 16:3); thence more northerly (i.e. in a general north- westerly direction) to the Mediterranean (probably along tile Jaffa road to Wady Budrfis, and thence north on the western brow of the hills to Wady el-Atnjeh, which it may naturally have followed westward to the sea; for it excluded Batlath [Balait], Jehnd [Yehudieh], and Japho [Joppa], Jos 19:44-45, but. included Bethhorton and Gezer [Abu-churheb], Jos 21:21-22), passing on the way Gezer (Jos 16:3) west of Beth-el (1Ch 7:2 S [the other passages where it is mentioned do not help to fix the locality more definitely]; lately thought to have been found in Tell Jazer). The remainder of the description of the southern boundary (Jos 16:5, last clause of 6, and whole of 7) is the same as that of Benjamin on the north.

The northern boundary (the account in Jos 16:7, with the exception of the first name, must be transposed so as to connect immediately with the description of the south border in Jos 16:5), beginning tat the Jordan (probably at the mouth of Wady Fusail), passed westward (up this wady, otherwise called Wady Mudadireh, or Burshek) to Taanath-shiloh (Jos 16:6) (probably the present Ain-Fhria); thence north-westerly to Tappulah (Jos 17:7) (probably the Belad el-Taffne [or Atuf] mentioned by some travelers east of Shechem); thence northerly to Michmnethah (16:61, Jos 17:7) (apparently at the intersection of the line ‘with Wady Tubas); thence, with  a north-westerly curve, to Asher (ibid.) (probably represented by the modern Yasir) thence the line is only given in general terms as extending to the river Kanah on the Mediterranean (Jos 16:8; Jos 17:9) (no doubt the present Nahr Falaik, which is the principal marshy stream in that region).

9. Manasseh West. — The boundaries of this tribe are given with great indistinctness, and must be in part collected from the contiguous portions of Ephraim, Asher, and Issachar, from which certain towns were set off in addition to its proper territory (Jos 17:11). From the Mefgditerranean, the northern boundary, beginning at Carmel (for Dor, below Carmel, is included [ibid.; 19:26]), and following the edge of the mountain (probably along the Kishon [Nahr-el-Mukattah]) south-easterly (as far as Joklneamn [Tell-el-Kamon ], and thence keeping the mountain more closely so as to throw the plain of Esdraelmo entirely within Issachar [Gen 49:15]), so as to include (Jos 17:11) Meriddo (Lejjun), Taanach (Ta'anuk), but so as to exclude (Jos 19:21) En-gannlim (Jenii); thence (with a sharp curve) due north (on the west brow of Mts. Gilboa and Little Herrnon), so as to include En-dor (Endiur) (Jos 17:11), but not Jezreel (Zerin), nor Chesulloth (Iksal), nor Shunem (Solam) (Jos 19:18), nor Tabor (vol. 21): thence (with another sharp curve) south-east (probably down Wady Oskeh), so as to include Beth-shean (Beisan) (Jos 17:11), to the Jordan, which formed the eastern boundary.

10. Issachar. — This tribe was hemmed in on the south, by Manasseh West, on the west by Asher, and on the north by Zebulon, leaving, only the Jordan as a natural boundary on the east (Jos 19:22).

11. Zebulun In Jacob's dying blessing (Gen 49:13), the territory o f this tribe is prophetically described as being suitable for maritime purposes, and as extending along a sea as far as Sidol, which must le explained as meaning that it reached Phoenicia, through which latter seafaring people a communication was kept up through the river Kishon and the harbor at Carmel. In Jos 19:10-15, the boundaries are definitely laid down thus: Be ginning at a place called Sarid, which is nowhere else mentioned in Scripture, but which, is here described as situated eastward from the Mediterranean, with high country intervening, one or two stations distant from the river before Jokneam (doubtless the Kishon), also as situated west of Chisloth-tabor, and beyond (i.e. south of) Daberath and Japhia, and finally on the southern boundary (for the northern line is subsequently  described); all which details point to some spot about midway on the northern side of the plain of Esdraelons (probably the ruins on the “Mount of Precipitation,” near el-Mezraah, on the north-west); thence westward (“towards the sea”), passing Maralah (perhaps at Mujeidil) and Dabbasheth (perhaps the present Jebuta), to the Kishon opposite Jokneam (probably Tell el-Kuurntn); then returning to Sarid, and passing northerly in the general direction of Chislou Tabor (Iksail) and Daberath (Debhfrieh) (leaving these ins Issachar), so as on the way to include Japhia (Yafa) (situated on higher ground); thence (northward) facing the east to Gittah- hepher (or Gath-hepher, 2Ki 14:25) (at el-Meshad) (included within Zebulun) and Ittah-kazin (perhaps the modern Kefr Kenna); finally (as regards the southern line) extending (due north) in the direction of Rimmon that pertains to Neah (“Rimmon-methoar to Neah”) (the former answering doubtless to Rumaneh and the latter possibly to Nirmrin, the names apparently being associated as adjacent) (and excluding both these, as will appear presently), so as to meet the line of Naphtali in Aznoth-tabor (apparently Kurn Hattin) (Jos 19:34). After this the description applies to the northern boundary (for the expression “compasseth it [Rimmon] on the north side” cannot mean that the southern border passed to the north of Rimmon, as this place belonged to Zebulun [1Ch 6:17, which likewise includes Tabor, i.e. apparently Hattin, in the same tribe]), which does not appear to have extended to the Sea of Galilee (since the northern border of Issachar terminated at the Jordan [Jos 19:22], and the border of Naphiali, as it included various towns on the southern end of the shore [Jos 19:35; Mat 4:13], as well as Aznoth-tabor [Jos 19:34], must have passed up to this last point not far from the Wady Bestuin), turning (with a north-westerly sweep) “so as to exclude (ibid.) Hukkok (Yakufk), and, passing (apparently west) along Wady Selanmeh, so as to include Hunnethon (perhaps Deir Hlannali), and running (south-west) to the valley of Jiphthah-el (probably marked by the modern Jefat), where it met the border ofAsher (Jos 19:27).

In the enumeration of the border and interior towns of this tribe (Jos 19:10-15), twelve metropolitan cities only are counted, six others (Maralah, Jokneam, Chislothtabor, Daberath, Ittah-kazin, and Jiphthah-el) being situated outside the boundary line.

12. Asher. — The description of the boundary (Jos 19:24-30) begins with a generals statement of several towns Helkath (perhaps Ukreth), Hall (perhaps Alia), Beteni (perhaps el-Baneh), Achshaph (probably Kesaf),  Alamrimelech (probably some place on the Waidy el-Melek), Amad (perhaps Shefu-namar), and Mishal (probably Missalli)-as lying near the border, which, crossing Carmel, reached to Shihor-libnuath (perhaps Wady Milheh), just above Dor (see 17:11), leaving in Naphtali the city of Heleph (probably Beit lif); then returning: eastward the same line, passing Beth- dagon (probably Hajeb) and the city of Zebulun (now Alidin) as far as Jiphthah-el, pursued this last valley northward past Beth-eniek and Neiel, leaving Cabul (Kabul) on the north, and, including several cities generally described .(Hebron [i.e. Abdon], Rehob, Hammomi, and Kanah), ran east of north (doubtless so as to strike the Litany), and then was continued as the northern boundary about opposite Sidon, where (without including the Philenician sea-coast): it turned south-westerly (as the western border) past Tyre as far as Achzib (Zib).

In the recapitulation of the cities of this tribe (Jos 19:25-30), twenty-two metropolitan towns only are reckoned, three others (Jiphthah- el, Sidon, and Tyre) being outside the border, and two other names (Carmel and Shitior-libnath) it being towns.

13. Naphtai was bounded by Issachar, Zebulun, and Asher on the south and west, and extended as far as Mount Hermon on the north, and eastward by the sea of Galilee, the Jordan, sea of Merom, and the Damascus road, extending to Juduah-upon-Jordan (Tell Naby Sidihnda), and including, Beth-shemesh (Medjel es-Sheirns) (Jos 19:22). The northerly limits of this tribe are stated in the general boundaries of Palestine (q.v.), laid down in Num 34:7-11, as follows: A line from the Mediterranean Sea crossing the mountain-range (Lebanon, or its offshoot Hermon), and intersecting the “entrance to 1iamath” (Coele-Syria or the valley of the Leontes) apparently at Zedad (perhaps the present Jedeimdeh); thence to Ziphrou (probably another place in the same valley [possibly Kankaha]), and so by way of Hazar-enan (perhaps Hasbeya) to the edge of the Hanuran. From Hazarenan, the southern boundary bent southward (so as to firm in part the eastern boundary), so as to follow substantially the eastern arm of the-upper Jordan, taking in successively Shepham (perhaps Caesare Philippi; comp. Baal-gad in Jos 11:17) and Riblah (not the Iiblah of Hamath, but a much: more southerly place), east of Ain (perhaps the spring of Tell el-Kady), and so on down to the sea of Galilee. The account in Eze 47:14-17 (which is evidently a. copy of that in Numbers) contains the following additional names: Hethlon, Berothah, Sibraim, and Hazar-hatticon, which (at least the middle two),  from their association with Hamath, appear (in this vague enumeration) to have been situated beyond the bounds of the Oriental Promised Land altogether.

In the sum of the cities enumerated in connection with this tribe, nineteen metropolitan towns only are included, five of the names (Allon-zaanaim, Adami-nekeb, Ziddimzer, Hammath rakkath, and Migdal el Horem) being double, and two others (Aznoth-tabor and Judah-upon Jordan) lying outside the border. SEE PALESTINE.

## Tribe Of Simeon[[@Headword:Tribe Of Simeon]]

             The six sons of Simeon and the chief families of the tribe are mentioned in the lists of Gen 46:10 (in which one of them, bearing the name of Shaul, [Saul], is specified as “the son of the Canaanitess”), Num 26:12-14, and 1Ch 4:24-43. In the last passage (1Ch 4:27) it is mentioned that the family of one of the heads of the tribe “had not many children, neither did they multiply like to the children of Judah.” This appears to have been the case not only with one family, but with the whole tribe. At the census at Sinai Simeon numbered 59,300 fighting men (Num 1:23). It was then the most numerous but two, Judah and Dan alone exceeding it; but when the second census was taken, at Shittim, the numbers had fallen to 22,200, and it was the weakest of all the tribes. This was no doubt partly due to the recent mortality following the idolatry  of Peor, in which the, tribe of Simeon appears to have taken a prominent. share, but there must have been other causes which have escaped mention.

The connection between Simeon and Levi implied in the blessing of Jacob (Gen 49:5-7) has already been adverted to. The passage relating to them may be thus rendered:

Simeon and Levi are [uterine] brethren, Instruments of violence are their swords. Into their [secret] council come not my soul! Unto their assembly join not my honor. For in their wrath they slew man, And in their self-will they houghed ox. Cursed be their wrath, for it [was] fierce, And their anger, for it [was] cruel! I will divide them in Jacob, And scatter them in Israel.

The terms of this denunciation seem to imply a close bond of union between Simeon and Levi, and violent and continued exploits performed under that bond, such as the one that now remains on record. The expressions of the closing lines evidently refer to the more advanced condition of the nation of Israel after the time of the death of the father of the individual patriarchs. Taking it, therefore, to be what it purports — an actual prediction by the individual Jacob — it has often been pointed out how differently the same sentence was accomplished in the cases of the two tribes. Both were “divided” and “scattered.” But the dispersion of the Levites arose from their holding the post of honor in the nation, and being spread, for the purposes of education and worship, broadcast over the face of the country. In the case of Simeon the doom refers primarily to the fact that originally this tribe had no separate allotment of territory, but only a series of cities selected from the region at first assigned to Judah (Jos 15:21 sq.; comp. with 19:1 sq.). SEE SOUTH COUNTRY. The eventual dispersion seems to have arisen from some corrupting element in the tribe itself, which first reduced its numbers, and at last drove it from its allotted seat in the country — not, as Dan, because it could not, but because it would not, stay — and thus in the end caused it to dwindle and disappear entirely. The non appearance of Simeon's name in the blessing of Moses (Deu 33:6) may be explained from the circumstance that the tribe is, in accordance with the above peculiarities, not regarded as having an independent existence.  During the journey through the wilderness Simeon was a member of the camp which marched on the south side of the sacred tent. His associates were Reuben and Gad — not his whole brothers, but the sons of Zilpah, Leah's maid. The head of the tribe at the time of the Exode was Shelumiel, son of Zurishaddai (Num 1:6), ancestor of its one heroine, the intrepid Judith. Among the spies Simeon was represented by Shaphat, son of Hori, i.e. Horite, a name which, perhaps, like the “Canaanitess” of the earlier list, reveals a trace of the lax tendencies which made the Simeonites an easy prey to the licentious rites of Peor, and ultimately destroyed the permanence of the tribe. At the division of the land his representative was Shemuel, son of Ammihud.

The connection between Judah and Simeon already mentioned seems to have begun with the conquest. Judah and the two Joseph brethren were first served with the lion's share of the land; and then, the Canaanite's having been sufficiently subdued to allow the sacred tent to be established without risk in the heart of the country, the work of dividing the remainder among the seven inferior tribes was proceeded with (Jos 8:1-6). Benjamin had the first turn, then Simeon (19:1). By this time Judah had discovered that the tract allotted to him was too large (Jos 8:9), and also too much exposed on the west and south for even his great powers. To Simeon accordingly was allotted a district out of the territory of his kinsman, on its southern frontier, which contained eighteen or nineteen cities, with their villages, spread round the venerable well of Beersheba (Jos 8:1-8; 1Ch 4:28-33), Of these places, with uthe help of Judah, the Simeonites possessed themselves (Jdg 1:3; Jdg 1:17); and here they were found, doubtless by Joab, residing in the reign of David (1Ch 4:31). During his wandering life David must have been much among the Simeonites. In fact, three of their cities are named in the list of those to which he sent presents of the spoil of the Amalekites, and one (Ziklag) was his own private property. It is therefore remarkable that the numbers of Simeon and Judah who attended his installation as king of Hebron should have been so much below those of the other tribes (12:23-37). Possibly it is due to the fact that the event was taking place in the heart of their own territory, at Hebron. This, however, will not account for the curious fact that the warriors of Simeon (7100) were more numerous than those of Judah (6800). After David's removal to Jerusalem, the head of the tribe was Shephatiah, son of Maachah (27:16).

The following list contains all the names of places in this tribe, with the probable modem names. (On the possible identifications, see the Quar. Statement of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,” Jan. 1875, p. 23 sq.). SEE TRIBE.

Acrabbim. Hills. SEE MAALEH-ACRAB-BIM. Adadah. Town. Kasr-el-Adadah? Adar. do. SEE HAZAR-ADDAR. Ain. do. SEE EN-AIMMON. Amam. do. SEE HAZOR. Arad. do. Tell-Arad. Aror. do. Ararah. Aruboth. District. [Jebel Khalil]? Ashan. Town. [Deir Samil]? Athach. do. Wady Ateiche? Azem. do. [Tell-Akhmar]? Azmon. do. [On Wady es-Shutein]? Baal. do. SEE BAALATH-BEER. Baalah, or Baalath-beer, or Balah, or Bealoth. do. SEE LEHI. Beer-lahai.roi. Well. SEE LEHI. Beer-sheba. do. Bir es-Seba. Bered. Town. [Khulassah]? Besor. Brook. Wady Gazzeh? Beth-birei, or Beth-lebaoth. Town. [Sheta]?? Beth-marcaboth. do. Mirkib. Beth-palet or -phelet. do. [Tell-Kuseifeh]? Bethuel, or Bethul. do. [Themail]?? Bizjoth-jah. do. SEE BAALAH. Chesil. do. SEE BETHUL. Chor-ashan. do. See ASHAN. Dimonah. do. [Um-Mzoghal]? Eder. do. [Wady Emaz]? Eltolad. do. [Tell-Meraha]? En-hakkore. Spring. Tell-Hora? En-rimmon. do. SEE RIMMON. Esek. Well. SEE GERAR. Etam. Town and Rock. Tell-Khewelfeh? Ether. Town. [Beit Anwa]? Gerar. do. Um el-Jerar.  Hadattah. do. SEE HAZOR-HADATTAH. Hazar-addar. Village. [On Wady Madurah]? Hazar-gaddah. do. [Jurrah]? Hazar-shual. do. SEE SHEMA. Hazar-susah, or Hazar-susah, or Hazar-susim. do. SEE SANSANNAH. Hazor. do. [Tayibeh]? Hazor-amam. do. SEE KEIROH-HEZRON. Hazor-hadattah. do. [Beyudh]? Heshmon. do. See AZMON. Hezron. do. SEE KERIOTH-HEZRON. Hormah. do. SEE ZEPHATH. Iim. do. [Jebel Rukhi]? Ithnar. do. SEE ZIPH. Jagur. do. [On Wady Jurrah]? Kabzeel. do. [On Wady Kuseib]? Kadesh-barnea. do. A'in-Hasb? Karkaa. Village. [Bir Abu Atreibe]? Kedesh. do. SEE KADESII. Kinah. do. [On Wady Fikreh]? Lebaoth. do. SEE BETH-LEBAOTH. Lehi. do. Tell Lekiyah? Maaleh-acrabbim. Ascent. Hills S.W. of Dead Sea. Madmannah. Village. SEE BETH-MARCABOTH. Moladah. do. Tell Milh. Rachal. do. [Makhul]? Ramath, or Ramoth. do. SEE LEHI. Rehoboth. Well. Ruheiba. Rimmon. Town. Um er-Rummamin. Sansannah. do. Simsin? Sharuhen, or Shlilhim. do. [Tell Sheriah]? Sheba, or Shema. do. Saweh? Siphmoth. do. [Kasr es-Sir]? Sitnah. Well. SEE JERAI. Telem, or Telaim. Town. [Sudeid]? Tochen. do. SEE TELEM. Tolad. do. SEE ELTOLAD. Zephath, or Ziph. do. Ruins S. of Nakb es-Safeh. Ziklag. do. [Musrefa]?  What part Simeon took at the time of the division of the kingdom we are not told. The tribe was probably not in a sufficiently strong or compact. condition to have shown any northern tendencies even had it entertained them. The only thing which can be interpreted into a trace of its having taken any part with the northern kingdom are the two casual notices of 2Ch 15:9; 2Ch 34:6, which appear to imply the presence of Simeonites there in the reigns of Asa and Josiah. But this may have been merely a manifestation of that vagrant spirit which was a cause or a consequence of the prediction ascribed to Jacob. On the other hand, the definite statement of 1Ch 4:41-43 (the date of which by Hezekiah's reign seems to show conclusively its southern origin) proves that at that time there were still some of them remaining in the original seat of the tribe, and actuated by all the warlike, lawless spirit of their progenitor. This fragment of ancient chronicle relates two expeditions in search of more eligible territory. The first, under thirteen chieftains, leading, doubtless, a large body of followers, was made against the Hamites and the Mehunim, a powerful tribe of Bedawin, “at the entrance of Gedor at the east side of the ravine.” The second was smaller, but more adventurous. Under the guidance of four chiefs a band of five hundred undertook an expedition against the remnant of Amalek, who had taken refuge from the attacks of Saul or David, or some later pursuers, in the distant fastnesses of Mount Seir. The expedition was successful. They smote the Amalekites and took possession of their quarters; and they mere still living there after the return of the Jews from captivity, or whenever the first book of Chronicles was edited in its present form.

The audacity and intrepidity which seem to have characterized the founder of the tribe of Simeon are seen in their fullest force in the last of his descendants of whom there is any express mention in the sacred record. Whether the book which bears her name be a history or a historic romance, Judith (q.v.) will always remain one .of the most prominent figures. among the deliverers of her nation. Bethulia would almost seem to have been a Simeomnitish colony. Ozias, the chief man of the city, was a Simeonite (Jdt 6:15), and so was Manasses, the husband of Judith (8:2). She herself had the purest blood of the tribe in her veins. Her genealogy is traced up to Zurishaddai (in the Greek form of the present text Salasadai, Jdt 6:1), the head of the Simeonites at the time of their greatest power. She nerves herself for her tremendous exploit by a prayer to “the Lord God of  her father Simeon” and by recalling in the most characteristic manner, and in all their details, the incidents of the massacre of Shechem (9:2).

Simeon is named by Ezekiel (Eze 48:25) and the author of the book of Revelation (Rev 7:7) in their catalogues of the restoration of Israel. The former removes the tribe from Judah and places it by the side of Benjamin. See Meth. Quar. Revelation Jan. 1875, p. 121.

2. (A.V. “Shimeon.”), An Israelite of the .family of Harim who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:31). B.C. 458.

3. A priest, son of Joiarib (i.e. Jehoiarib), father of John. and grandfather of Mattathias the father of the Maccabee brothers (1 Maccabees 2, 1).

4. The son of Judah and father of Levi in the maternal genealogy of our Lord (Luk 3:30). B.C. cir. 886. He seems to have been the same with Maaseiah the son of Adaiah (2Ch 23:1).

5. A devout Jew, inspired by the Holy Ghost, who met the parents of our Lord in the Temple, took him in his arms, and gave thanks for what he saw, and knew of Jesus (Luk 2:25-35). B.C. 6. The circumstance is interesting as evincing the expectations which were then entertained of the speedy advent of the Messiah; and important from the attestation which it conveyed in favor of Jesus from one who was known to have received the divine promise that he should “not taste of death till he had seen the Lord's Christ.”

In the Apocryphal gospel of Nicodemus, Simeon is called a high priest, and the narrative of our Lord's descent into hell is put into the mouths of Charinus and Lenthius, who are described as two sons of Simeon, who rose from the grave after Christ's resurrection (Mat 27:53) and related their story to Annas, Caiaphas, Nicodemus, Joseph, and Gamaliel.

Rabban Simon, whose grandmother was of the family of David, succeeded his father Hillel as president of the. Sanhedrim about A.D. 13 (Otho, Lexicon Rabb. p. 697), and his son Gamaliel was the Pharisee at whose feet Paul was brought up (Act 22:3). A Jewish writer specially notes, that no record of this Simeon is preserved in the Mishna (Lightfoot, Horie Heb. Luk 2:25). It has been conjectured that he (Prideaux, Connection, anno 37, Michaelis) or his grandson (Schottgen, Horoe Heb. Luk 2:25) of the same name may be the Simeon of Luke. In favor of  the identity it is alleged that the name, residence, time of life, and general character are the same in both cases, that the remarkable silence of the Mishna and .the counsel given:by Gamaliel (Act 5:38) countenance a, suspicion of an inclination on. the part of the family of the rabban towards Christianity. On the other hand, it is argued that these facts fall far short of historical proof, and that Simeon was a very common name among the Jews; that Luke would never have introduced so celebrated a character as the president of the Sanhedrim merely as, “a man in Jerusalem;” and that his son Gamaliel, After all, was educated as a Pharisee. The question is discussed in Witsius, Miscellanea Sacra, 1, 21, 14-16. See also Wolf, Curoe Philologicae at Luk 2:25; and Bibl. Hebr. 2, 682. SEE SIMON BEN-HILLEL.

6. A form (Act 15:14; also 2Pe 1:2 in some MSS.) of the name of Simon Peter (q.v.).

7. The proper name (Act 13:1) of NIGER SEE NIGER (q.v.), an eminent Christian at Antioch.

## Tribolos[[@Headword:Tribolos]]

             SEE THORN.

## Tribulation[[@Headword:Tribulation]]

             ( צָר, θλίψις, both literally signifying. pressure or straits) expresses in the A. V. much the same as trouble or trial, importing afflictive dispensations to which a person is subjected either by way of punishment (see Jdg 10:14; Mat 24:21; Mat 24:29; Rom 2:9 2Th 1:6) or by way of trial (see Joh 16:33; Rom 5:3; 2Th 1:4).

## Tribur (Conciliunm Triburense), Councils Of[[@Headword:Tribur (Conciliunm Triburense), Councils Of]]

             Tribur was a royal residence near Mayence, where several Church councils were held.

I. The first council was held in 895. Twenty-two bishops were present, including Hatho, archbishop of Mayence; Herman, archbishop of Cologne and Ratbode, archbishop of Treves. King Arnulphus also attended, with many of the chief lords of his kingdom. Fifty-eight canons were published.

3. Declares that, with the king's consent, it is ordered that all his nobles shall seize those who refuse to perform the penance due to their offences, and bring them before the bishop.

4. Regulates the manner of disposing of the pecuniary mulct inflicted for wounding a priest; if the latter survived, the whole belonged to him; if he died, it was to be divided into three parts, one for his church, one for his bishop, and one for his relations.

5. Imposes five years penance for killing a priest, during which time the penitent might not eat meat nor drink wine, except on Sundays and festivals. At the end of the five years he might be admitted into the Church, but not to communion, until the expiration of other five years, during which he was to fast three days in the week.

10. Renews the canon of the Council of Carthage which enacts-that a bishop shall not be deposed by fewer than twelve bishops; a priest by fewer than six; nor a deacon by fewer than three.

12. Restricts the solemn celebration of baptism to Easter and Whitsuntide.

13. Orders the division of tithe into four portions: 1, for the bishop: 2, for the clerk; 3, for the poor; and, 4, for the fabric.

15. Orders that the dead be buried, if possible, at the cathedral church; if not, at the church belonging to a monastery, in order that they might benefit by the prayers of the monks; otherwise in the church to which, they pay tithe.

16. Proves from Scripture that no fee may be taken for burials.

17. Forbids to bury laymen within the church.

18. Forbids chalices and panels of wood.

19. Orders that water be mixed with the wine in the. chalice, but that there be twice as much wine as waiter.

30. Orders all due respect to the see of Rome, and enacts penalties against those who cause the death of Christians by enchantments. See Mansi, Concil. 9:438.

II. The second council convened in October, 1076, The pope's legates, with several German lords and some bishops, assembled in council, debated concerning the deposition of the emperor Henry IV in consequence of which he passed into Italy, and, after, the most, humiliating concessions, obtained absolution from the pope, Jan. 25, 1077. See Mansi, Concil. 10, 355.

## Tribute[[@Headword:Tribute]]

             (prop. מִס, φόρος), an impost which one prince or state agrees, or is compelled, to pay to another, as the purchase of peace or in token of  dependence.. In the Scriptures we find three forms of this requirement. SEE TAX.

I. Native. — The Hebrews acknowledged no other sovereign than-God; and in Exo 30:12; Exo 30:15, we find they' were required to pay tribute unto the Lord, to give an offering of half a shekel to “make an atonement for their souls.” The native kings and judges of the Hebrews did not exact tribute. Solomon, indeed, at the beginning of his reign, levied tribute from the Canaanites and others who remained in the land and were not of Israel, and compelled them to hard servitude (1Ki 9:21-23; 2Ch 8:9); but the children of Israel were exempted from that impost, and employed in the more honorable departments and offices of his kingdom. Towards the end of his reign, however, he appears to have imposed tribute upon the Jews also, and to have compelled them to work upon the public buildings (1Ki 5:13-14; 1Ki 9:15; 1Ki 11:27). This had the effect of gradually alienating their minds, and of producing that discontent which afterwards resulted in open revolt under Jeroboam, son of Nebat. “Thy father made our yoke grievous,” said the Israelites to Rehoboam; “now, therefore, make thou the grievous service of thy father and his heavy yoke which he put upon us lighter, and we will serve thee” (1Ki 12:4). SEE ASSESSMENT.

II. Foreign. — The Israelites were at various times subjected to heavy taxes and tributes by their conquerors. After Judaea was reduced to a, Roman province, a new poll of the people and an estimate of their substance were taken, by command of Augustus, in order that he might more correctly regulate the tribute to be exacted (Joseph us, Anq. 17:15). This was a capitation-tax levied at so much a head, and imposed upon all males from fourteen, and all females from twelve, up to sixty-five years of age (Ulpian, Digest. de Censib. lib. 3; Fischer, De Numism. Census). SEE TAXING

.

To oppose the levying of this tribute, Judas the Gaulonite raised an insurrection of the Jews, asserting that it was not lawful to pay tribute to a foreigner, that it was a token of servitude, and that the Jews were not allowed to acknowledge any for their master who did not worship the Lord. They boasted of being a free nation, and of never having been in bondage to any man (Joh 8:33). These sentiments were extensively  promulgated, but all their efforts were of no avail in restraining or mitigating the exactions of their conquerors. SEE JUDAS.

The Pharisees, who sought to entangle Jesus in his talk, sent unto him demanding whether it was lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or not; but, knowing their wicked designs, he replied, “Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?” “Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.” SEE PENNY.

The apostles Peter and Paul severally recommended submission to the ruling powers, and inculcated the duty of paying tribute, “tribute to whom tribute is due” (Rom 13:1-8; 1Pe 2:13).

III. The Temple Tax. — The payment of the half shekel (half statre =two drachmae) was (as has been said above), though resting on an ancient precedent (Exo 30:13), yet, in its character as a fixed annual rate, of late origin. It was proclaimed, according to Rabbinie rules, on the 1st of Adar, began to be collected on the 15th, and was due, at latest, on the 1st of Nisan (Mishna, Shekalim, 1, 7; Surenhusins, p. 260, 261). It was applied to defray the general expenses of the Temple, the morning and evening sacrifice, the incense, wood, showbread the red heifers, the scape-goat, etc. (Mishna, Shekal. loc. cit.; in Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Mat 17:24). After the destruction of the Temple it was sequestrated by Vespasian and his successors, and transferred to the Temple of the Capitoline Jupiter (Josephus, War, 7,6, 6). SEE TEMPLE.

The explanation thus given of the “tribute” of Mat 17:24 is, beyond all doubt, the true one. To suppose, with Chrysostom, Augustine, Maldonatus, and others, that it was the same as the tribute (κῆνσος) paid to the Roman emperor (Mat 22:17) is at variance with the distinct statements of Josephus and the Mishna, and takes away the whole significance of our Lord's words. It may be questioned, however, whether the full significance of those words is adequately brought out in the popular interpretation of them. As explained by most commentators, they are simply an assertion by our Lord of his divine Sonship, an implied rebuke of Peter for forgetting the truth which he had so recently confessed (comp. Wordsworth, Alford, and others): “Then are the children (υἱοί) free;” Thou hast owned me as the Son of the Living God, the Son of the Great King, of the Lord of the Temple, in whose honor men pay the Temple- tribute; why, forgetting this dost thou so hastily make answer as if I were  an alien and a stranger? This explanation, however, hardly does justice to the tenor of the language. Our Lord had not been present at the preceding Passover, and had therefore failed to pay the tax at the regular time and place. Hence he was waited upon in Galilee for that purpose, with-some apprehension, perhaps, on the part of the collectors, that he might excuse himself for some reason, or at least neglect to pay. In his reply he asserts his just claim to exemption, not as an alien, but precisely because he was a member of the theocratic family in the highest sense. He was exempt on the broad constitutional ground that a king's son belongs to the royal household for whom tribute is collected, and not by whom it is rendered. Inasmuch as the tax was for the Temple service, Jesus, who was the son of the Lord of the Temple, could not be required to contribute to that expense. Peter is coupled in the payment, but not in the exemption; at least, not on the same ground precisely, but, if at all, on the general principle of association with the royal family. SEE TRIBUTE-MONEY.

## Tribute-money[[@Headword:Tribute-money]]

             (διδραχμον), the Temple-tax levied upon all Jews (Mat 17:24), and likewise (κῆνσος) the money collected by the Romans in payment of the taxes imposed upon the Jews (Mat 22:19). The piece shown to our Savior at his own request (in the latter passage) was a Roman coin, bearing the image of one of the Caesars, and must have been at that time current in Judaea, and received in payment of the tribute, in common with other descriptions of money. There is no reason to suppose that the tribute was collected exclusively in Roman coins, or that the tribute-money was a description of coin different from that which was in general circulation. SEE PENNY.

As regards the half-shekel of silver paid to the Lord by every male of the children of Israel as a ransom for his soul (Exo 30:13; Exo 30:15), colonel Leake says “that it had nothing in common with the tribute paid by the Jews to the Roman emperor. The tribute was a denarius, in the English version a penny (Mat 22:17; Luk 20:24); the duty to the Temple was a didrachmon, two of which made a stater. It appears, then, that the half-shekel of ransom had in the time of our Savior been converted into the payment of a didrachmon to the Temple, and two of their didrachma formed a stater of the Jewish currency.” He then suggests that the stater was evidently the extant “Shekel Israel,” which was a tetradrachm of the Ptolemaic scale, though generally below the standard  weight, like most of the extant specimens of the Ptolemies; and that the didrachmon paid to the Temple was therefore of the same monetary scale. “Thus,” says he, “the duty to the Temple was converted from the half of an Attic to the whole of a Ptolemaic didrachmon, and the tax was nominally raised in the proportion of about 105 to 65; but probably the value of silver had fallen as much in the two preceding centuries. It was natural that the Jews should have revived the old name shekel, and applied it to their stater, and equally so that they should have adopted the scale of the neighboring opulent and powerful kingdom, the money of which they must have long been in the habit of employing” (Appendix, Numismata Hellenica, p. 2, 3). SEE DIDRACHM.

## Tricerium[[@Headword:Tricerium]]

             (τρικήριον), a three-branched taper, so arranged that the wicks of each, though distinct, blend into one flame. With this the Oriental bishops sign the book of the gospels during, certain services of the Greek Church.

## Trichotomy[[@Headword:Trichotomy]]

             (threefold division) is the theory according to which man is divided into three parts-body, soul, and spirit. This is thought by many to be the apostolic classification of our nature (1Th 5:23). Generally soul and body are opposed; but spirit, so contrasted, is the highest portion of our nature, allying it to God, and on which his Spirit works. Soul (in the German sense) is the lower portion, the region of appetite, instinct, and of much besides which we have in common with the lower creation. This idea throws light on many passages of Scripture. The body mediates between the soul and the external world, the soul between the spirit and body, and the spirit between both and God. This view of human nature would have prevailed, had it not been so keenly opposed by Tertullian, and so slighted even by Augustine, and had not Apollinaris adopted it to illustrate his erroneous view of our Lord's nature. He denied spirit, in this human sense, to Christ, but held that its place was occupied by the Divine Spirit. It was held by Luther, as it still is by the more evangelical part of the Lutheran Church. The Reformers, however, did not consider spirit and soul as different substances, but only as different attributes or operations of the same spiritual essence. SEE SOUL; SEE SPIRIT.

## Tridentine[[@Headword:Tridentine]]

             (of or belonging to Trent). The term is applied to the celebrated council of the 16th century, and to that part of the Church Universal which accepts the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent (q.v.).

## Tridentine Profession of Faith[[@Headword:Tridentine Profession of Faith]]

             or the Creed of Pius IV, is a summary of the doctrines of the Council of Trent, suggested by that council, prepared by a college of cardinals under the supervision of pope Pius IV, and issued by him, Nov. 13, 1564. It consists of twelve articles, including the Nicene Creed (q.v.), and is put in the form of an individual profession and solemn oath. It is required of all Roman Catholic priests, and public teachers in seminaries, colleges, and universities. It is also used for Protestant converts to the Roman Catholic Church, and hence called the “profession of converts.” The 10th article reads, “I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and as the vicar of Jesus Christ.” See Latin text in the two papal bulls of Nov. 13 and Dec. 9, 1564, and in Denzinger's Enchiridion, p. 292-294; also a history of this creed by Mohnike, Urkundliche Geschichte der Professio Fidei Tridentince (Greifswald, 1822). SEE TRENT, COUNCIL OF.

## Triennial Visitation[[@Headword:Triennial Visitation]]

             a visitation which is held once in three years. In England it is the custom to hold episcopal visitations at such intervals.

## Triers, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Triers, Ecclesiastical]]

             A parliamentary ordinance was passed in 1654 appointing thirty-eight commissioners to the office of triers; they were chosen by Cromwell, and sat at Whitehall. They were mostly Independents, though some Presbyterians were joined with them. They were appointed to try all ministers that came for institution and induction, and without their approval none were admitted. The opinion of Baxter is that they were of essential service to the Church. He says they saved many congregations from ignorant, ungodly, and intemperate teachers-men who designed nothing more in the ministry than to repeat a sermon as readers say their  prayers, and to patch up a few good words together to talk the people asleep on Sunday, and all the rest of the week go with them to the ale- house, and harden them in their sin; and that sort of ministers who either preached against a holy life, or preached as men that were not acquainted with it. They had power to eject scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient ministers and schoolmasters.

## Triffechov, Adam[[@Headword:Triffechov, Adam]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 11, 1641, at Lubeck, studied at different universities, was in 1672 ecclesiastical counsellor at Gotha, in 1677 general superintendent, and died August 17, 1687. He published, Historia Chiliasmi: — De Impositione Manuum in Sacrificiis ex Hebraeorum nec non Christianorum Monumentis: — De Emphasibus Scripture Sacrae ad Ies. 1:1-6: — De Rechabitis ad Jeremiah 35 : — De Angelis: — De Mose AEgyptiorum Osiride: — De Concursu Dei: — Historia Naturalismi a Prima sua Origine ad Nostra usque Tempora per suas Classes Deducta (edited and published by his son, Jena, 1700). See  Moller, Cimbria Literata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Trigland, Jacob[[@Headword:Trigland, Jacob]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Harlem, May 8, 1652, and died at Leyden, Sept. 22, 1705. His writings are, Dissertt. Theologico-philologica, Continens Defensionem Integritatis Codicis Sacri adversus Nuperas in eum Censuras (Leyden, 1703): — Diatribe de Secta Karceorum (ibid. eod.; Germ. transl. by Fürst. in Literaturbl. des Orients, 1843, c. 12, 23, 39, 763, 776, 794, 827): — Dissertationes Theologicce et Philologicce, Sylloqe ut et Orationun Acad. (Delft, 1728): — Trium Scriptorium illustr. de Tribus Judaeo-rum Sectis Syntagma in quo N. Serarii (Mayence, 1604), Drusii (Franecker, 1603-5), Jos. Scaligeri (ibid. 1605) Opuscula, quae eo Pertinent, etc. (ibid. 1703): — Disputt. II de Origine Sacrifiiosrum (Leyden, 1692): — De Josepho Patriarcha in Sacri Bovi Hieroglyph. ab Egypti's Adorato (ibid. 1705). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 447; Winer, Handb. der theol. Literatur, 1, 29, 139, 442, 515, 823. (B. P.)

## Triglaw[[@Headword:Triglaw]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was the supreme god of the Servians, Wends, Poles, partly also of the Rigen islanders, Pomeranians, Prussians, and Lithuanians. He was, as his name indicates, triple-headed, and therefore represented the Slavonic trinity. The priests proclaimed Triglaw as the unseen supreme sovereign of heaven, earth, and the infernal regions. He was represented veiled, in the greatest temple at Stettin, as a celebrated man with three heads. A large army of priests served him, and taught that he, being long-suffering and kind-hearted, veiled his face so as not to see the evil deeds of men, and seldom made his appearance on earth, but taught his priests his will and commands, and by means of his holy black steed he distributed oracles, etc. This steed governed by his hoofs the whole population, and no one would have dared to do anything to which it did not give favorable signs. His temple, made of huge wooden posts covered with cloths, contained the largest part of all the spoils of war. Vast riches were heaped up here, and the superstitious dread of the people was a  surer protection than marble or granite, perhaps, would have been. The destructive campaigns of Henry the Lion were the means of destroying all these temples, and closed to the world the inspection of the idols of their gods.

## Trim, Council of[[@Headword:Trim, Council of]]

             Trim is the county town of Meath, situated on the river Boyne, about twenty-seven miles north-west of Dublin. It contains a national school, besides other public institutions; a handsome Roman Catholic chapel; the remains of Trim Castle; and the Yellow Tower, a part of St. Mary's Abbey, rebuilt by the De Lacys in the 13th century.

The council was held on the Sunday after St. Matthew's Day (1291). Nicholas M'Motissa, archbishop of Armagh, presided. The four archbishops, all the suffragan bishops, all the cathedral chapters, by their deputies, and the other orders and degrees of the clergy, unanimously agreed in this synod to maintain and defend each other in all courts, and before all judges, ecclesiastical or secular, against all lay encroachments upon, and violations of, their rights, liberties, or customs; and, further, amply to indemnify those of their messengers, executors of their orders, etc., who might receive loss or damage in the performance of their duty. Other articles of agreement were drawn up, pledging them to mutual cooperation in enforcing sentences of excommunication, etc. See Mant, Hist. of the Irish Church, p. 17..

## Trimble, Joseph Mcdowell, D.D[[@Headword:Trimble, Joseph Mcdowell, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the year 1807. After graduating at the University of Ohio in 1829, he joined the Ohio Conference. From 1836 to 1840 he was professor of mathematics in Augusta College. For thirty-one years he was secretary of his conference, and rerepresented it in thirteen General Conferences. For thirty-nine years he was a trustee, and for twenty years agent of Ohio Wesleyan University. For thirty-two years he was a member of the General Missionary Committee, and for four years one of the missionary secretaries. He died May 6, 1891. See Cyclop. of Methodism, Christianity in Earnest, May- June, 1891.

## Trimble, Robert W., LL.D[[@Headword:Trimble, Robert W., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Wheeling, W. Virginia, February 2, 1829, ordained deacon in 1858, and presbyter in 1860, was  rector at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, for twenty-one years, and died April 18, 1882.

## Trimmer, Sarah[[@Headword:Trimmer, Sarah]]

             a zealous promoter of religious education in England, was born at Ipswich, Jan. 6,1741. She was carefully educated, and while a resident of London passed her time in the society of Dr. Johnson, Dr. Gregory Sharpe, and other eminent persons in the literary world. In her reading she was directed by her father. Becoming a mother of a large family of children, her current of thought was turned to education. Having experienced great success in the plan of educating her own family, she naturally wished to extend that blessing to others, and this first induced her to become an author. She strenuously opposed the current of French and German infidelity and a lax education independent of the history and truths of revelation. She was also an early promoter and supporter of Sunday schools. She died Dec. 15,1810. Of her works, we refer to the last London edition: Abridgment of the New Test. (1852, 18mo): — Abridgment of the Old Test. (1850,  12mo): — Help to the Unlearned in the Study of the Holy Scriptures (1805, 8vo; 2d ed. 1850, 2 vols. 12mo): New and Comprehensive Lessons on the New Test. (1849, 18mo): — New and Comprehensive Lessons on the Old Test. (1849, 18mo): — Prayers and Meditations (1842, 12mo; 2d ed. 1860): — Sacred History (1782-85, 6 vols. 12mo; 1841-49, 2 vols. 12mo): — Scripture Catechism (1851, 2 vols. 12mo): — The Economy of Charity (1786; revised 1801): — and many other works on history, education, etc. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Trimnell, Charles[[@Headword:Trimnell, Charles]]

             bishop of Norwich and Winchester, was born at Ripton-Abbots, England, Dec. 27, 1663. He graduated with honor at Winchester College, and in 1688 was appointed preacher at Rolls. In 1691 he was installed prebendary of Norwich, in 1694 presented by the earl of Sunderland to the rectory of Bodington, and in 1698 installed archdeacon of Norfolk. About this time he was made chaplain in ordinary to queen Anne. Having no parochial duty in 1705, he for some time took charge of St. Giles's parish, Norwich; and in October, 1706, was instituted to St, James's, Westminster. In January, 1707, Mr. Trimnell was elected bishop of Norwich, and in August, 1721, he was transferred to the bishopric of Winchester. He died Aug. 15, 1723. He had a very serious turn of mind, and performed the duty of every station with the greatest exactness. His public life was characterized by great moderation and firmness of spirit. “He was a lover of peace and order both from judgment and inclination; and, being a sincere friend to the Church of England, he constantly avowed those principles of toleration and indulgence which make that Church the glory of the Reformation.” Bishop Trimnell published fifteen single Sermons, Letters, Charges, etc. (1697- 1715).

## Trimurti[[@Headword:Trimurti]]

             (Sanscrit, fri, "three," and murti, “form"), the name of the Hindu triad, the gods Brahma (masculine), Vishnuu, and Siva, which are considered an inseparable unity, though three in form. Different works assign the chief place to different members, according to the schools from which they emanate. The Paduca-Purana of the Vaishnava (q.v.) sect assigns to Vishnu the highest rank in the trimurti, and thus defines its character: "In the beginning of creation the great Vishnu, desirous of creating the whole world, became threefold — creator, preserver, and destroyer. In order to create this world the Supreme Spirit produced from the right side of his body himself, as Brahma; then, in order to preserve the world, he produced from the left side of his body Vishnu; and, in order to destroy the world, he produced from the middle of his body the eternal Siva. Some worship Brahma, others Vishnu, others Siva; but Vishnu, one, yet threefold, creates, preserves, and destroys; therefore let the pious make no difference between the three." The Matsya-Purana, speaking of the Mahat, or intellectual principie, says, "Mahat becomes distinctly known as three gods, through the influence of the three qualities, goodness, passion, and sin; being one person and three gods, viz., Brahma, Vishnf, and Siva." We are thus enabled to see that, aside from sectarian belief, which makes its own god the chief, trimurti implies the unity personified of the three principles of creation (Brahma), preservation (Vishnuf), and destruction (Siva). When represented, the trimurti is one body with three heads: in the middle that of Brahma, at its right that of Vishnuf, and at its left that of Siva. The symbol of the trimurti is the mystical syllable om, in which o is equivalent to a and u, and where a means Brahma, u means Vishnu, and m, means Siva.

## Trine Baptism[[@Headword:Trine Baptism]]

             A mode of administering the sacrament, which was so universal in the primitive Church that some entertain no doubt of its being derived: from apostolic tradition. The person baptized was thrice immersed, or water was thrice poured on him, in the name of the three persons of the Godhead. The reason of trine baptism was manifest: the three immersions showed the distinction of the three divine Persons, although the baptism was only one, in the name of the undivided Godhead— “one baptism for the remission of  sins.” Thus in baptism the unity of the Divine Nature and the distinction of the three Persons are clearly implied and set forth. The first who departed from this usage was Eunomius the Arian. Trine baptism was according to the fiftieth apostolical canon, the bishop or presbyter who baptized with one immersion being ordered to be deposed. In the 6th and 7th centuries one immersion in baptism was substituted by some in Spain for the ordinary rule of the Church, the Council of Toledo (A.D. 633, canon 6) allowing single immersion in Spain, to avoid schism; but this innovation lasted for only a short period, the early usage being restored, and remaining the rule of the Western Church. Single immersion has never been authorized by the Eastern Church. See Blunt, Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol. s.v.; Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 582.

## Trine-God Controversy[[@Headword:Trine-God Controversy]]

             In the churches over which Hincmar (q.v.), archbishop of Rheims, presided, he forbade the singing of the last words of a very ancient hymn- Te trina Deitas, unaque poscimus (“Of thee, trine Deity, yet one, we ask”) on the ground that this phraseology subverted the simplicity of the Divine Nature, and implied the existence of three Gods. The Benedictine monks would not obey this mandate-of Hincmar; and one of their number, Ratramnus, wrote in defense of a trine Deity. Godeschalcus, hearing of this dissension while in prison, sent forth a paper, in which he defended the cause of his fellow-monks. For this he was accused by Hincmar of Tritheism, and was confuted in a book written expressly for that purpose. But this controversy soon subsided; and, in spite of Hincmar's efforts, the words retained their place in the hymn. See Mosheim, Ch. Hist. bk. 5, ch. 2, p. 94.

## Trinitarian Brothers[[@Headword:Trinitarian Brothers]]

             or ORDER OF THE MOST HOLY TRINITY for the Redemption of Captives, was founded by St. John of Matha, who was born at Faucon, Provence, in 1154. When he first celebrated divine service, after his ordination, he beheld a vision of an angel in white, having a cross of red and blue on his breast, and his hands, crossed over each other, rested on the heads of two slaves who knelt on each side of him. He, with another holy man, Felix de Valois, arranged the institution of a new order for the redemption of slaves. They went to Rome, and received the approval of  Innocent III in 1198. They assumed the white habit, having on the breast a Greek cross of red and blue. They returned to France, and received from Gaucher de Chatillon lands in the province of Valois. The pope also gave them at Rome the church and convent of S. Maria della Navicella, on the Monte Celio. Honorius III confirmed their rule, and in 1267 Clement IV approved of a change in their rules permitting them to purchase meat and own horses. They had at one time two hundred and fifty convents in France, three in Spain, forty-three in England, fifty-two in Ireland, besides others in Portugal, Italy, Saxony, Hungary, and Bohemia. In 1594 the Barefooted branch of this order was begun by Jean Baptiste de la Conception in the convent of Valde. Spain. He was granted a bull by Clement VIII in 1598 to establish a reform in his order and lead them back to the ancient practice. The founders of the Trinitarians placed themselves under the protection of St. Radegunda, queen of Clothaire V of France, who afterwards took the religious habit and founded a monastery at Poitiers.) See Jameson, Leg. of Monastic Orders, p.217 sq.; Migne, Dict. des Ordres Relig. s.v.

## Trinitarian Sisters[[@Headword:Trinitarian Sisters]]

             This order was founded at Valence in 1615, and constituted a convent in 1696. They received letters patent from Louis in 1712, and were registered in Parliament in January, 1728. They established two hospitals, which were in 1802 devoted to the care of aged men and women. They have been quite flourishing since 1837. See Migne, Dict. des Ordres Relig. s.v.

## Trinitarians[[@Headword:Trinitarians]]

             A general name for all Christians who hold the doctrine of the divine Trinity (q.v.).

## Trinity[[@Headword:Trinity]]

             The doctrine of the Trinity in the godhead includes the three following particulars, viz. (a) There is only one God, one divine nature; (b) but in this divine nature there is the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as three (subjects or persons); and (c) these three-have equally, and in common with one another, the nature and perfection of supreme divinity. It was the custom in former times for theologians to blend their own  speculations and those of others with the statement of the Bible doctrine. It is customary now to exhibit first the simple doctrine of the Bible, and afterwards, in a separate part, the speculations of the learned respecting it.

I. The Biblical Doctrine. — It has always been allowed that the doctrine of the Trinity was not fully revealed before the time of Christ, and is clearly taught only in the New Test. Yet, while it is true (1) that if the New Test. did not exist we could not derive the doctrine of the Trinity from the Old- Test. alone, it is equally true (2) that by the manner of God's revelation of himself in the Old Test. the way was prepared for the more full disclosure of his nature that was afterwards made. But (3) respecting the intimate connection of these persons, or respecting other distinctions which belong to the doctrine of the Trinity, there is nothing said in the Old Test. While in each particular text allusion is made to a trinity or plurality in God, yet these texts are so many in number and so various in kind that they impress one with the opinion that such a plurality in God is indicated in the Old Test., though it is not fully developed or clearly defined.

(I.) The texts of the Old Test. may be arranged in the following classes:

1. Those giving the names of God in the plural form, and thus seeming to indicates a plurality of his nature, of which קְדוֹשַׁים אֲדֹנָי אֵֹלהַיםare cited as examples; but as these may be only the pluralis majestaticus of the Oriental languages, they afford no certain proof.

2. Texts in which God speaks of himself in the plural. The plural in many of these cases can be accounted for from the use of the plural nouns אֲדֹנָי אֵֹלהַים, etc. Philo thinks (De Opif. Mundi, p. 17) that in the expression “Let us make man” (Gen 1:26), God addresses the angels. It is not uncommon in Hebrew for kings to speak of themselves in the plural (1Ki 12:9; 2Ch 10:9; Ezr 4:18). In Isa 6:8 God asks, who will go for us (לָנוּ), where the plural form may be explained either as the pluralis majestaticus, or as denoting an assembly for consultation.

3. Texts in which יְהוָֹה(Jehovah) is distinguished from אֲלֹהַים(Elohim).These texts do not, however, furnish any decisive proof; for in the simplicity of ancient style the noun is often repeated instead of using the pronoun; and so, from Jehovah may mean from himself, etc. Further, the name אֵֹלהַים (Elohim) is sometimes given to earthly kings, and does  not, therefore, necessarily prove that the person to whom it is given must be of the divine nature.

4. Texts in which express mention is made of the Son of God and of the Holy Spirit.

(a.) Of the Son of God. — The principal text of this class is Psa 2:7, “Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee;” comp. Psa 72:1; Psa 89:27. This Psalm was understood by the Jews and by the writers of the New Test. to relate to the Messiah. But the name Son of God was not infrequently given to kings; it is not, therefore, nomen essentice, but dignitatis Messiance. The passage would then mean, “Thou art the king (Messiah) of my appointment; this day have I declared thee such.” In this psalm, therefore, the Messiah is rather exhibited as king, divinely appointed ruler and head of the Church, than as belonging to the divine nature.

(b.) Of the Holy Spirit. — There are many texts of this class, but none from which, taken by themselves, the personality of the Holy Spirit can be proved. In these texts the term Holy Spirit may mean (1) the divine nature in general; (2) particular divine attributes, as omnipotence, knowledge, or omniscience; (3) the divine agency, which is its more common meaning. Isa 48:16, “And now Jehovah (the Father) and his Spirit (Holy Ghost) hath sent me” (the Messiah), is supposed to teach the whole doctrine of the Trinity. But the expression “and his Spirit” is used by the prophets to mean the direct, immediate command of God. . To say, then, the Lord and his Spirit hath sent me is the same as to say, the Lord hath sent me by a direct, immediate command.

5. Texts in which three persons are expressly mentioned, or in which there is a clear reference to the number three (Num 6:24; Psa 33:6; Isa 6:3). But the repetition of the Word Jehovah in the one text is not an undeniable proof of the Trinity; and in the other, the word of his mouth means nothing more than his command; and in the last text the threefold repetition of the word holy may have been by three choirs, all uniting in the last words, “The whole earth is full of thy glory.”

Thus it appears that none of the passages cited from the Old Test. in proof of the Trinity are conclusive when taken by themselves; but, as was before stated, when they are all taken together, they convey the impression that at least a plurality in the godhead was obscurely indicated in the Jewish Scriptures.

(II.) Since we do not find in the Old Test. clear or decided proof upon this subject, we must now turn to the New Test. The texts relating to the doctrine of the Trinity may be divided into two classes — those in which the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are mentioned in connection, and those in which these three subjects are mentioned separately, and in which their nature and mutual relation are more particularly described.

1. The first class of texts, taken by itself, proves only that there are the three subjects named, and that there is a difference between them; that the Father in certain respects differs from the Son, etc.; but it does not prove, by itself, that all the three belong necessarily to the divine nature, and possess equal divine honor. In proof of this, the second class of texts must be adduced. The following texts are placed in this class:

Mat 18:18-20. This text, however, taken by itself, would not prove decisively either the personality of the three subjects mentioned, or their equality or divinity. For (a) the subject into which one is baptized is not necessarily a person, but may be a doctrine or religion. (b) The person in whom one is baptized is not necessarily God, as 1Co 1:13, “Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” (c) The connection of these three subjects does not prove their personality or equality. We gather one thing from the text, viz. that Christ considered the doctrine respecting Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as a fundamental doctrine of his religion, because he requires all his followers to be bound to a profession of it when admitted by baptism into the Church.

1Pe 1:2 : “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.” From what is here said of the Holy Spirit, it does not necessarily follow that he is a personal subject; nor, from the predicates here ascribed to Christ, that he is necessarily divine. This passage, therefore, taken by itself, is insufficient.

2Co 13:14, “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.” Here we might infer, from the parallelism of the third member of the passage with the two former, the personality of the Holy Spirit; but we could not justly infer that they possessed equal authority, or the same nature.

Joh 14:26 offers three different personal subjects, viz. the Comforter, the Father, and Christ; but it is not sufficiently proven from this passage  that these three subjects have equal divine honor, and belong to one divine nature.

Mat 3:16-17 has been considered a very strong proof-text for the whole doctrine of the Trinity. But though three personal subjects are mentioned, viz. the voice of the Father, the symbol of the Holy Spirit, and Christ, yet nothing is here said respecting their nature.

1Jn 5:7-8 are generally admitted to be spurious; and, even if allowed to be genuine, they do not determine the nature and essential connection of the three subjects mentioned.

2. We now turn to the second class of texts; viz. those in which the Father. Son, and Holy Ghost are separately mentioned, and in which their nature and mutual relation are taught. These texts prove (a) that the Son and Holy Spirit, according to the doctrine of the New Test., are divine, or belong to the one divine nature; and (b) that the three subjects are personal and equal.

(1.) The Deity of the Father. — When the term Father is applied to God, it often designates the whole godhead, or the whole divine nature; as θεὸς ὁ Πᾷτήρ,, 1Co 8:4-6; Joh 17:1-3. He is often called θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ, i.e. θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ, or θεὸς θεὸς ὅς ἐστι Πατήρ, as Gal 1:4, All the arguments, therefore, which prove the existence of God prove also the deity of the Father.

(2.) The Deity of Christ. — To prove the deity of Christ we present three classes of texts.

(a.) The following are the principal texts in which divine names are given to Christ:

Joh 1:1-2. Christ is here called ὁ Λόγος (the Word), which signified among the Jews and other ancient people, when applied to God, everything by which God reveals himself to men, and makes known to them his will. Hence those who made known the divine will to men were called by the Hellenists λόγοι. It was probably on this account that John declared Jesus to be the Logos which existed ἐν ἀρχῇ; that the Logos was with God, and the Logos Was God. In this passage the principal proof does not lie in the word Λόγος, nor even in the word θεός, which in a larger sense is often applied to kings and earthly rulers; but to what is predicated of the Λόγος,  viz. that he existed from eternity with God, that the world was made by him, etc.

Joh 20:28. Here Thomas, convinced at last that Christ was actually risen from the dead, thus addresses him, “My Lord and my God.” This must not be considered an exclamation of surprise or wonder, as some have understood it; for it is preceded by the phrase ειπεν αὐτῷ, he said this to him.” Thomas probably remembered what Jesus had often said respecting his superhuman origin (Joh 5:8; Joh 5:10; Joh 5:17), and he now saw it all confirmed by his resurrection from the dead.

Php 2:6, “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” There it is said of Christ that he is ἴσα θεῷ, Deo cequalis; not ὅμοιος θεῷ, ἀντίθεος, θεοείκελος, similis Deo-terms applied by Homer to kings and heroes. The term ἴσος θεῷ, on the contrary, is never applied to a finite or created being. Hence the Jews (John 18) considered it as blasphemy in Christ to make himself ἴσον θεῷ.

Joh 10:28-30, “I and my Father are one.” These words are not to be understood to denote so much an equality of nature as unanimity of feeling and purpose. Still the passage is quite remarkable; because Christ professes to do his work in common with his Father; and that is more than any man, prophet, or even angel is ever said in the Bible to do. That being one with God, therefore, which Jesus here asserts for himself is something peculiar, which belongs to him only as he is a being of a higher nature.

Tit 2:13, “We expect the glorious appearance,” etc. In this passage, since τοῦ is omitted before σωτῆρος, both μεγάλου θεοῦ and σωτῆρος must be construed in apposition with Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Moreover, ἐπιφάνεια is the word by which the solemn coming of Christ is appropriately designated.

In some of the texts in which Christ is called the Son of God, the name is used in three different senses [1] Messiah or king, a title very commonly given to the Messiah by the Jews (see Mat 16:16; Luk 9:20; Mat 27:40; Luk 23:35; see also Mar 13:32; 1Co 15:28); [2] the higher nature of Christ (Joh 5:17 sq.; Joh 10:30; Joh 10:33; Joh 20:31; Rom 1:3-4); [3] he is also called the Son of God (Luk 1:35), to designate the immediate power of God in the miraculous production of his, human nature.

(b.) Texts in which divine attributes and works are ascribed to Christ. It is not necessary to find texts to prove that all the divine attributes are ascribed to Christ. These attributes cannot be separated; and if one of them is ascribed to Christ in the Bible, the conclusion is inevitable that he must possess all the rest. The following attributes and works are distinctly ascribed to Christ in the Scriptures:

[i.]

 Eternity (Joh 1:1; Joh 8:58; Joh 17:5; Col 1:17).

[ii.]

 Creation and preservation of the world (Joh 1:1-3; Joh 1:10; Col 1:16; Heb 1:10 [where Psa 102:26 is quoted and applied to Christ]; Heb 2:10).

[iii.]

 Omnipotence is ascribed to Christ (Php 3:21); omniscience (Mat 11:27). He is described as the searcher of hearts, etc. (1Co 4:5).

(c.) Texts in which divine honor is required for Christ. The following are the principal texts of this class; Joh 5:23, All men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father;” Act 1:24; Act 7:59; 2Co 12:8, where Christ is approached in prayer; and those in which the apostles refer to Christ the texts of the Old Test. that speak of the honor and worship of God, e.g. Heb 1:6 from Psa 97:7; also Rom 14:11 from Isa 45:3; Php 2:10; 2Co 5:8-11; 2Ti 4:17-18.

(3.) The third point in the discussion of this doctrine is the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit; for a full discussion of which SEE HOLY GHOST.

II. History of the Doctrine. — Respecting the manner in which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost make one God, the Scripture teaches nothing, since the subject is of such a nature as not to admit of its being explained to us. It is therefore to be expected that theologians should differ widely in their opinions respecting it, and that in their attempts to illustrate it they should have pursued various methods.

1. As Held by the Primitive Christians. — For the first age the Scripture is sufficient evidence of the Christians' practice. For, not to insist upon the precept of honoring the Son as they honored the Father; or the form of baptism, in which they were commanded to join the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in one act of worship; or the injunction to believe in the Son as they  believed in the Father, let reference be made only to their example and practice. Stephen, the protomartyr, when he was sealing his confession with his blood, prayed to Christ, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,” and “Lord, lay not this sin to their charge” (Act 7:59-60). Paul asserts that he baptized only in the name of Christ (1Co 1:13). Notice also his constant use of the name of Christ in invocation. There is the well known fact that the early believers were known as those who called on the name of Christ (Act 9:14; Act 9:21; 1Co 1:2; 2Ti 2:22).

2. As Held in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries. — Towards the end of the 1st century, and during the 2d, many learned men came over both from Judaism and paganism to Christianity. These brought with them into the Christian schools of theology their Platonic ideas and phraseology, and they especially borrowed from the philosophical writings of Philo. As was very natural, they confined themselves, in their philosophizing respecting the Trinity, principally to the Logos; connecting the same ideas with the name λόγος as had been done before by Philo and other Platonists. Differing on several smaller points, they agreed perfectly in the following general views, viz.: the Logos existed before the creation of the world; he was begotten, however, by God, and sent forth from him. By this Logos the Neo-Platonists understood the infinite understanding of God, belonging from eternity to his nature as a power, but that, agreeably to the divine will, it began to exist out of the divine nature. It is therefore different from God, and yet, as begotten of him, is entirely divine. By means of this Logos they supposed that God at first created, and now preserves and governs, the universe. Their views respecting the Holy Spirit are far less clearly expressed, though most of them considered him a substance emanating from the Father and the Son, to whom, on this account, divinity must be ascribed. These philosophical Christians asserted rather the divineness of the Son and Spirit, and their divine origin, than their equal deity with the Father. Justin Martyr expressly declares that the Son is in God what the understanding (νοῦς) is in man, and that the Holy Spirit is that divine power to act and execute which Plato calls ἀρετή. With this representation Theophilus of Antioch, Clemens of Alexandria, and Origen substantially agree. According to Tertullian, the persons of the Trinity are gradus, formae species unius Dei. Thus we find that the belief in the subordination of the-Son to the Father, for which Arianism is the later name, was commonly received by most of those fathers of the 2d and  3d centuries who assented, in general, to the philosophy of Plato. Another class of learned, philosophizing Christians substituted another theory on the subject of the Trinity, which, however, was nonetheless formed rather from their philosophical ideas than from, the instructions of the Bible. Among the writers of this class was Praxeas, of the 2rd century, who contended that the Father, Son, and Spirit' were not distinguished from each other as individual subjects; but that God was called Father, so far as he was creator and governor of the world; Son (Λόγος), so far as he had endowed the man Jesus with extraordinary powers, etc. He, in accordance with this view, denied any higher, preexisting nature in Christ; and with him agreed Artemon, Noetus, and Beryllus of Bostra. Sabellius regarded the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as merely describing different divine works, and various modes of divine revelation.

In the following table the writers of the first three centuries on the subject of the Trinity are ranged according to their opinions:

Catholics

Justin Martyr

Theophilus of Antioch

Athenagoras

Irenaeus

Clemens Alexandrinus

Tertullian

Origen

Dionysius Alexandrinus

Cyprian

Novatian

Dionysius Romanus

Monarchians Unitarians

Theodotus

Artemon

Paul of Samosata

Monarchians Patripassians

Praxeas

Noetus

Beryillus of Bostra

Sabellius

Among the terms introduced in the discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity during this period the following are the most common, viz.

(1.) Τρίας, introduced by Theophilus of Antioch in the 2d century, and often used by Origen in the 3d century. Tertullian translated it into Latin by the word trinitas, of which the English word is an exact rendering.

(2.) Οὐσία, ὑπόστασις. These terms were not sufficiently distinguished from each other by the Greek fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, and were often used by them as entirely synonymous. By the word ὑπόστασις, the older Greek fathers understood only a really existing subject, in opposition to a nonentity, or to a merely ideal existence; in which sense they also not infrequently used the word οὐσία.

(3.) Persona. This word was first employed by Tertullian, and by it he means an individual, a single being; distinguished from others by certain peculiar qualities, attributes, and relations; and so he calls Pater, Filius, Spiritus Sanctus, tres personae (three persons), at the same time that he ascribes to them unitas substantiac (unity of substance), because they belong to the divine nature (οὐσία) existing from eternity.

We call attention to the following as shedding light upon the practice of the Church during this period. Pliny, a judge under Trajan, in the beginning of the 2d century took the confessions of some accused Christians, and says, “They declared that they were used to meet on a certain day before it was light, and, among other parts of their worship, sing a hymn to Christ as their God.” Polycarp (Ep. ad Philip. n. 12) joins God the Father and the Son together in his prayers for grace and benediction upon men. Justin Martyr answering, in his Second Apology, the charge of atheism brought against them by the heathen answers. “That they worshipped and adored still the God of righteousness and his Son, as also the Holy Spirit of prophecy.” Athenagoras answers the charge of atheism after the same manner. Similar testimony is afforded by the writings of Lucian the heathen, Theophilus of Antioch. Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Novatian, and others, illustrating the practice of the Church in paying divine honors to the Son and Holy Spirit.

3. The Trinity as Held in the 4th Century. — It had already been settled, by many councils held during the 3d century, and in the symbols which they had adopted in opposition to Sabellius and Paul of Samosata, that the Father must be regarded as really distinguished from the Son, and the Holy Spirit as distinguished from both; The relation, however, of the three persons of the Trinity, and the question in what the distinction between them properly consists, not having been discussed, these subjects were left undetermined by the decisions of councils and symbols. Different opinions prevailed, and learned men were left to express themselves according to their convictions.

Origen and his followers maintained, against the Sabellians, that there were in God τρεῖς ὑποστάσείς' (three persons), but, μία οὐσία (one substance) common to the three. Few had as yet taught the entire equality of these three persons, but had allowed, in accordance with their Platonic principles, that the Son, though belonging to the divine nature, was yet subordinate to the Father. In the beginning of the 4th century, Alexander of Alexandria, and Athanasius, his successor, attempted to unite the hypotheses of Origen and Sabellius, thinking that the truth lay between the two extremes. Athanasius stated the personal distinction of the Father and the Son to be that the former was without beginning and unbegotten, while the latter was eternally begotten by the Father, and equally eternal with the Father and the Spirit.

Arius, about 320, disputed the doctrine taught by Alexander, viz. ἐν τριάδι μονάδα ειναι, and so favored the Sabellian theory. As the controversy proceeded, Arius declared, in opposition to Sabellius, that there were not only three persons in God, but that these were unequal in glory (δόξαις οὐχ ὅμοιαι); that the Father alone was supreme God (ἀγέννητος), and God in a higher sense than the Son; that the Son derived his divinity from the Father before the creation of the world, and that he owed his existence to the divine will; and that the Holy Spirit was likewise divine in a sense inferior to that in which the Father is so. In opposition to all the Arian, and various other theories, Athanasius and his followers zealously contended. They succeeded, at a general council at Nice in 325, in having a symbol adopted which was designed to be thenceforward the only standard of orthodoxy. This symbol was confirmed by the council held at Constantinople in 381, under Theodosius the Great. The distinctions established at Nice and Constantinople were often reenacted at various succeeding councils. Many urged, in opposition, that tritheism (q.v.) was  the inevitable consequence of the admission of these distinctions, but they, nevertheless, remained in force. The council adopted the word ὁμοούσιος (consubstantiality), explaining themselves thus: The Son was not created, but eternally generated from the nature of the Father, and is therefore in all respects equal to him, and no more different, as to nature, from God than a human son is from his father, and so cannot be separated from the Father. All that they meant to teach by the use of this word was that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit had the divine nature and divine perfections so in common that one did not possess more and another less; without asserting, however, that there were three Gods; in short, that in the Godhead there were tres distincti, unitate essentice conjuncti. SEE CREED, NICENE.

The characteristics by which the persons of the Trinity may be distinguished from each other under this view belong to two classes.

(1.) Internal (“characteres interni”). These are distinctive signs arising from the internal relation of the three persons in the Godhead to each other, and indicating the mode of the divine existence. The following distinctions are derived from the names Father, Son, and Spirit, and from some other Bible phraseology:

(a.) The Father generates the Son, and emits the Holy Spirit, generat Filium, spirat Spiritum Sanctum; and possesses, therefore, as his personal attributes, generatio activa and spiratio activa.

(b.) The Son is generated by the Father — Filii est generari non generare. The Son, therefore, possesses as his personal attributes jiliatio, generatio passiva; and also, as he is supposed to emit the Spirit in conjunction with the Father, spiratio activa.

(c.) The Holy Spirit neither generates nor is generated, but proceeds from the Father and the Son-Spiritus Sanctus est, nec generare nec generari, sed procedere. In regard to the Holy Spirit, there was nothing decided, during the first three centuries, by ecclesiastical authority respecting his nature, the characteristics of his person, or his relation to the Father and the Son. Nor was anything more definite, with regard to his nature and his relation to the other persons of the Trinity, than what has already been stated, established by the council at Nice, or even by that at Constantinople. To believe in the Holy Ghost — τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, and ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενονwas all that was required in the symbol there adopted. But there were many, especially  in the Latin Church, who maintained that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but also from the Son. They appealed to Joh 16:13, and to the texts where the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ, e.g. Rom 8:9. To this doctrine the Greeks were, for the most part, opposed, because they did not find that the New Test. ever expressly declared that the Spirit proceeded from the Son. It prevailed, however, more and more in the Latin Church; and when in the 5th and 6th centuries the Arians urged it as an argument against the equality of Christ with the Father, that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father only, and not from the Son, the Catholic churches began to hold more decidedly that the Holy Spirit proceeded from both and insert the adjunct Filioque after Patre in the Symbolusm Nicceno-Constantinopolitaium.

(2.) External (“characteres externi”). These are characteristics of the persons of the Trinity arising from the works of the Deity relating to objects extrinsic to itself, and called opera externa, sive ad extra. They are twofold:

(a.) Opera Dei aeconomica, those institutions which God has founded for the salvation of the human race. The Father sent his Son to redeem men (Joh 3:16-17), and gives or sends the Holy Spirit (Joh 14:26). The Son is sent from the Father, etc., and sends the Holy Spirit from the Father (Joh 15:26). The Holy Spirit formed the human nature of Christ (Luk 1:35) and anointed it (Act 10:38), i.e. endowed it with gifts; and is sent into the hearts of men, and carries them forward towards moral perfection.

(b.) Opera Dei attributiva, such divine works as are common to the three persons, but which are frequently ascribed to one of the three. To the Father are ascribed the decree to create the world, the actual creation, and the preservation of it. To the Son, also, the creation, preservation, and government of the world are ascribed; also the raising of the dead and judgment. To the Holy Spirit are ascribed the immediate revelation of the divine will to the prophets, the continuation of the great work of salvation commenced by Christ, and the communication and application to men of the means of grace.

4. History of the Doctrine since the Reformation. Nearly all the writers upon the subject of the Trinity since the Reformation belong to some one of the general classes already mentioned. We present several theories.

(1.) Some have attempted to illustrate and explain this doctrine by philosophy; and not a few have gone so far as to think they could prove the Trinity a priori, and that reason alone furnishes sufficient arguments for its truth. Others, again, looked to reason for nothing more than an illustration of this factor of the divine existence. In the latter class may be placed Philip Melancthon, who, in his Loci Theologici, thus explained the Trinity: “God from his infinite understanding produces thought, which is the image of himself. To this thought he imparted personal existence, which, bearing the impress of the Father, is his likeness and resemblance: and hence called by John λόγος. This illustration of the Trinity was received without offence or suspicion, until the heresy, which lurks beneath it was detected and exposed by Flacius. The latest attempt to explain the Trinity in this manner may be found in the Berliner Monatsschrift, Sept. 1790, § 280, in an article written by Schwab of Stuttgart, who refers to the accidents of space, viz. length, breadth, and thickness, as an illustration of the Trinity. Among those who supposed that the Trinity could be mathematically proved were Bartholomew Keckerman, in his Systema Theologicum; Peter Poiret, and Daries, who published an essay In qua Pluralitas Pe'sonaarum in Deitate Methodo Mathematicorum, Demonstratur (Leovardiae, 1735, 8vo).

(2.) Others have expressed themselves so boldly on the subject of the Trinity that they have seemed to approximate towards tritheism; in which. class we may mention Matthew Gribaldus of Padua, in the 16th century, who maintained that the divine nature consisted of three equally eternal spirits, between whom, however, he admitted a distinction in respect to rank and perfections.

(3.) Some modern writers have inclined to adopt the Sabellian theory, among whom were Servetus (q.v.), Grotius, Silvae Sacrae; Stephen Nye, Doctrine of the Trinity (Lond. 1701). In this class we place the hypothesis of Le Clerc, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit designate the different modifications of the divine understanding, and the plans which God forms. This is the error into which Weigel and Jacob Bohme fell. Many of the modern German theologians have so explained the Trinity as to lose the idea of three ‘divine persons, for which they have substituted either three distinct powers or attributes (as Meier, Seller, Claudius, and Tollner), or a threefold agency in God-three eternal actions distinct from each other (as S. G. Schlegel, Kant, Tieftrunk, Daub, Schelling, De Wette, and Fessler).

(4.) The Aian theory has also found advocates among Protestant theologians, especially those of the 18th century (e.g. Whiston, Harwood, and Wettstein); but the system which has met with the most approbation is that more refined subordinationism taught by Samuel Clarke, Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity (Lond. 1712).

(5.) The Socinians or Photinians. The founders of this sect were Lelius Socinus and his nephew Faustus Socinus (q.v.), who brought over considerable numbers to their doctrine in Poland and Transylvania.

(6.) A new theory on the Trinity was proposed by Dr. Urlsperger, Kurzgefasstes System seines Vortrags von Gottes Dreyeinigkeit (Augsburg, 1777, 8vo). He endeavored to unite the three theories — the Arian, Sabellian, and Nicene-by making a distinction between trinitas essentialis, the internal threefold distinction necessarily belonging to the divine nature, and trinitas aeconomica, the three persons revealed to us in the work of redemption.

It is proper to say that “the conclusion is obvious that, while we are taught by the Scriptures to believe in three equal subjects in the Godhead, who are described as persons, we are still unable to determine in what manner or in what sense these three have the divine nature so in common that there is only one God” (Knapp, Christ. Theology, § 34-44). SEE PERSON.

III. Practical Value of the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity. — The idea of a triune being — Father, Son, and Holy Ghost — is not by any means to be considered as separate from that of the nature and attributes of God. This apparent tritheism can be considered as the conclusion of true deism, and as a safeguard in the most momentous questions. Polytheism, pantheism, and dualism have been to some extent employed to vivify and prove the truth of religion; but we would present the practical advantages of the doctrine of the Trinity in quite a different manner; not as serving merely to prove another proposition without being also true in itself, but as aiding us in arriving at the knowledge of God's nature with an efficacy which is essentially inherent to its objective and permanent recognition. God may be considered either as not true or lofty enough, or not good and holy enough, or not essentially active enough; these may be considered the possible faults of a given system of deism. So long, then, as it distinguishes only between God and the world, and not between God himself, it retains always a tendency either to return to pantheism or to deny the existence of  an absolute being. An absolute safeguard against atheism, polytheism, pantheism, or dualism cannot be found except in the doctrine of the Trinity; for the distinction existing between the Divine Being and the world is better made and observed as an absolute one by those who worship the triune God than by those who do not. Those monotheistic systems which were the most strenuously opposed to the idea of a Trinity, such as Judaism and Mohammedanism, have, by reason of their dryness and emptiness, led to the grossest pantheism.

From the doctrine that the Word, who was God, became flesh, follows the necessity of considering God as personally united with sinless humanity, but at the same time, also, the necessity of drawing a clear distinction between the divine essence and mere human nature. Faith in the everlasting holy love, which is God, can only be rendered theoretically and practically perfect by the knowledge of the perfect, eternal object of the self- consciousness and love of God; i.e. by the thought of the love of God for his only begotten Son. Finally, the idea of the fullness of God's creative and imparting nature can only be preserved from diminishing by the Trinitarian doctrine of a Holy Ghost. Whatever difficulties may result from the Christian idea of different divine persons, when brought into connection with the personality of the divine essence, the apparent contradiction is yet susceptible of a solution; even when we do not consider that the Primitive Church did not, for a long time, recognize these three persons but as only ἰδιότητες, ὑποστάσεις, etc.

The Latin Church alone has, since Augustine, sanctioned the expression personce in the Symbolum Quicunque. Augustine himself said, yet, “Tres personse, si ita dicendae sunt.” Some consider the Trinity as essential to constitute the perfect personality, and employ the metaphysics of consciousness as an analogical proof thereof (see Schneider, Colestin, drei geistliche Gesprdche i. d. Personen d. Gottheit [1834], 1). Others refuse to recognize the real personality of God in any but one of the so-called hypostases: namely in the Logos, the Son. Such is Swedenborg. Others still hold peculiar opinions. At any rate, we are obliged, according to the clear sense of Scripture, to seek not only the Trias in the subjectivity of the representation, nor exclusively in the economy of revelation, but also recognize that immediate faith does here contain within itself the germ of endless speculation; not only because every theological system of antiquity, from the time when, as reflecting gnosis, it rose above the myths, shows certain higher theological ideas (in the sense in which Nitzsch has  presented it in a historical and critical manner in his Theol. Stud. ch. 1), nor merely because the Christian theologians of all times have made a certain rational understanding of this mystery possible and found it necessary. It is even essentially necessary for the Biblical theologian to recognize in the notion of the Logos-who is with God and is God, the procreative image of God, the inmost spirit of God who knew God-the elements of essential, immanent Trinity. For those only retain the trace of Biblical theology who, in all attempts at explaining it, keep in view the notion of the self- knowledge and self-love of God, or of the distinction between the self- concealing and self-revealing God. Twesten has latterly greatly perfected the philosophy of the doctrine of the Trinity, in its history and in its essence; first by placing the Trinity κατὰ τὸν ἀποκαλύψεως τρόπον, as subordinate to the analogical and philosophical interpretation; but then, again, κατὰ τρόπον ὑπάρξεως, and shows the connection between both interpretations. In the first case, he seeks a mediation between the ens absolutum and the finite world which yet reveals the infinite, and this he finds in the primordial, creative thought of God. But revelation cannot take place except towards discerning beings, and finite beings cannot know God save through God. This argument presents the three notions of God, Logos, and Spirit, yet forming still but one godhead. Such as God reveals himself, such, however, he is. This leads us to another consideration, viz. that the ego, in order to possess a real, living personality, must not only become dually contradistinguished within itself, but also, by a third process, reflectively act on itself as a third subject, and be conscious of itself as being a perfect image of self. This manner of treating this mystery, by analogy, is neither accidental nor gratuitous, since, according to Scripture, human nature is also analogous to the divine. Tertullian and Augustine had themselves established their theories already on this basis.

IV. Literature. — This is immensely copious. We can here refer only to a few leading authorities. See Baur, Hist. of Doctrines; Burris, The Trinity (Chicago, 1874); Cunningham, Hist. Theology, 1, 267; Lamson, Origin of Trinity; Lessing, Das Christenthum und die Vernunft (Berlin, 1784, 8vo); Marheinecke, Grundlehren der christl. Dogm. p. 129,370 (ibid. 1819); Mattison, The Trinity and Modern Arianism (18mo); Morus, Commentary; Mosheim, Leben Servet's (Helmst. 1748, 8vo); Meier, Historical Development of the Trinity; Neander, 2, 2, 891; Sailer, Theorie des Weisen (Spottes, 1781, 8vo); Walch, Historia Controversice Graecorum Latinorumque de Processione Spiritus Sancti (Jenae, 1751, 8vo); Ziegler,  Geschichtsentwickelung des Dogma vom heiligen Geist. For further literature see Biblioth. Sac. (184473), index to vol. 1-30; Dantz, Wörterbuch der theol. Literatur, s.v. “Trinitit;” Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. col. 268, 1446, 1719-1722; Poole, Index to Period. Lit. s.v. “Trinity.”

## Trinity Sunday[[@Headword:Trinity Sunday]]

             the octave day of the feast of Pentecost. The introduction of this day into the calendar is of comparatively recent date, it being established by pope Benedict XI, A.D. 1305. It is probable that the zeal of many Christians against the use of images in the 8th and 9th centuries may have been the first cause of the appointment of a distinct day for meditating upon the nature of the Holy Trinity in unity, or the one true God, as distinguished from all idols. The reason for its late introduction is that in the creed of the Church, and in its psalms, hymns, and doxologies, great prominence was given to this doctrine, and it was thought that there was no need to set apart a particular day for that which was done every day.

## Trinity, Fraternity of the[[@Headword:Trinity, Fraternity of the]]

             a religious society instituted at Rome by Philip Neri in 1548. They had charge of the pilgrims who were constantly coming to Rome from all parts of the world. Pope Paul IV gave them the Church of St. Benedict, near which they built a large hospital, and in which there was also a college of twelve priests for the instruction of pilgrims.

## Trinity, Heathen Notions Of[[@Headword:Trinity, Heathen Notions Of]]

             In examining the various heathen philosophies and mythologies, we find clear evidence of a belief in a certain sort of trinity, and yet something very different from the Trinity of the Bible.

In the Egyptian mythology, the powers of the Supreme Being as the producer, the producing, and the produced were symbolized by deities who were respectively father, mother, and child of each other. Every Egyptian town had its local triad, but the most famous was the great Theban triad of Amen-ra, Maut, and Khousu. Sometimes the king himself, as a god, made the third member of the triad. These combinations of divine properties must not be confounded with the dogma of a trinity either of creator, preserver, and destroyer, as in Hindû mythology, or of Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of the Christian faith. The Babylonian mythology offers a trinity, each member of the triad having his own wife or consort. At the head of this trinity stands Ann, representing abstract divinity. He appears as an original principle; the primeval chaos, the god of time, and the world- uncreated matter issuing from the fundamental principle of all things. A companion deity with Anu is Hea, god of the sea and of Hades. He is lord of generation and of all human beings; he animated matter and rendered it fertile, and inspired the universe with life. The third member of this triad was Bel (Elu, Enu, Kaptu), the demiurges and ruler of the organized universe. There were also second and third trinities descending from the first, but becoming more and more defined in character, and assuming a decidedly sidereal aspect.

The system of Plato may be thus stated: God first produced the ideal world, i.e. his infinite understanding conceived of the existence of the world, and formed the plan of creation. The real world was then formed after this ideal world as its model; and this was done by uniting the soul of the world with matter, by which the world became an animated, sensitive, rational creature guided, pervaded, and held together by this rational soul. The three principles of Plato were (a) the Supreme God, whom he calls Πατήρ; (b) the divine understanding, which he calls νοῦς, λόγος, σωτήρ,  σοφία; and (c) the soul of the world. These views are developed in his Timceus, etc. The Neo-Platonists eagerly embraced these ideas of Plato, and during the 2nd and 3rd centuries seemed to labor to outdo one another in explaining, defending, and more fully developing them. They not only widely differ from Plato, but often disagree among themselves in their mode of thinking and in their phraseology.

While the Jews who resided in Palestine were satisfied with their Pharisao- Rabbinic theology, and looked for their Messiah as a religious reformer, this was not the case with those residing elsewhere, who had been educated under the influence of the Grecian philosophy. These abandoned the expectation of a future Messiah, or regarded his kingdom as entirely of a moral nature. Among them the theory of the λόγος is found as early as the 1st century. The λόγος they regarded as existing before the Creation, and as the instrument through whom God made all things. See Knapp, Christ. Theol. p. 145 sq.; Lenormant, Chald. Magic, ch. 9; Smith, Chald. Account of Genesis; Tholuck, Die speculative Trinitdtslehre der neuern Orientalen (Berlin, 1826,8vo).

## Trinius, Johann Anton[[@Headword:Trinius, Johann Anton]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 6, 1722. He studied at Leipsic, Helmstadt, and Halle; was in 1748 assistant minister at Braunroda, in the county of Mansfeld, Saxony, and died at Eisleben, May 3, 1784. He published, Schediasmai Hiistoricum de Conjugiis Proselytorum Judaicorum (Helmstidlt, 1744): — Diatribe Historico- apologetica de Digamia Clericorum quibusdam Exosa (1746): — De  Pathopatridalgia Sanctorum (Rostock, 1752): — Theologisches Worterbuch (Leipsic, 1770), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:375, 500, 856. (B.P.)

## Triphysites[[@Headword:Triphysites]]

             (from τρεῖς, three, and φύσεις, natures), those divines who, at the fourteenth and fifteenth councils of Toledo, A.D. 684, 688, carried their opposition to the Monophysites and Monothelites to such an extreme that they declared a belief not only in Christ's distinct divine and human natures, but also in a third nature resulting from the union of the two.

## Triplet[[@Headword:Triplet]]

             a window of three lights. Many such occur in the First Pointed style, the center light being usually longer or more elevated than the two side lights.

## Tripolis[[@Headword:Tripolis]]

             (ἡ Τρίπολις), the Greek name of a city of great commercial importance, which served at one time as a point of federal union for Aradus, Sidon, and Tyre (hence the name the threefold city), which each had here its special quarter. What its Phoenician name was is unknown; but it seems not impossible that it was Kadytis, and that this was really the place captured by Necho, of which Herodotus speaks (2, 159; 3, 5). Kadytis is the Greek form of the Syrian Kedutha, “the holy,” a name of which a relic still seems to survive in the Nahr-Kadish, a river that runs through Tarabalus, the modern representative of Tripolis. All ancient federations had for their place of meeting some spot consecrated to a common deity, and just to the south of Tripolis was a promontory which went by the name of Θεοῦ πρόσωπον.

It was at Tripolis that, in the year B.C. 351, the plan was concocted for the simultaneous revolt of the Phoenician cities and the Persian dependencies in Cyprus against the Persian king Ochus. Although aided by a league with Nectanebus, king of Egypt, this attempt failed, and in the sequel a great part of Sidon was burned and the chief citizens destroyed. Perhaps the importance of Tripolis was increased by this misfortune of its neighbor, for soon after, when Alexander invaded Asia, it appears as a port of the first order. After the battle of Issus, some of the Greek officers in Darius's service retreated thither, and not only found ships enough to carry themselves and eight thousand soldiers away, but a number over and above, which they burned in order to preclude the victor from an  immediate pursuit of them (Arrian, 2, 13). The destruction of Tyre by Alexander, like that of Sidon by Ochus, would naturally tend rather to increase than diminish the importance of Tripolis as a commercial port. When Demetrius Soter, the son of Seleucus, succeeded in wresting Syria from the young son of Antiochus (B.C. 161), he landed there and made the place the base of his operations. It is this circumstance to which allusion is made in the only passage in which Tripolis is mentioned in the Bible (2Ma 14:1).

The prosperity of the city, so far as appears, continued down to the middle of the 6th century of the Christian aera. Dionysius Periegetes applies to it the epithet λιπαρήν in the 3rd century. In the Peutinrge Table (which probably was compiled in the reign of the emperor Theodosius), it appears on the great road along the coast of Phoenicia, and at Orthosia (the next station to it northwards) the roads which led respectively into Mesopotamia and Cilicia branched off from one another. The possession of a good harbor in so important a point for land traffic doubtless combined with the richness of the neighboring mountains in determining the original choice of the site, which seems to have been a factory for the purposes of trade established by the three great Phoenician cities. Each of these held a portion of Tripolis surrounded by a fortified wall, like the Western nations at the Chinese ports; but in A.D. 543 it was laid in ruins by the terrible earthquake which happened in the month of July of that year, and overthrew Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, and Byblus as well. On this occasion the appearance of the coast was much altered. A large portion of the promontory Theuprosopon (which in the Christian times had its name, from motives of piety, changed to Lithoprosopon) fell into the sea, and, by the natural breakwater it constituted, created a new port, able to contain a considerable number of large vessels. The ancient Tripolis was finally destroyed by the sultan El-Mansur in A.D. 1289, and the modern Tarabalus is situated a couple of miles distant to the east, and is no longer a port. El- Myna, which is perhaps on the site of the ancient Tripolis, is a small fishing village. Tarabalus contains a population of fifteen or sixteen thousand inhabitants, and is the center of one of the four pashalics of Syria. It exports silk, tobacco, galls, and oil, grown in the lower parts of the mountain at the foot of which it stands, and performs, on a smaller scale, the part which was formerly taken by Tripolis as the entry point for the productions of a most fertile region (Diod. Sic. 16:41; Strabo, 16:2; Vossius ad Melam, 1, 12; Theophalnes, Chronographia, sub anno 6043). For the modern place, see Pococke, 2, 146 sq.; Maundrell, p. 26;  Burckhardt, p. 163 sq.; Porter, Handbook, p. 542; Badeker, Palestine, p. 509 sq. (where a map is given). SEE PHOENICIA.

## Triptych[[@Headword:Triptych]]

             a picture with two folding-doors, set over altars. The center panel usually contains the chief subject. In the illustration (from the pencil of Mr. A. Welby Pugin) the triptych is a kind of cupboard with folding-doors, containing a throned figure of the Virgin Mary crowned, and holding her divine child in her lap. A figure of Peter on one side and of Paul on the other are painted on the inner panels of the doors.

## Triquetral[[@Headword:Triquetral]]

             (three-cornered), a censer use by Bishop Andrewes, in which the clerk put incense at the reading of the finite lesson.

## Trisacramentarians[[@Headword:Trisacramentarians]]

             a controversial name given to those reformers who maintained that there are three sacraments necessary to salvation, viz. baptism, the Lord's supper, and absolution. This opinion was held by some Lutherans at, Leipsic, and was, authoritatively set forth as a doctrine of the Church, of England in the Institution of a Christian Man (1562).

## Trisagion[[@Headword:Trisagion]]

             (τρίσαγιον, thrice holy) was so called because of the thrice repeating “Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts,” in imitation of the seraphim in the vision of Isaiah. The original of this hymn was “Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts! heaven and earth are full of thy glory, who art blessed forever. Amen.” Thus it is in the Constitutions, and frequently in Chrysostom. Afterwards the Church added some words to it, and sang it in this form: ῞Αγιος ὁ θεός, ἃγιος ἴσχυρος, ἃγιως ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς (“Holy God, holy Mighty, holy Immortal, have mercy upon us”). The hymn is attributed to the patriarch Proclus, in the 4th century. Theodosius the younger ordered it to be sung in the liturgy, after his vision of a child chanting it during an earthquake at Constantinople. Later still, by Anastasius the emperor, or by Peter Enapheus, bishop of Antioch, the following words were added: ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δἰ ἡμᾶς, (“that was  crucified for us”). This was done to oppose the heresy of the Theopaschites (q.v.), which was, in effect, to say that the whole Trinity suffered, because this hymn was commonly applied to the whole Trinity. To avoid this inconvenience, Calandio, bishop of Antioch, in the time of Zeno the emperor, made another addition to it of the words “Christ our King” reading it thus: “Holy God, holy Mighty, holy Immortal, Christ our King, that wast crucified for us, have mercy on us.” These additions occasioned much confusion in the Eastern Church, while the Constantinopolitans and Western Church stiffly rejected them. It was chiefly sung in the middle of the communion service, though sometimes it was used on other occasions. After the preface this hymn was always sung, and, according to Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and the second Council of Vaison, also at all masse mamain lenten, or of the dead. — Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 14 ch. 2, § 3.

## Trisantia[[@Headword:Trisantia]]

             a mediaeval term for (1) a cloister, or (2) a place of retreat for religious persons where meditations are made. — Lee. Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.

## Triscilidee[[@Headword:Triscilidee]]

             a sect of Sabellian heretics mentioned by Philaster (Hcer. c. xciii), Augustine (Hrer. 100. 74), and Predestinatus (Haer. 100. 74) as maintaining the opinion that the divine nature is composed of three parts, one of which is named the Father, the second part the Son, and the third the Holy Ghost; and that the union of these three parts constitutes the Trinity. Philaster, in condemning this heresy, uses expressions very similar to some in the Athalnasian hymn, “Ergo est vera persona Patris quae misit Filium, et est vera persona quae advenit de Patrae est vera persona Spiritus quae a Filio et Patre missa est.”

## Tritheim (Lat. Trithemius), Johann[[@Headword:Tritheim (Lat. Trithemius), Johann]]

             a German historian and theologian, was born at Trittenheim, near Treves, Feb. 1, 1462, being the only son of John of Heidenberg and Elizabeth of Longway. His early education was conducted in a desultory manner, but in 1482 he entered the Benedictine abbey at Spanheim, where the next year he was elected abbot, and administered its affairs with great zeal. In 1506 he exchanged this position for a similar one in the abbey of Wiurzburg, where he remained till his death, Dec. 27, 1516. His many learned writings  are enumerated in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. The principal ones are, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiarstiis (1492): — Polygraphia (1518): — Stenographia (1531).

## Tritheists[[@Headword:Tritheists]]

             a sect which appeared in the 6th century, and which taught that the Father, Son, and Spirit were three coequal, distinct Beings, united by one. common will and purpose. This sect was divided into the Philoponists and Cononites, according to the names of their respective leaders, who agreed in the doctrine of the three Persons in the Godhead, but differed in' some opinions concerning the resurrection of the body. Having made this change in the doctrine of the Trinity, they made another change answerable to it in the form of baptism-baptizing in the name of three unoriginated principles, as three Sons; three Paracletes. As a consequence of asserting three unbegotten principles, they made three Fathers, three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts, which was a Trinity of trinities.

Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. c. 16) attributes the origin of Tritheism in its broadest form to Marcion, and Hilary (De Synod. 22:56) associates it with the heresy of Photinus. The Tritheists of the 6th century did not hold the opinion in its broad form, and would have shrunk from any such statement as that there are three Gods. The Tritheism of the 6th century was revived by Roscelin in the 11th, and his Nominalistic opinion that the name God is the abstract idea of a genus containing the three Persons called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was opposed by Anselm (De Fide Trinitat. etc.), and was condemned by the Council of Sessions, A.D. 1092. In 1691 the heresy was revived by Dr. Sherlock (A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever blessed Trinity). In a sermon delivered before the University of Oxford (1695), the preacher maintained the theory of Dr. Sherlock that “there are three infinite distinct minds and substances in the Trinity,” and that “the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite minds or spirits, and three individual substances.” These propositions were condemned by the authorities of the university. The speculation of Hutchinson in the last century was very similar in its logical consequences to that of the older Tritheists. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 11:ch. 3, § 4; Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.

## Triton[[@Headword:Triton]]

             in Greek mythology, was primarily a son of Nepture, by Amphitrite, who lived with his father and mother on the bottom of the sea in a golden palace. Hence the name was applied to any daemon of the Mediterranean Sea, who rode, sometimes upon horses, at other times on monsters of the deep, and occasionally appeared, assisting other deities in riding. Such Tritons are described differently. They are probably of the double nature, half man and half fish. The hair of their head is green, they have fine scales, gills under their ears, a human nose, a broad mouth with animal teeth, green eyes, hands, fingers, and nails rough, and instead of feet they possess the tail of a dolphin. They blow a spiral-formed trumpet.

## Triumph[[@Headword:Triumph]]

             (usually עָלִזor עָלִוֹ, θριαμβεύω). Almost all ancient nations celebrated success in war by a triumph, which generally included a gorgeous procession, a display of captives and spoils, and a solemn thanksgiving and sacrifice to the gods. Among the Egyptians, the triumph of a king returning from war was a grand solemnity celebrated with all the pomp, which the wealth of the nation could command (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 1, 277 sq.). The Assyrian sculptures abound with similar representations. SEE SENNACHERIB.

The Hebrews, under the direction of inspired prophets, celebrated their victories by triumphal processions, the women and children dancing, accompanying their steps with various musical instruments (see Jdg 11:34-37), and singing hymns of triumph to Jehovah, the living and true God. The song of Moses at the Red Sea, which was sung by Miriam to the spirited sound of the timbrel (Exo 4:1-21), and that of Deborah on the overthrow of Barak (Jdg 5:1-31), are majestic examples of the triumphal hymns of the ancient Hebrews. Triumphal songs were uttered for the living (1Sa 18:6-8; 2Ch 20:21-28) and elegies for the dead (2Sa 1:17-27; 2Ch 35:25). The conquerors were intoxicated with joy, and the shout of victory resounded from mountain to mountain (Isa 42:11; Isa 52:7-8; Isa 63:1-4; Jer 1:2; Eze 7:7; Nah 1:15). Monuments in honor of victory were erected, and the arms of the enemy were hung up as trophies in the temples (1Sa 21:9; 1Sa 31:10; .2Sa 8:13; 2Ki 11:10). Indignities to prisoners formed a leading feature of triumphs among ancient nations generally; and among the Assyrians and Babylonians atrocities were frequently practiced, such as maiming, blinding, SEE EYE, and killing, especially in the case of rebel princes. SEE CAPTIVE.

To put one's foot upon the head or neck of a conquered foe was an ancient, though somewhat barbarous, custom, marking the complete subjection of the vanquished party. Many representations of this custom appear among the monumental remains of antiquity; and, following the prevailing usage in this respect, we find Joshua ordering the five kings of the Canaanites, who had taken refuge in a cave, to be brought out that his captains might come  one after another and put their foot on the necks of the prostrate princes (Jos 10:24). Literally this usage does not appear to have been much practiced by the covenant people, but it forms the ground of many figurative representations in the prophetical Scriptures (Psa 110:1; Isaiah 110:14; 1Co 15:26). SEE FOOT; SEE NECK.

Among the Greeks, it does not appear that triumphs were accorded to victorious generals, but conquerors occasionally entered their native cities attended by their victorious soldiers bearing branches of palm. Such processions became very common under the successors of Alexander the Great, particularly the Seleucid of Syria and the Ptolemies of Egypt, who are generally believed to have been the inventors of the toga palmata, or robe adorned with representations of palm-trees interwoven into its fabric. It is clearly to the Graeco-Syrian form of triumph that the apostle John alludes in the Apocalypse, when he describes those who had overcome by the blood of the lamb standing “before the throne, clothed with robes, and palms in their hands” (Rev 7:9).

Next to the Egyptians, the Romans were chief among ancient nations in attributing importance to a triumph, and exerting themselves to bestow a gorgeous brilliancy upon the triumphal procession. The highest honor which could be bestowed on a citizen or magistrate was the triumph or solemn procession in which a victorious general passed from the gate of the city to the Capitol. He set out from the Campus Martius, and proceeded along the Via Triumphalis, and from thence through the most public places of the city. The streets were strewn with flowers, and the altars smoked with incense. First went a numerous band of music, singing and playing triumphal songs; next were led the oxen to be sacrificed, having their horns gilt and their heads adorned with fillets and garlands; then followed the spoils taken from the enemy, carried in open wagons, or a on a species of bier called feretrum, around which were displayed the golden crowns sent by allied and tributary states. The titles of the vanquished nations were inscribed on wooden frames; and images or representations of the conquered countries and cities were exhibited. The captive leaders followed in chains, with their children and attendants; after the captives came the lectors, having their faces wreathed with laurel,  followed by a great company of musicians and dancers, dressed like satyrs, and wearing crowns of gold; in the midst of whom was a pantomime, clothed in a female garb, whose business it was with his looks and gestures to insult the vanquished. A long train of persons followed, carrying perfumes; after whom came the general, dressed in purple, embroidered with gold, wearing a crown of laurel on his head, holding a branch of laurel in his right hand, and in his left an ivory scepter with an eagle on the top, his face painted with vermilion, and a golden ball hanging from his neck on his breast. He stood upright in a gilded chariot adorned with ivory, drawn by four white horses, attended by his relations and a great crowd of citizens, all clothed in white. It was creditable to Roman morality that a public slave accompanied the conqueror in his chariot, to remind him of the vicissitudes of fortune, and to present to him, in the midst of all his glory, the remembrance of the varied changes and chances of mortality. The conqueror's children sometimes accompanied him, and sometimes rode in a second chariot, escorted by the lieutenants and military tribunes who had served in the war. The consuls, senators, and other magistrates followed the general's chariot on foot; and the whole procession was closed by the victorious army, drawn up in order, crowned with laurel, decorated with the gifts which they had received for their valor, and singing their own and their general's praises. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. SEE TITUS (Emperor).

Paul makes frequent allusions to such triumphal processions (Col. 2, 15; Eph 4:8), with which he compares the triumphs of Christ's followers in spreading abroad, in every place, the perfume of the gospel of salvation (2 Corinthians 2, 14-16). Our Savior's triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mat 21:1-9) was a token of his royal character (see the monographs in Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 181).

## Triumphus, Augustinus[[@Headword:Triumphus, Augustinus]]

             an Augustinian hermit monk who was a native of Ancona, attended the University of Paris for a time, and was present at the Council of Lyons in 1274. He also sojourned at Venice while engaged in the publication of several small books in honor of the Virgin, and at Naples, where he became the favorite of kings Charles and Robert, and where he died in 1328, at the age of eighty-five years. A number of published and unpublished works from his pen are yet extant. We note one On the Ecclesiastical Power, addressed to pope John XXII (Augsburg, 1473): — A Commentary on the  Lord's Prayer: — Comments on the Ave Maria and the Magnificat (Rome, 1590, 1592, 1603): — a Milleloquium from the works of Augustine, unfinished by Triumphus, but completed by the Augustinian Bartholomew of Urbino (Lyons, 1555). Of unpublished writings we mention, Four Books on the Sentences: — On the Holy Ghost, a polemic against the Greeks: — On the Spiritual Hymn: — On the Entrance into the Land of Promise: — On the Knowledge and Faculties of the Soul: — Theorems respecting the Resurrection of the Dead: — Expositions of Ezekiel and all New Test. Books: — Discourses of the Lord: — On the Saints: — On the Moralia of St. Gregory. See Pamphilius, Chronicles Eremit. S. August. p. 46; Cave, Script. Eccl. Hist. Lit. (Gen, 1720). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Trivet, Nicholas[[@Headword:Trivet, Nicholas]]

             an English Dominican monk, was born at Norfolk about 1258. He was educated at Oxford and Paris, and became prior of English houses of his order. He died in 1328. He was the author of Annales Sex Regum Anglice, cum Continuatione ut et A. Murimruthensis Chronicon, etc. (Oxon. 1719- 22, 2 vols. 8vo). He left many MSS. on various subjects of philosophy and theology, as well as a Commentary on Seneca's Tragedies, etc. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Trivulzi[[@Headword:Trivulzi]]

             the name of several cardinals of Italian extraction, but of French association in the diplomatic movements-of their age. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

1. AGOSTINO was the nephew of Antonio (1); became deacon in 1517, archbishop of Reggio in 1520, and successively bishop of Bobbio (1519- 21), Toulon (1524), Asti (1528), Bayeux (1529), and Brugnato (1535); and died at Rome, March 30, 1548.

2. ANTONIO (1) was born at Milan in January, 1457, and after various diplomatic services was made bishop of Coma in 1487, and cardinal in 1501. He died at Rome, March 18, 1508.

3. ANTONIO (2), nephew of the following, was made successor of his uncle Agostino as bishop of Toulon in 1528, and cardinal in 1557. He died June 26, 1559.

4. SCARAMICCIO, a learned lawyer, was made professor of canon law at Pavia in 1491, and in 1499 counselor of Louis XII. He became cardinal in 1517, bishop of Coma in 1508, and afterwards of Piacenza (1522-26). He died at the monastery of Maguzzano, near Verona, Aug. 9,1527.

## Troas[[@Headword:Troas]]

             (Τρωάς). The city from which Paul first sailed, in consequence of a divine intimation, to carry the Gospel from Asia to Europe (Act 16:8; Act 16:11) where he rested for a short time on the northward road from Ephesus (during the next missionary journey), in the expectation of meeting Titus (2Co 2:12-13); where, on the return southwards (during the same missionary journey), he met those who had preceded him from Philippi (Act 20:5-6), and remained a week, the close of which (before the journey to Assos) was marked by the raising of Eutychus from the dead during the protracted midnight discourse; and where, after an interval of many years, the apostle left (during a journey the details of which are unknown) a cloak and some books and parchments in the house of Carpus (2Ti 4:13)-deserves the careful attention of the student of the New Test., and is memorable as a relic of the famous city of Troy.

The full name of the city was Alexandria Troas (Livy, 35:42), and sometimes it was called simply Alexandria, as by Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5, 33) and Straba (13, 593), sometimes simply Troas (as in the New Test. and the Ant. Itin. See Wesseling, p.334). The former part of the name indicates the period at which it was founded. It was first built by Antigonus, under the name of Antigonia Troas, and peopled with the inhabitants of some neighboring cities. Afterwards it was embellished by Lysimachus, and named Alexandria Troas. Its situation was on the coast of Mysia, opposite the south-east extremity of the island of Tenedos. The name Troad strictly belongs to the whole district around Troy.

Under the Romans it was one of the most important towns of the province of Asia. It was the chief point of arrival and departure for those who went by sea between Macedonia and the western Asiatic districts; and it was connected by good roads with other places on the coast and in the interior. For the latter see the map in Leake's Asia Minor, and in Lewin's St. Paul,  2, 81. The former cannot be better illustrated ‘than by Paul's two voyages between Troas and Philippi (Act 16:11-12; Act 20:6), one of which was accomplished in two days, the other in five. At this time Alexandria was was a colonia with the Justalicum. This strong Roman connection can be read on its coins. The Romans had a peculiar feeling connected with the place, in consequence of the legend of their origin from Troy. Suetonius tells us that Julius Caesar had a plan of making Troas the seat of empire (Caes. 79). It may perhaps be inferred from the words of Horace (Catrm. 3, 3, 57) that Augustus had some such dreams. Even the modern name EskiStamnbul or Eski-Istamboul (“Old Constantinople”) seems to commemorate the thought which was once in Constantine's mind (Zosim. 2, 30; Zonar. 13:3), who, to use Gibbon's words, “before he gave a just preference to the situation of Byzantium, had conceived the design of erecting the seat of empire on this celebrated spot, from which the Romans derived their fabulous origin.”

The ruins at Eski-Stambul are considerable. The most conspicuous, however, especially the remains of the aqueduct of Herodes Atticus, did not exist when Paul was there. The walls, which may represent the extent of the city in the apostle's time, enclose a rectangular space, extending above a mile from east to west, and nearly a mile from north to south. The harbor (Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 1, 283) is still distinctly traceable in a basin about 400 feet long and 200 broad. — Smith. Descriptions in greater or less detail are given by Pococke, Chandler, Hunt (in Walpole's Memoirs), Clarke, Prokesch, Richter (Walfahrten,p.462), Olivier, Fellows, and the later travelers mentioned in Murray's Handbook for Turkey in Asia, p.153-159. The vicinity has recently become noted for the discovery of what are presumed to be the ruins of ancient Troy at Hisarlik by Sehliemann (Troy and its Remains [Lond. 1875]). See also Maclaren, Plain of Troy (Edinb. 1863); Meyer, Gesch. von Troas (Leips. 1877).

## Trogyllium[[@Headword:Trogyllium]]

             (Τρωγύλλιον, the rocky extremity of the ridge of Mycale, which is called- thus in the New Test. (Act 20:15) and by Ptolemy (5, 2), and Trogilium (Τρωγίλιον) by Strabo (14, 636). It is directly opposite Samos  (q.v.). The channel is extremely narrow. Strabo (loc. cit.) makes it about a mile broad, and this' is confirmed by the Admiralty charts (1530 and 1555). Paul sailed through this channel on his way to Jerusalem at the close of his third missionary journey. (Act 20:15). The navigation of this coast is intricate; and it can be gathered from Act 20:6, with subsequent notices of the days spent on the voyage, that it was the time of dark moon. Thus the night was spent at Trogyllium. It is interesting to observe that a little to the east of the extreme point there is an anchorage which is still called St. Paul's Port. Pliny refers to three small islands lying about Trogyllium, and names them Sandalion, Psilon, and Argennon (Hist. Nat. 5, 37). The port where Paul anchored is generally considered to be that sheltered by Sandalion; but the port now known as the Port of St. Paul is that protected by the island of Nero, the ancient Argennon (Lewin, St. Paul, 2, 89). SEE PAUL.

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

             a. Swedish prelate, was born May 22, 1706 at Saint Schedwi (Dalecarlia), being the son of a pastor. He studied philosophy at the University of Stockholm, and became successively grand almoner of the king (April 22, 1740), president of the consistory (Jan. 2,1742), bishop of Westeras (April 23,1751), and archbishop of Upsala (Nov. 8, 1757), where he died, Jan. 18,1764. He was a learned and eloquent preacher, and left many funeral discourses, etc.

## Troil, Uno[[@Headword:Troil, Uno]]

             a Swedish prelate, son of the foregoing, was born at Stockholm, Feb. 24,1746. After a brilliant course of study at Upsala, and extensive travels in Germany, France, and England, he became successively almoner of the regiment (1773), preacher in ordinary to the king (1775), bishop of Linkoping (1784), president of the consistory of Stockholm and archbishop of Upsala (Aug. 30, 1787), where he died, July 27, 1803. He wrote several historical sketches, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Troki, Isaac ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Troki, Isaac ben-Abraham]]

             a Jewish scholar, who derived his name from his native place, Troki, a town in the Russian province of Wilna, was born in 1533. At the period in which this character lived, Poland was not only the seat of Jewish learning, but also the scene of action of the different sects to which the Reformation  gave rise. “In the earlier years of the religious Reformation of the 16th century, the skepticism which had prevailed so generally in Rome and the Italian states, chiefly among the higher clergy, and perhaps most intensely in the highest, tainted the Italian mind, and imparted a peculiar stamp of heterodoxy to the adherents of the Reformation in that country. The court of Rome had sagaciously put off the garb of pagan laxity, which it had worn so jauntily since the revival of letters. The Council of Trent, while reviewing every article of Roman theology, having stated in its canons the fundamental articles of Christian faith with a clearness that was indeed much needed, gave strict instructions to all the licensed preachers of their Church, and so enabled them to assume a new appearance of sound faith, at least in those particulars which would contrast not only with their former heterodoxy, now to be concealed, but with the open heterodoxy of certain fugitive Italian Protestants. These persons found congenial society among the Jews in Poland, who, while heroically adhering to the letter of the Mosaic law, had nevertheless not accepted the-more fully unfolded verity of Christian revelation. Heretics they were in the eye of Rome, and the persecution that haunted them drove them at once into the arms of the Polish Karaites; for, like them, and even more than they, these protesters against Rome hated tradition and all human authority. Like the Karaites, they were sturdy Monotheists in the same narrow sense. They outran Arius in the race of unbelief. Their own Socino left his name to a sect just as Sadok had left his; and Socino, with his principal followers, chose Poland to be at once their asylum and their citadel. From that time it became the center of Socinialism in Europe. In Poland the Jew and the Christian both enjoyed religious liberty, and for once the most orthodox of the Israelites and the least orthodox of the Christians could fraternize on one point, and on only one. One of those Jews was Isaac. He was brought up in the study of Talmudism as a branch of Jewish learning, and in the faith of the Karaite, cold withal, until quickened and elevated under the impulse of persecution.

Young Isaac, to whom Hebrew was vernacular, was also liberally educated in the Latin and Polish languages. In these languages he read the chief controversial writings, as they were issued by their eminent authors, against the Church of Rome. He carefully studied the Catholic- Polish version of the Bible, made by Leonard from the Vulgate, which appeared in Cracow in 1561, and again in 1575 and 1577; the Calvinistic- Polish version, called the Radzivil Bible, and published in 1563; and the Socinian version, made also from the original texts, by the celebrated Simon Budny, which was published at Nieswicz, in Lithuania, in 1570; as  well as the writings of Nicholas Paruta, Martin Chechowiz, and Simon Budny, the heads of Unitarianism in Poland. As all these sects, who differed from each other on almost every other point, agreed in their attack upon the Jews and their faith, the rabbi set to work on a confutation of Christianity. He read the New Test., in Budny's version, with the cool and orderly habit of a hard-working student. Every passage on which he could fix a doubt or hazard a denial was marked as it stands in the sacred book and for the purpose of controversy. The entire stock of all Christian cavils with which educated Jews, at least, are familiar, combined with the objections of the Socinians, were brought to bear on the New Test. by direct attack on all the leading sentences in relation to the person, life, and ministry of Christ. The work, written in Hebrew, under the title of Confirmation of the אמונה הזוק and which has a world-wide celebrity, Isaac finished in 1593, when sixty years of age.

The work is interesting for its quotations from some little-known Christian and polemical works in the Polish language, and because it has been made use of by critical writers upon the New Test. from Voltaire to Strauss; for the former at least acknowledges in his Melanges, 3, 344: “Il a rassemble toutes les difficultes que les incredules ont prodiguees depuis.... Enfin, incredules les plus determines nont presque rien allegui qui ne soit dans ce rempart de la foi du rabbin Issac.” The book is divided into two parts — the first, which is devoted to an examination of the objections raised by Christians against Judaism, and which is subdivided into fifty chapters, discusses very minutely the interpretation of the Messianic passages of the Old Test. and their application to Christ as the predicted Messiah; while the second part is taken up with a critical examination of the statements made in the sundry books of the New Test. Troki died in 1594. His work was first published by Wagenseil, with a Latin translation, in his collection of The, Fiery Darts of Satanm (Tela Jgneaa Satance) (Altdorf, 1681), from a MS. obtained from an African Jew, which was imperfect. A reprint of this vitiated text without the Latin translation appeared in Amsterdam in 1717s and in Jerusalem in 1845. The best edition, however, is that edited by rabbi D. Deutsch, with a German translation (Sohran, 1865). Besides this German translation, there is another by M. Gelling (Hamb. 163L-33). It was translated into Spanish by Isaac Athia, and into Italian by M. Luzzatto. The work has also been redefined by Müller, Coifutatio Libri Chizuk Enzuwta, comprised in his Judcismus ex Rabbinorum Scriptis Detectuts, etc., Refutatus (ibid. 1644); by GouSsset, Ternio Controvers. adversus Judaeos, Oppositus R. Isaac Chissuk Emuna (Dordrecht, 1688), which,  however, was not satisfactory to the duke Louis of Orleans (d. 1752), who wrote another refutation; by Gebhard, Centum Loca N.T. Vindicata adversus Chissuk Emuna (Greifswalde, 1699); Storr, Evangelische Glaubenskraft. Gegen das Werk Chissuk Emuna (Tub. 1703); and by Kidder [Bp.], in his Demonstration of the Messiah (2d ed. Lond. 1726). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 4:639 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:10; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 2, 138; 3, 448, De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 320 sq. id. Biblioth. Antichristiana, p. 42 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Steinschneider, Catal. Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. col. 1074 sq., and his Jewish Literature, p. 212; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Lit. p. 444; Rule, Hist. of the Karaite Jews, p. 170 sq. Basnage, Hist. des JuiJs (Taylor's transl.), p. 772; Geiger, Isaak Tamroki, ein Apologet des Judenth. am Ende des 16ten Jahrhdts. (Breslau, 1853; reprinted in his Nachgelassenie Schriften, 3, 178, Berlin, 1876); id. Probenjkidischer Vertheidiqung geen christliche Angriffe, in Liebermann's Kalender, 1854; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:490 sq.; Becker, in Saat amf Honffung (Etlang. 1870), 7:154 sq.; Fürst, in the same quarterly (ibid. 1871), 8:224 sq. (B. P.)

## Trolle, Gustavus[[@Headword:Trolle, Gustavus]]

             a Swedish prelate, descended from a noble Danish family named Erik, was born near the close of the 11th, century, and became archbishop of Upsala Oct. 30, 1514, but was besieged in his palace by an old family enemy; and, although reinforced by the interdict and troops of pope Leo X, he at length fell in battle on the island of Fiona, and died at Gottorp; near Sleswick, Juill , 1535. For the details of his stormy career see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tromm (Van Der Trommen, Lat. Trommius), Abraham[[@Headword:Tromm (Van Der Trommen, Lat. Trommius), Abraham]]

             a learned Protestant divine of Holland, was born at Groningen, Aug. 23, 1633, and studied the classics, philosophy, and theology in that university. He traveled through Germany. Switzerland, France, and England, and on his return was appointed curate at Haren. In 1671 he was invited to the pastorate of Groningen, and continued there until his death, May 29, 1719. John Martinius, of Danutzic, having begun a Concordance of the Old Testament in Flemish, Tromm completed it (Amsterd. 1685-92, 2 vols. fol.). He also published a Greek Concordance of the Septuagint (Utr. 1718, 2 vols. fol.), which has remained a standard work.

## Tronchin, Louis[[@Headword:Tronchin, Louis]]

             a Swiss divine, was born at Geneva, Dec. 4, 1629, and after studying theology there and at Satumur, he traveled abroad and then became preacher at Lyons in 1654. In 1661 he was made professor of theology in Geneva, where he died, Sept. 8, 1705. He was noted for his mildness during the Caivinistic controversy of his time.

## Tronchin, Theodore[[@Headword:Tronchin, Theodore]]

             a learned Swiss divine, father of the preceding, was born at Geneva, April 17, 1582. He was well educated, visited foreign universities, and on his return to Geneva, in 1606, he gave such proof of his learning that he was chosen professor of the Hebrew language. He was made minister in 1608, and created rector of the university in 1610. In 1616 he was promoted to the professorship of divinity, He was sent from Geneva to the Council of Dort, where he displayed his great knowledge in divinity, and a moderation which was highly applauded. For several of his works see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v.

## Troop[[@Headword:Troop]]

             is, in the A. V., especially employed as the rendering (sometimes “band,” etc.) of גְּדוּד, gedûd, which means a marauding party, in the forays for which Palestine has always been notorious, especially beyond the Jordan (Gen 49:19; 1Sa 30:8; Job 19:12; Psa 18:29; Jer 18:22; Hos 6:9; Hos 7:1; Mic 5:1).

## Tropaea[[@Headword:Tropaea]]

             (τρόπαια), the name of churches erected in honor of martyrs, or dedicated to them. The reason of the name is found in the reported appearance of the cross to Constantine, and in the labarum on which, according to Eusebius, were inscribed the words τοῦ σταυροῦ τρόπαιον.

## Tropes[[@Headword:Tropes]]

             or sequence, are verses sung before the holy Gospel in the mass. They are a kind of prose, written in a species of verse, though unfettered by any recognized law of meter. They were introduced at the close of the 9th century. Four only are found in the Roman missal. SEE SEQUENCE.

## Trophimus[[@Headword:Trophimus]]

             (Τρόφιμος, nutritious) a Hellenistic Christian, who with others traveled with the apostle Paul in the course of his third missionary journey, and during part of the route which he took in returning from Macedonia towards Syria (Act 20:4). A.D. 54. From what we know concerning the collection which was going on at this time for the poor Christians in Judaea, we are disposed to connect him with the business of that contribution. Both he and Tychicus accompanied Paul from Macedonia as far as Asia (ἄχρι τῆς Α᾿σίας frag, clc. cit.), but Tychicus seems to have remained there, while Trophimus proceeded with the apostle to Jerusalem.

There he was the innocent cause of the tumult in which Paul was apprehended, and from which the voyage to Rome ultimately resulted. Certain Jews from the district of Asia saw the two Christian missionaries together, and supposed that Paul had taken Trophimus into the Temple (21:27-29). From this passage we learn two new facts, viz. that Trophimus was a Gentile and that he was a native not simply of Asia; but of Ephesus. A considerable interval now elapses, during which we have no trace of either Tychicus or Trophimus; but in the last letter written by Paul, shortly before his martyrdom, from Rome, he mentions them both (Τυχικὸν ἀπέστειλα εἰς ῎Εφεσον;, 2Ti 4:12; Τρόφιμον ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλητῳ ἀσθε νοῦντα, 2Ti 4:20).

From the last of the phrases we gather simply that the apostle had no long time before been in the Levant, that Trophimus had been with him, and a that he had been left in infirm health at Miletus. Of the further details we are ignorant; but this we may say here, that while there would be considerable difficulty in accommodating this passage to any part of the recorded narrative previous to the voyage to Rome, all difficulty vanishes on the supposition of two imprisonments, and a journey in the Levant between them. Trophimus was no doubt at Miletus on the occasion' recorded in Act 20:15-38, but it is most certain that he was not left there. The theory also that he was left there on the voyage to Rome is preposterous; for the wind forced Paul's vessel to run direct from the south-west corner of Asia Minor to the east end of Crete (Act 27:7). We may add that when Trophimus was left in sickness at Miletus, whenever that might be; he was within easy reach of his home friends at Ephesus, as we see from 20:17.

Stanley thinks that Trophimus was one of the two brethren who, with Titus, conveyed the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2Co 8:16-24). “Trophimus was like Titus, one of the few Gentiles who  accompanied the apostle; an Ephesian, and therefore likely to have been sent by the apostle from Ephesus with the first epistle, or to have accompanied him from Ephesus now; he was, as is implied of ‘this brother,' whose praise was in all the churches, well known; so well known that the Jews of Asia [Minor?] at Jerusalem immediately recognized him; he was also especially connected with the apostle on this very mission of the collection for the poor in Judaea. Thus far would appear from the description of him in Act 21:29. From 20:4 it also appears that he was with Paul on his return from this very visit to Corinth” (Commentary on Corinthians, 2nd ed. p. 492).

The traditional story that Trophimus was one of the seventy disciples is evidently wrong; but that part of the legend which states that he was beheaded by Nero's orders is possibly true (Menol. Gr. 3, 57).

## Tropici[[@Headword:Tropici]]

             are those who explain away, by figurative interpretations, texts of Scripture which Catholic faith and tradition require to be otherwise interpreted. Athanasius (Ad Serap. 1, 2,10, 21) gives the name Tropici to the Pneumatomachi (q.v.) in so marked a manner that it has narrowly escaped becoming a proper name of that sect. For example, they argued that in 1Ti 5:21 the name of the Holy Spirit would naturally follow the names of Father and Son, that the term “elect angels,” tropically taken, includes the Holy Spirit, the inference being that the Holy Spirit is a created angel. The word Tropici has been used, again, by Catholic writers to describe those who err regarding the holy sacraments, and explain as mere figures the words of our Lord in Joh 3:5; Mat 16:26.

## Tropitae[[@Headword:Tropitae]]

             (τροπίται) were a sect of heretics who held that our Lord acquired a body of flesh by conversion of the substance of the godhead into the substance of flesh; an opinion which arose in the latter time of the Arian controversy among those who, maintaining the true divinity of the Son of God, and rightly desiring to maintain his sinlessness, were perplexed by the erroneous assumption that the human body, as such, is and cannot but be the seat of sin. To avoid the impiety of attributing a sinful body to our Lord, they devised the tenet that the body of Christ is consubstantial with his divinity, which passes into the somewhat more definite proposition that the substance of the Word is converted into the substance of flesh, and that  the flesh being in the form of man is thus called human. This heresy was first dealt with by Athanasius (Epistle to Epictefus), A.D. 370. Apollinaris was at the head of those who denied the true incarnation of Christ, asserting the general proposition that the Son of God did not assume that which in man is the seat of sin; and varied applications of this proposition - were made by his followers.. A belief in the possibility of the conversion of the godhead into flesh almost necessarily presupposes the reception of the Cabalistic doctrine that all matter is an emanation from God. Athanasius remarks that Valentinus fancied the flesh to be a part of Deity, and so concluded that the passion was common to the whole Trinity. Fabricius remarks that the heresy is confuted by Tertullian. T-he Council of Chalcedon determined that the two natures in Christ are united ἀτρέπτως.

## Tropological Interpretation[[@Headword:Tropological Interpretation]]

             is where a moral signification is given to a passage. An illustration will explain this sense. In Deu 25:4 we read, “Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.” Paul (1Co 9:9) quotes this precept of the law, adding the comment,” Doth God take care for oxen ? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written.” Blunt, Dict, of Doctrines, s.v. SEE HERMENEUTICS,

## Trosle, Council Of (Conciliunm Trosleianum)[[@Headword:Trosle, Council Of (Conciliunm Trosleianum)]]

             was held in Trosle, a small village near Soissons, France. It assembled June 26, 909, Herive, archbishop of Rheims, presiding. The decrees of this council are signed by twelve prelates, and are contained in fifteen chapters; they are in the form rather of long exhortations than of canons, showing the pitiable condition of the Church,

1. Orders due respect to the Church, to clerks, and to monks.

3. Relates to the reform of abuses in monastic institutions.

4. Anathematizes those who pillage the Church.

5. Anathematizes those who injure and persecute the clergy.

6. Is directed against those who refuse tithe.

7. Against rapine and robbery, and orders restitution.

8. Is directed against the violent abduction of women, and incest.

9. Forbids priests to have women in their houses.

10. Exhorts all Christians to charity, and to avoid luxury and excess.

11. Forbids perjury and on the breaking.

12. Is directed against passionate and litigious persons.

13. Against liars and homicides.

14. Denounces those who plunder the property of bishops after their death.

15. Contains an exhortation to all the faithful to abstain from sin and to do their duty. See Mansi, Concil. 9:520.

## Trost, Martin[[@Headword:Trost, Martin]]

             professor of Hebrew at Wittenberg, where he also died, April 8, 1636, was born at Hoxter in the year 1588. He published, Grammatica Hebraica Universalis (Hafniae, 1627,and often); excerpts from his grammar were published by Baldovius, Gezelius, Mitternacht, and Mylius: —Disputatio de Mutatione Punctorum Hebrceorum Generali (Wittenberg, 1633): — Novum Test. Syr. cum Versione Latina ex Diversis Editionibus Recensitum. Accesserunt in fine notationes variantis lectionis collectae ac M. Tr. (Cothen, 1621). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 449; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 55; 2, 808; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbuch, p. 141. (B. P.)

## Troth (Truth)[[@Headword:Troth (Truth)]]

             a word occurring in the Prayer-book only in the marriage service, thus, “And thereto I plight thee my troth;” that is, “thereto I most solemnly pledge thee my truth and sincerity.” Near the end of the same service the minister says that the persons now married have “pledged their troth each to other,” i.e. have promised to be true and faithful to each other. — Stanton, Dict. of the Church, s.v.

## Trotter, John, D.D[[@Headword:Trotter, John, D.D]]

             a Scotch Presbyterian clergyman, was born in Edinburgh in 1728, in which city his father was a magistrate. He showed marks of true piety in his youth, and a preference for the ministry. He studied the learned languages, philosophy, and divinity at the City University, passed his trials before the Synod of Edinburgh in 1749, and was soon afterwards presented to the living at Ceres, Fifeshire, where he was very popular for seventeen years. The Swallow Street Church, in London, became vacant in 1769, and Dr. Trotter accepted the pastorate there in December of that year, and with uniform and unwearied diligence performed the duties for nearly forty years. After a short illness he died, September 14, 1808, and was interred in Bunhill Fields Cemetery. He made Calvinistic theology his careful study through his long life of more than fourscore years. He published a short memoir of his first wife in 1771. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 9:49.

## Trottet, Jean Pierre Philippe[[@Headword:Trottet, Jean Pierre Philippe]]

             a Protestant theologian of Switzerland, was born at La Tour de Peilz, in the canton of Vaud, December 12, 1818. He studied at Lausanne and at some German universities, and was ordained in 1851. In 1853 he published  a volume of Discpurs Evcmngliques (Paris), and spent some years at Stockholm as pastor of the French Church. In 1860 he was called to the Hague as pastor of the Walloon Church, where he published, against Groen van Prinsterer, Le Patti Orthodoxe Pur dans l'Eglise Wallonne de La Haye: — Le Parti Anti-Revolutionnaire et Confessionnel dans l'Eglise Reformee des Pays-Bas: — Pourquois je Prends Conge de l'Eglise Wallonne de La Haye (1860-61). In 1862 he retired to Geneva, and died August 30 of the same year. He published also, Grands Jours de l'Eglise Apostolique, Consideres-Relativement a l'Epoque Actuelle (Paris, 1856): — Genie des Civilisations (1862, 2 volumes). See Montet, Dic. Biog. des Genev. et des Vaud, 2:583 sq.; Chretien Evanglique, 1859, 1862; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Trough[[@Headword:Trough]]

             (שֹׁקֶת, shohketh, from שָׁקָה, to drink), a vessel of wood or stone for watering animals (Gen 24:20; Gen 30:38). SEE WELL. But in Exo 2:16 a different term (רֵהֵט, rahat, from the idea of owing;  “gutter,” Gen 30:38; Gen 30:41) is employed for the same thing. SEE KNEADING-TROUGH.

## Trowbridge, Tillman Conklin, LL.D[[@Headword:Trowbridge, Tillman Conklin, LL.D]]

             a missionary, was born in Troy County, Michigan, January 28, 1831. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1852, and Union Theological Seminary in 1855. Taking appointment under the American Board, he reached Constantinople early in 1856. The first year of service was in Constantinople; from there he was sent through Northern Armenia, returning in 1861. The six years following he had charge of the city mission work in Constantinople. In 1868 he removed to Marash to take part in the theological instruction there. In 1872 he was appointed to raise funds for the college then decided upon at Aintab. In 1876 he returned and was appointed president of the college, which position he held until his death, July 20, 1888.

## Troy, John Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Troy, John Thomas, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born near Porterstown, in the county of Dublin, and at the age of fifteen went to Rome, where he became a Dominican, and finally rector of St. Clement's in that city. In 1776 he was elected bishop of Ossory. In January, 1779, he promulgated very spirited circulars against the outrages of the Whiteboys, and in October excommunicated them. In 1786 he was promoted to the see of Dublin. In November, 1787, he issued hi pastoral directions to his clergy, in which he strictly prohibited the future celebration of midnight masses. In 1793 he published Pastoral Instructions on the Duties of Christian Citizens. He died May 11, 1823. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, p. 480.

## Troyes, Councils Of (Concilium Tricassinum)[[@Headword:Troyes, Councils Of (Concilium Tricassinum)]]

             were held in Troyes, France, a city which has a splendid Gothic cathedral, founded in 1208; the Church of St. Urban; the Church of St. John, in which Henry V of England was married; the Church of Sainte-Madeleine, containing a stone rood loft of great beauty; and a public library of 110,000 volumes.

I. Held Oct. 25, 867. ‘About twenty bishops, from the kingdoms of Charles and Lothaire, were present, who wrote a long letter to pope Nicholas I, in which they gave the history of the affair of Ebbo, and of the priests whom he had ordained. They, moreover, besought the pope not to interfere with the rule laid down by his predecessor, and not to permit, in future, the deposition of any bishop without the intervention of the Holy See. This was in accordance with the principles of the false decretals of the pope. See Mansi, Concil. 8:868.

II. Held in 878, by pope John VIII, who presided over thirty bishops. The former had come into France to escape from the violence of Lambert, duke of Spoletto. In the first session, the pope exhorted the bishops to compassionate the injuries which the Roman Church had suffered from Lambert and his accomplices, and to excommunicate them. The prelates, however, declined to act until the arrival of their brethren. In the second session, John read an account of the ravages committed by Lambert, after which the council declared him to be worthy of death and anathema. The  archbishop of Arles presented a petition against bishops and priests leaving one Church for another, and also against persons deserting their wives in order to marry other women. In the third session the bishops declared their consent to the pope's propositions. Hincmar of Laon, whose eyes had been put out, presented a complaint against his uncle, and demanded to be judged according to the canons. Hincmar of Rheims required that the cause might be delayed, to give him time to reply to the complaint. Further, the sentence of condemnation passed against Formosus, formerly bishop of Porto, and Gregory, a nobleman, was read, anathematizing them without hope of absolution; as also were the canons forbidding the translation of bishops, viz. those of Sardica, Africa, and of pope Leo. Seven canons were published.

1. Orders that temporal lords shall show due respect to bishops, and that they shall not sit down in their presence without their permission.

7. Forbids to receive anonymous accusations against any person.

III. Held in 1104, by the legate Richard, bishop of Albano, whom Paschal II had sent into France to absolve king Philip. The council was very numerous, and among those present we find Ivo of Chartres. Hubert, bishop of Senlis, accused of simony, cleared himself by oath. The election of the abbot Godefroi, by the people of Amiens, to the bishopric of that town was approved, and, in spite of the abbot's resistance, he was compelled to consent to it. See Mansi, Concil. 10:738.

IV. Held in 1107, by pope Paschal II, who presided. The main object of this council was to excite the zeal of men for the Crusade, besides which sentence of excommunication was denounced against those who should violate the Truce of God. The freedom of elections of bishops was asserted and established, and the condemnation of investitures repeated. Several German bishops were on various accounts suspended. Mansi (Concil. 10:754) adds five canons to those usually attributed to this council.

1. Orders that any one receiving investiture at the hands of a layman shall he deposed, as well as the persons ordaining or consecrating him.

V. Held Jan. 13,1128, by the legate Matthew, bishop of Albano, assisted by the archbishops of Rheims and Sens, thirteen bishops, and by St. Bernard, St. Stephen, and other abbots. A rule was drawn up for the Order of the Templars, instituted in 1118, prepared by authority of the pope and  of the patriarch of Jerusalem. In this council the white dress was given to the Templars. See Mansi, Concil. 10:922.

## Truber, Primus[[@Headword:Truber, Primus]]

             a notable personage in the Reformation in Germany, was consecrated to the priesthood by Peter Bonomus, bishop of Trieste, and took charge of the parish of Lack in 1527. In 1531 he became at canon of Laibach, where the new doctrine was already promulgated, and soon afterwards he took ground in opposition to the Church of Rome. He was assailed by the clergy and the government, but protected by the nobles until 1540. Bishop Bonomus then called him to Trieste. In 1547 the bishop of Laibach, Urban Textor, procured an order for the apprehension of Truber, in consequence of which the latter was compelled to flee. He found a new parish at Rothenburg in the following year, and while there he entered into wedlock with a woman named Barbara. From 1553 to 1560 he was pastor at Kempten. As early as 1550, or, perhaps, earlier still, Truber had endeavored to minister to the needs of his countrymen by preparing translations in the Wendish dialect of an Abecedarium and a catechism, which were printed, with Latin letters, at Tibingen. The prosecution of his plans was made possible through Vergerius (q.v.), who induced duke Christopher of Würtemberg to pay for the printing. In 1555 the Wendish Gospel of St. Matthew appeared in print, and in 1556 the other historical books of the New Test. Romans, both epistles to the Corinthians, and Galatians were published in 1561. After various vicissitudes, Truber obtained the parish of Urach, where the famous baron Hans Ungnad became his patron and enabled him to establish his own press for the printing of Slavic books. The types used were both Glagolitic and Cyrillic. SEE GLAGOLITA.

The accounts of the printing-office are still in existence, and show that many princes and towns contributed to its support. Its publications included Luther's catechisms, the Augsburg Confession, and the Apology, Melancthon's Loci Communes, the Würtemberg Church Discipline, the Beneficium Christi, and spiritual hymns: but the enterprise was not remunerative, and was abandoned soon after the death of baron Ungnad in 1564. Truber passed the last twenty years of his life in charge of the parish of Deredingen, near Tiibingen. Two days before he died he dictated to his amanuensis the closing sentences for his translation of Luther's Hauspostille. He died June 28, 1586, after a brief illness, and in the seventy-eighth year of his age. See Sillem, Primus Truber, der Reformator Krains (Erlang. 1861); Schnurrer, Slavischer  Bicherdruck in Würtemberg (Tib. 1799); and particularly Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 21 s.v., where a much more complete and somewhat divergent sketch of Truber's career is given.

## Trublet, Nicholas C. J[[@Headword:Trublet, Nicholas C. J]]

             a French abbé, of temporary fame, was born at St. Malo, in December, 1697. There are no memoirs of his education or early progress, but it appears that he was treasurer of the Church of Nantes, and afterwards archdeacon and canon of St. Malo. His irreproachable conduct and agreeable manners procured him very general esteem as a man, but as a writer he never ranked high in public opinion, and though ambitious of a seat in the French Academy, did not' secure that honor until 1761. He died in March, 1770, at his native place. His principal works are, E'ssais de Literature et de Morale (4 vols. 12mo): —Panegyriques des Saints: — Megmoires pour servir a l'Histoire de Messieurs de la Motte et de Fontenelle (Amst. 17.61). He was also a contributor to the Journal des Savans and Journal Chretien. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Trubner, Nicholas[[@Headword:Trubner, Nicholas]]

             a publisher of London, who died April 3, 1884, deserves an honorable mention for the great interest he took in Oriental research, and more especially in Indian studies. His Record has always been a welcome and invaluable visitor to all those who were interested in such pursuits, and the assistance which it has rendered to Oriental learning cannot be overestimated. But Mr. Trubner's interests and sympathies were not confined to these researches. The history of religions, the study of languages, the development of political life in the East, all claimed a share of his time and thoughts. Many struggling scholars have lost in him the best friend they had. (B.P.)

## Truce of God[[@Headword:Truce of God]]

             a scheme set on foot by the Church in the Middle Ages for the purpose of quelling the violence and preventing the frequency of private wars, occasioned by the fierce spirit of barbarism. It was first proposed at the Council of Charroux in 989, adopted by the Council of Orleans in 1016, and by the Council of Limoges in 1031. In France a general peace and cessation from hostilities took place A.D. 1032, and continued seven years, through the efforts of the bishop of Aquitaine. A resolution was formed that no man should, in time to come, attack or molest his adversaries during the season set apart for celebrating the great festivals of the Church, or from the evening of Thursday in each week to the morning of Monday in the week ensuing, the intervening days being consecrated as particularly holy-Thursday as the day of our Lord's ascension; Friday as that of his Passion; Saturday, when he rested in the grave; and Sunday, the day of his resurrection. In 1034 it was opposed by the bishop of Cambray. Later it was extended to nearly all the more important fasts, feasts, and holy seasons of the Church. England (1042) and Italy adopted the custom, which was further confirmed by the second and third Lateran councils (A.D. 1139,1179). A change in the dispositions of men so sudden, and one  which proposed a resolution so unexpected, was considered as miraculous, and the respite from hostilities which followed upon it was called the “Truce of God.” This cessation from hostilities during three complete days every week allowed a considerable space for the passions of the antagonists to cool, and for the people to enjoy a respite from the calamities of war, and to take measures for their own security. The triumph of legal over feudal government eventually did away with the institution and the necessity for it. See Trench, Medieval Church History, p. 424 sq.

## Trudpert[[@Headword:Trudpert]]

             is the name of a hermit and founder of a celebrated monastery in the Breisgau, Baden. About the year 640 he came into the region of the upper Rhine, and settled at the river Neumage. Othpert, a German noble, gave to Trudpert the land, besides six servants, who were to assist him in the clearing and making arable the wooded country. Soon a chapel was built in honor of St. Peter. Three years Trudpert led an ascetic life, when two of the servants killed him while resting from his manual labor. Othpert had Trudpert buried in the chapel. During the 8th century the place lay waste, but in 816 Rambert, one of Othpert's descendants, built a splendid basilica in honor of Peter and Paul, and Trudpert's remains were placed there. See Mone, Quellensammlung zur badischen Landesgeschichte, 1:17-28; Rettberg, Kirchenfeschichte Deutschlands, 2:48-50; Hefele, Geschichte  der Einfuhrung des Christenthums im sudwestlichen Deutschland, pages 314-329; Friedrich, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, 2:607-613; Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## True Reformed Dutch Church[[@Headword:True Reformed Dutch Church]]

             is an organization which grew out of the secession of the Rev. Solomon Froeligh, D.D., in 1822. . He was a professor of theology, a man of erudition, and pastor of the two congregations of Hackensack and Schralenburg, N. J., which he carried with him. His secession was the culmination of difficulties of long standing, in which he was subjected to censure for aggression upon a neighboring Church. He refused to submit to the authorities of the Church. A number of disaffected ministers united with him, together with portions of their churches. The grounds alleged for their separation were that the Dutch Church had become erroneous in doctrine, lax in discipline, and corrupt in practice. The confusion, strife, and troubles produced by this conflict were long and bitter. The “True Reformed Dutch Church” retains the standards of the Church which it left, and declares that it alone keeps them in their purity. It holds no fellowship with any other denomination, refuses to co-operate with the benevolent religious institutions of the age, and is generally antinomian in sentiment and practice. The churches of this sect are less than twenty in number, small, feeble, and dwindling away with the survivors of the original strife. They are located in New Jersey and New York. For full accounts, reference is made to their pamphlet entitled Reasons Assigned by a Number of Ministers, Elders, and Deacons for Declaring Themselves the True Reformed Dutch Church in the United States of America. See also Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America; Taylor, Annals of Classis and Township of Bergen, very full and accurate. (W. J. R. T.)

## True, Charles K., D.D[[@Headword:True, Charles K., D.D]]

             an eminent Methodist Episcopal divine, was born in Portland, Me., Aug. 14, 1809. The family afterwards removed to Boston. He graduated at Harvard University in 1832, having been converted at the Eastham camp- meeting while connected with that college, and immediately commenced preaching in the vicinity, being among the first Methodist preachers at the opening of denominational services in Newton Upper Falls, established through the faithful endeavors of Marshall S. Rice. His early efforts awakened great attention. His personal appearance was attractive, his voice pleasant, his address graceful, and his discourses often very eloquent. He entered the New England Conference in 1833, was an agent of the New England Education Society in 1834, and became the first principal of the Amenia Seminary in 1835. He entered the New York Conference in 1836, and had a memorable experience, both in the conference and in his charge at Middletown, Conn., in the antislavery controversy, having early taken very pronounced grounds on the question. In 1838 he was transferred to the New England Conference, and stationed at Lynn. He remained, filling appointments with much acceptableness, in Boston and vicinity until 1849, when he was elected professor of intellectual and moral science in Wesleyan University. He became again a member of the New York Conference in 1860, but re-entered the New England Conference in 1866. From 1870 to 1873 he was a financial agent of the Wesleyan University, and was a member of the New York East Conference until his death, which occurred suddenly, June 20, 1878. During his last years he was connected with one or two of the charitable societies whose offices are in New York city, and supplied the pulpits of charges in the New York East Conference not far distant from his home. Dr. True wrote a text-book upon logic, and several interesting volumes of a historical character. He was a man of fine abilities, an original thinker, with marked repose of mind and manner, self- reliant, and with just enough eccentricity to give an original flavor to his  opinions. He was a good preacher, at times powerful in discourse, and particularly effective in exhortation. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1879, p. 30 sq.

## Trullan Councils, The[[@Headword:Trullan Councils, The]]

             were held in a room of the imperial palace at Constantinople, which had a dome (τροῦλλος), whence the name.

I. The first Trullan council was called in 680 by the emperor Constantinus Pogonatus, and held eighteen sittings. The legates of pope Agatho were accorded the highest rank, then followed in order the patriarch George of Constantinople, the legate of the patriarch of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch, the legate of the patriarch of Jerusalem, three delegates from the Western Church, delegates from Ravenna, and finally the bishops and abbots present. In the very first session the papal legates accused the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch of heresy. Macarius defended himself against this accusation, and referred to the canons of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and of the fifth Constantinopolitan council. In the eighth sitting George of Constantinople went over to the Roman doctrine. In the sixteenth sitting pope Honorius I was anathematized for his monothelitic views, and the anathema was repeated at the eighteenth session. Pope Agatho's confession of two wills in Christ, in his Epistola ad Imperatores, was declared the doctrine of the council, and all monothelites were anathematized. The patriarch Macarius was deposed at a later time.

II. The second Trullan council, called together by Justinian in 692, is known as the Concilium Quinisextumn, for which see the art. QUINISEXTUM CONCILIUM. See, besides, the Church histories of Schrbckh and Gieseler; Pichler, Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident (Munich, 1864), 1:87 sq.; Hergenrother, Photius, Patriarch von Constantinope (Ratisbon, 1867), 1:208-526; Plitt- Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Trullo, Council of[[@Headword:Trullo, Council of]]

             the name by which the sixth Council of CONSTANTINOPLE SEE CONSTANTINOPLE (q.v.) is called, from the circumstance of its having been held in the domed chapel of the palace.

## Trumbull, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Trumbull, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Hebron, Conn., Dec. 19, 1735, graduated at Yale College in 1759, and was ordained December, 1760, pastor at North Haven, where he remained until his death, Feb. 2, 1820. He  published, A Discourse Delivered at Freemans Meeting (1773): —A Plea in Vindication of the Connecticut Title to the Contested Lands lying West of the Province of New York, Addressed to the Public (1776): —An Appeal to the Public respecting Divorce (1785): —An ‘Address on Family Religion (1807): —Twelve Discourses on the Divine Origin of the Scriptures (1810): —A General History of the United States, etc. (eod.): — Two Pamphlets on the Unlawfulness of Marrying a Wife's Sister (eod.): — A Complete History of Connecticut (2 vols. 1797, 1818)--and several occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 584.

## Trumbull, David, D.D[[@Headword:Trumbull, David, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister,, was born at Elizabeth, N.J., November 1, 1819; graduated from Yale College in 1842, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1845; was ordained and went to Valparaiso, Chili, first as Missionary of the Foreign Evangelical Society, and then of the American Seaman's Friend Society; next became pastor of the Independent Church there until his death, February 1, 1889.

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

             a distinguished Baptist minister and scholar, was born in Whiteburn, Linlithgowshire, Scotland, Sept. 10, 1809. He was brought up as a Presbyterian. Having graduated at the Glasgow University, he attended the theological lectures of Drs. Chalmers and Dick in Edinburgh, having among his fellow-students Kobert Pollok, the author of the Course of Time. While pursuing his theological studies, he changed his sentiments on the subject of Christian baptism, and connected himself with a Baptist Church. For a year and a half he preached in Westmancotte, Worcestershire, England. In 1833 he came to this country, and for two years was pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Danbury, Conn., when he was called to the pastorate of the First Baptist Church ill Detroit, Mich., where he remained two ears, and then became pastor of the South Baptist Church in Hartford, Conn. In all these churches his labors were greatly blessed. For two years he continued in Hartford, and then accepted a call in 1839 to what is now the Harvard Street Church in Boston, where his six years (1839-45) ministry added greatly to the strength of the Church. In July, 1845, he returned to Hartford, to take the pastoral charge of the First Baptist Church in that city. His connection with that Church as its minister continued for twenty-four years. “Under his earnest and faithful ministry the Church enjoyed a succession of revivals and constant accessions, till it became in numbers, beneficence, and influence one of the strongest in the denomination.” The unusually long pastorate of Dr. Trumbull closed in 1869. It was not his wish again to become a permanent pastor. For, more than two years he preached in New Haven, supplying the pulpit of a mission chapel in Dwight Street one year, and another year preaching in a chapel in the northwestern part of the city. Dr. Trumbull was chosen in 1872 secretary of the Connecticut Baptist Convention. In this capacity he served for the remainder of his life, performing a work for the feeble  Baptist churches in Connecticut the value of which cannot be overestimated. His memory is cherished with warm affection in the community and state which he so long blessed by his Christian ministry. For a little more than five years he devoted himself with great zeal to his work, and saw it abundantly successful. He died at Hartford, Nov. 20,1877. Dr. Trumbull was a voluminous writer, considering the amount of ministerial work he performed during his life. Among his published writings were the following: Olympia Morata (1842): —Vinet's Vital Christianity-a translation (1846): —Genius of Scotland (1847): — Pulpit Writers of France and Switzerland (1848): —Genius of Italy (1849): — Theophany, or the Manifestation of God in Christ (1851) : — Vinet's Miscellanies (1852): —Life Pictures (1857). He edited also sir William Hamilton's Discussions on Philosophy, Literature, and University Reform. He was the editor of the Christian Review for two years. See Christian Secretary, Nov. 28,1877. (J. C. S.)

## Trump[[@Headword:Trump]]

             (σάλπιγξ, 1Co 15:22; 1Th 4:16). SEE TRUMPET.

## Trumpet[[@Headword:Trumpet]]

             is in the A.V. usually the rendering of one or the other of the two Hebrew words detailed below; but besides these it occasionally stands as the representative of the following: יוֹבֵל, Exo 19:13, the jubilee (q.v.) trumpet; תָּקוֹעִtakea, Eze 7:14, prop. the blowing of the trumpet. SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.

1. חֲצוֹצְרָה, chatsotserah (Sept. σάλπιγξ, Vtmlg. tuba), prob. an onomatopoetic word, like the Lat. taratantara, from the quivering reverberation of its sound, was the straight trumpet (Josephus, Ant. 3, 12, 6; Jerome, ad Hosea 5, 8; Buxtorf, Lex. s.v.), and is the term used in Num 10:2; Num 10:8-10; Num 31:6; 2Ki 11:14 (“trumpeter,” in first occurrence); 12:13; 1Ch 13:8; 1Ch 15:24; 1Ch 15:28; 1Ch 16:6; 1Ch 16:42; 2Ch 5:12-13; 2Ch 13:12; 2Ch 13:14; 2Ch 15:14; 2Ch 20:28; 2Ch 23:13; 2Ch 29:26-28; Ezra 3, 10; Neh 12:35; Neh 12:41; Psa 98:6; Hos 5:8. There were originally two such, which the priests used on festive occasions  (Num 10:2 sq.; comp. 31:6; 2Ki 12:13). Later (in David's time) the instruments were of a richer character (1Ch 15:24; 1Ch 16:42; 2Ch 5:12 sq.; 2Ch 29:20; for a conjecture as to their form, see Sommner, Bibl Abhandl. 1, 39 sq.). Similar ones were employed in the year of jubilee (2Ki 11:14), and for popular proclamations (Hos 5:8); comp. Rosellini, Monum. II, 3, 32; Wilkinson, 2, 262. The form of this trumpet is indicated in the sculpture on the Arch of Titus at Rome (see Reland, Spolia Templi Hieros. p. 184 sq.) and on coins (Frohlich, Anal. Syr. proleg. p. 80, pl. 18, fig. 17 and 18), and it appears to have emitted a clear, shrill tone (comp. Foskel, 1, 86), adapted to an alarum (תָּקִע). SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

2. שׁוֹפָר, shophar (Sept. usually σάλπιγξ, Vulg. buccina), was the curved trumpet or horn (Lat. lituus) for signals; and is the word elsewhere rendered “trumpet” in the A. V. (“cornet,” 1Ch 15:28; 2Ch 15:14; Psa 98:6; Hos 5:8). It was sounded in the year of jubilee (Lev 25:9; the Talmudic New-year's day, Mishna, Rosh hash-Shanah, 3, 3), in battle (Job 29:25 [28]; Jer 4:5; Jer 6:1), and by sentinels (Eze 33:6); and had a loud (Isa 58:1) tone like a thunder-peal (Exo 19:16; Exo 19:19). Some writers fail to distinguish this from the preceding kind of trumpet (Credner, Joel, p.164 sq.; Hoffmann, in Warnekros, Hebr. Alterth. p. 598 sq.); both instruments are named in the same connection in 1Ch 15:28; 2Ch 15:14; Psa 98:6; Hosea 5, 8 (see Zoega, De Buccwiaa [Lips. 1712]). Jerome (on the passage last cited) clearly distinguishes the shophar: “Buccina pastoralis est et cornu recurvo efficitur, unde et proprie Hebraice shophar, Graece κερατίνη appellatur.” According to the Mishna (ut sup.), however, the shophar was sometimes straight and at others crooked (see Doughtei Analect. 1, 99 sq.). Curved horns (as of oxen or sheep) are still common in the synagogue under the same name (שׁוֹפָרוֹת); according to the Gemara (Shabb. 36:1), שׁוֹפָרoriginally denoted only the curved horn and not until the downfall of the Jewish polity was it confounded with the חֲצוֹצְרָה. The second Temple contained thirteen boxes (in the court of the women), shaped like (straight) trumpets (shopharoth), for the deposition of alms (Mishna, Shekal. 6:5). The horn with which the year of jubilee was ushered in is technically called (as above observed) יוֹבֵל, קֶרֶן הִיּוֹבֵלֹor שׁיֹפִר היּוֹבֵל(Jos 6:4 sq.); and the force of breath required to sound it is denoted by the term מָשִׁךְ, to  draw out (see Winer's Simonis Lex. p. 394,584; comp. Graser, Kathol. Messe, 1, 107 sq.). SEE CORNET.

As above intimated, the Lord commanded Moses to make two trumpets of beaten silver, for the purpose of calling the people together when they were to decamp (Numbers 10). They chiefly used these trumpets, however, to proclaim the beginning of the civil year, the beginning of the sabbatical year (Lev 23:24; Num 29:1), and the beginning of the jubilee (Lev 25:9-10). Josephus says (Ant. 3, 12, 6) that they were near a cubit long, and that their tube or pipe was of the thickness of a common flute. Their mouths were no wider than just admitted to blow into them, and their ends were like those of a modern trumpet. There were originally but two in the camp, though afterwards a great number were made. In the time of Joshua there were seven (Jos 3:4), and at the dedication of the Temple of Solomon there were one hundred and twenty priests that sounded trumpets (2Ch 5:12). The following particulars concerning the use of trumpets in the Temple will be useful, and are collected chiefly from Lightfoot's Temple Service. The trumpets were sounded exclusively by the priests, who stood not in the Levitical choir, but apart, and opposite to the Levites, on the other side of the altar, both parties looking towards it the priests on the west side and the Levites on the east. The trumpets did not join in the concert but were sounded during certain regulated pauses in the vocal and instrumental music. “The manner of their blowing with their trumpets was first a long plain blast, then a blast with breakings and quaverings, and then a long plain blast again. The priests did never blow but these three blasts went together. ... The Jews do express these three several soundings that they made at one blowing by the words (translated) An alarm in the midst, and a plain note before and after it; which our Christian writers do most commonly express by tarantara, though that word seems to put the quavering sound before and after, and the plain in the midst, contrary to the Jewish description of it.” SEE NEW YEAR FESTIVAL OF.

In addition to the sacred trumpets of the Temple, whose use was restricted to the priests, even in war and in battle, there were others used by the Hebrew generals (Jdg 3:27). Ehud sounded the trumpet to assemble Israel against the Moabites, whose king, Eglon, he had lately slain. Gideon took a trumpet in his hand, and gave each of his people one, when he  assaulted the Midianites (Jdg 7:2; Jdg 7:16). Joab sounded the trumpet as a signal of retreat to his soldiers, in the battle against Abner (2Sa 2:28), in that against Absalom (18:16), and in the pursuit of Sheba, son of Bichri (10, 22). SEE WAR.

In Mat 6:2 we read,” When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues,” and most expositors have regarded this as an expression derived by an easy metaphor from the practice of using the trumpet to proclaim whatever was about to be done, in order to call attention to it and make it extensively known. Others, however, refer it to the trumpet-shaped boxes in which the alms were deposited (see above), and which gave a ringing sound as the coin was dropped into them. SEE TEMPLE.

## Trumpets, Feast Of[[@Headword:Trumpets, Feast Of]]

             (יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, Num 29:1; Sept. ἡμέρα σημασίας; Vulg. dies clangoris et tubatrum; זְכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה, Lev 23:24; μνημόσυνον σαλπίγγων; sabbatum mnemoriale clangentibus tubis: in the Mishna, ראֹשׁ הִשָּׁנָה, “the beginning of the year”), the feast of the new moon, which fell on the first of Tisri. It differed from the ordinary festivals of the new moon in several important particulars. It was one of the seven days of Holy Convocation. SEE FEAST. Instead of the mere blowing of the trumpets of the Temple at the time of the offering of the sacrifices, it was “a day of blowing of trumpets.” In addition to the daily sacrifices and the eleven victims offered on the first of every month [see NEW MOON], there were offered a young bullock, a ram, and seven lambs of the first year, with the accustomed meat offerings, and a kid for a sin-offering (Num 29:1-6). The regular monthly offering was thus repeated, with the exception of one young bullock.

It is said that both kinds of trumpet were blown in the Temple on this day, the straight trumpet (חֲצֹצְרָה) and the cornet שׁוֹפָרor קֶרֶן), and that elsewhere any one, even a child. might blow a cornet (Reland, 4:7, 2; Carpzov, p. 425; Rosh hash-Shan. 1, 2). When the festival fell upon a Sabbath, the trumpets were blown in the Temple, but not out of it (Rosh hash-Shan. 4:1). SEE JUBILEE.

It has been conjectured that Psalms 81, one of the songs of Asaph, was composed expressly for the Feast of Trumpets. The psalm is used in the  service for that day by the modern Jews. As the third verse is rendered in the Sept., the Vulgate, and the A.V., this would seem highly probable-” Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, the time appointed, on our solemn feast day.” But the best authorities understand the word translated new moon (כֵּסֶה) to mean full moon. Hence the psalm would more properly belong to the service for one of the festivals which take place at the full moon, the Passover, or the Feast of Tabernacles (Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.; Rosenmüller and Hengstenberg on Psalms 81).

Various meanings have been assigned to the Feast of Trumpets. Maimonides considered that its purpose was to awaken the people from their spiritual slumber to prepare for the solemn humiliation of the Day of Atonement, which followed it within ten days. This may receive some countenance from Joe 2:15, “Blow the trumpet (שׁוֹפָר) in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly.” Some have supposed that it was intended to introduce the seventh or sabbatical month of the year, which was especially holy because it was the seventh, and because it contained the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles (Fagius, in Lev 23:24; Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. c. 24). Philo and some early Christian writers regarded it as a memorial of the giving of the law on Sinai (Philo, Opp. v, 46, ed. Tauch.; Basil, in Psalms 81; Theodoret, Quaest. 32 viz. Leviticus). But there seems to be no sufficient reason to call in question the common opinion of Jews and Christians, that it was the festival of the New-year's-day of the civil year, the first of Tisri, the month which commenced the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee. If the New- moon Festival was taken as the consecration of a natural division of time, the month in which the earth yielded the last ripe produce of the season, and began again to foster seed for the supply of the future, might well be regarded as the first month of the year. The fact that Tisri was the great month for sowing might thus have easily suggested the thought of commemorating on this day the finished work of creation, when the sons of God shouted for joy (Job 38:7). The Feast of Trumpets thus came to be regarded as the anniversary of the birthday of the world (Mishna, Rosh hash-Shun. 1, 1; Hupfeld, De Fest. Hebrews 2, 13; Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. c. 24).

It was an odd-fancy of the rabbins that on this day, every year, God judges all men, and that they pass before him as a flock of sheep pass before a shepherd (Rosh hash-Shan. 1, 2). SEE NEW YEAR.

## Trust in God[[@Headword:Trust in God]]

             signifies confidence in or dependence upon him. This trust ought to be:

1. Sincere and unreserved not in idols, in men, in talents, riches, power, in ourselves part and in him part (Pro 3:5-6);

2. Universal-body, soul, circumstances (1Pe 5:7);

3. Perpetual (Isa 26:4)

4. With a lively expectation of his blessing (Mic 7:7). The encouragement we have to trust in him arises:

1. From his liberality (Rom 8:32; Psa 84:11);

2. His ability (Jam 2:17);

3. His relationship (Psa 103:13);

4. His promise (Isa 33:16);

5. His conduct in all ages to those who have trusted him (Gen 48:15-16; Psa 37:25).

The happiness of those who trust in him is great, if we consider,

1. Their safety (Psa 125:1);

2. Their courage (Psa 27:1);

3. Their peace (Isa 26:3);

4. Their character and fruitfulness (Psa 1:3);

5. Their end (Psa 37:37; Job 5:26). SEE FAITH.

## Trust-deeds[[@Headword:Trust-deeds]]

             are forms of conveyances of real estate specifying some trust for which the property is held. At an early period of his history Wesley published a model deed for the settlement of chapels, to the effect that the trustees, for the time being, should permit Wesley himself, and such other persons as he might from time to time appoint, to have the free use of such premises, to preach therein God's word. After his death, and that of Charles Wesley and William Grimshaw, the Chapels were to be held in trust for the sole use of such persons as might be appointed at the yearly conference of the people called Methodists, provided that the said persons preached no other doctrines than those contained in Wesley's Notes on the New Test., and in his four volumes of Sermons. This was followed, on Feb. 28, 1784, by the Deed of Declaration, explaining the words “yearly conference of the people called Methodists.” This Deed of Declaration is recognized in the  trust deeds of all the chapels built by the Wesleyans. In the Methodist Episcopal Church it is directed that the following trust-clause shall be inserted in each deed: “In trust, that said premises shall be used, kept, maintained, and disposed of as a place of divine worship for the use of the ministry and membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America; subject to the discipline, usage, and ministerial appointments of said Church, as from time to time authorized and declared by the General Conference of said Church, and the Annual Conference within whose bounds the said premises are situate. In trust, that said premises shall be held, kept, and maintained as a place of residence for the use and occupancy of the preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America who may, from time to time, be stationed in said place; subject to the usage and discipline of said Church, as from time to time authorized and declared by the General Conference of said Church, and by the Annual Conference within whose bounds said premises are situate.”

Trustees are Church officers appointed for the purposes of holding the legal title to Church property, and of taking care thereof. In the different branches of Methodism there are some differences of provision, but in general principles they are the same. In the Methodist Episcopal Church the Discipline says, “Each board of trustees of our Church property shall consist of not less than three nor more than nine persons, each of whom shall be not less than twenty-one years of age, two thirds of whom shall be members of the Methodist Episcopal Church.” “Where the Church has not received a legal act of incorporation or charter; and where the law of the state does not specify any particular mode of election, the trustees are elected annually by the Fourth Quarterly Conference . . . upon the nomination of the preacher in charge, or the presiding elder of the district. Where the state or territory directs the mode of election, that mode must be strictly observed; and where charters of incorporation are obtained, they specify the particular qualifications and time of election of these officers.”

The trustees have the charge of all repairs to be made on Church property, and of all financial matters pertaining to its preservation; are directed by the Discipline to make an annual report to the Fourth Quarterly Conference of the amount and value of the property, expenditures and liabilities, etc.; and are held amenable to the Quarterly Conference for the manner in which they perform their duty. By the action of the General  Conference of 1876 trustees are forbidden to “mortgage or encumber the real estate for the current expenses of the Church.”

## Trustees, General Board Of[[@Headword:Trustees, General Board Of]]

             The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1864, appointed a committee of seven to report a plan of trusteeship. The report of the committee was adopted, and is substantially the same as the section of the Discipline on that subject. The General Conference appointed a board whose headquarters should be at Cincinnati, and which was incorporated with the title of “the Board of Trustees of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States,” and its charter was recorded July 11,1865. According to the Discipline, “The duty of the board shall be to hold in trust, for the benefit of the Methodist Episcopal Church, any and all donations, bequests, grants, and funds in trust, etc., that may be given or conveyed to said board, or to the Methodist Episcopal Church, as such, for any benevolent object, and to administer the said funds, and the proceeds of the same, in accordance with the direction of the donors,” etc.

## Truth[[@Headword:Truth]]

             conformity to fact.

1. It has been distinguished by most philosophical writers, according as it respects being, knowledge, and speech, into

(1.) Veritas entis, or truth of the thing. The foundation of all truth is in truth of being--that truth by which a thing is what it is, by which it has its own nature and properties; and has not merely the appearance, but reality, of being. Philosophy is the knowledge of being; and if there were no real being — that is, if truth could not be predicated of things — there could be no knowledge.

(2.) Veritas cognitionis, or truth of knowledge. Truth, as predicated of knowledge, is the conformity of our knowledge with the reality of the object known; for, as knowledge is the knowledge of something, when a thing is known as it is that knowledge is formally true. To know that fire is hot is true knowledge. Objective truth is the conformity of the thing or object known with true knowledge.

(3.) Veritas signi, or truth of the sign. This consists in its adequateness or conformity to the thing signified. The truth and adequacy of signs belong to enunciation in logic.

2. Scientific truth consists in the conformity of thoughts to things; and moral truth lies in the correspondence of words with thoughts; while logical truth depends on the self-consistency of thoughts themselves.

3. Truth, in the strict logical sense, applies to propositions, and nothing else; and consists in the conformity of the declaration made to the actual state of the case. In its etymological sense, truth signifies that which the speaker believes to be the fact. In this sense it is opposed to a lie, and may be called moral. Truth is not infrequently applied to arguments, when the proper expressions would be “correct,” “conclusive,” “valid.” The use of truth in the sense of reality should be avoided. People speak of the truth or falsity of facts; whereas, properly speaking, they are either real or fictitious. It is the statement that is true or false.

4. Necessary truths are such as are known independently of inductive proof; are those in which we not only learn that the proposition is true, but that it must be true; are those the opposite of which is inconceivable, contradictory, impossible. Contingent truths are those which, without doing violence to reason, we may conceive to be otherwise.

5. Absolute truth is the knowledge of God, the ground of all relative truth and being. All relative truth is partial because each relation presupposes something which is not relative. As to us relative truth is partial in another sense, because the relations known to us are affected by relations which we do not know, and therefore our knowledge even as relative knowledge is incomplete as a whole and in each of its parts. At the same time, relative knowledge is real knowledge; and if it were possible habitually to realize in consciousness that it is partial, it would be strictly true so far as it goes. See Blunt, Dict. of Hist. Theol. s.v.; Fleming, Vocab. of Philos. Sciences, s.v.

6. In Scripture language, eminently, God is truth; that is, in him is no fallacy, deception, perverseness, etc. Jesus Christ, being God, is also the truth, and is the true way to God, the true representative, image, character, of the Father. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, who communicates truth, who maintains the truth in believers, guides them in the truth, and  who hates and punishes falsehood or lies, even to the death of the transgressor (Psa 31:5; Joh 14:6; Joh 14:17; Act 5:3, etc.).

Especially is truth a name given to the religion of Jesus, in opposition to that of the Jew and that of the heathen. As contrasted with the Jewish system, it was the “truth” in the sense of “reality,” as distinguished from the “emblems,” symbols, representations, of that reality; from the “shadow of good things to come,” contained in the Levitical law in this sense it is that the apostle tells us “the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.” As contrasted with paganism, Christianity was truth opposed to falsehood. The heathen mythology not only was not true, but was not even supposed as true: it not only deserved no faith, but it demanded none. Jesus inaugurated a new way of propagating a religion, by inviting converts not to conform to its institutions, but to “believe” and to to let their actions be agreeable to truth: nothing, then, was more natural than that Christianity should receive names expressive of this grand peculiarity, the truth and the faith. See Whately, Essays on Difficulties of St. Paul, essay 1.

## Truyns, Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Truyns, Charles, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic priest of the Jesuit order, was born in Belgium in 1813. In 1837 he came to the United States, and was an officer of the St. Louis University and of St. Charles College, Louisiana. For some time he was engaged in missionary work among the Indians, and, later in life, was pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Bardstown, Kentucky. He died at St. Louis,  Missouri, December 14, 1868. See Hough, Amer. Biog. Notes, page 398. (J.C.S.)

## Tryphaena[[@Headword:Tryphaena]]

             (Τρύφαινα, luxurious), a person mentioned in connection with Tryphosa (q.v.), the two being Christian women at Rome, who, among those that are enumerated in the conclusion of Paul's letter to that city, receive a special salutation, and on the special ground that they are engaged there in “laboring in the Lord” (Rom 16:12). A.D. 55. They may have been sisters, but it is-more likely that they were fellow-deaconesses, and among the predecessors of that large number of official women who ministered in the Church of Rome at a later period (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 6:43); for it is to be observed that they are spoken of as at that time occupied in Christian service (τὰς κοπιώσας), while the salutation to Persis, in the same verse, is connected with past service (ἣτις ἐκοπίασεν).

We know nothing more of these two sister-workers of the apostolic time; but the name of one of them occurs curiously, with other names familiar to us in Paul's epistles, in the Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla. See THECLA LEGEND.

There Tryphsena appears as a rich Christian widow of Antioch, who gives Thecla a refuge in her house, and sends money to Paul for the relief of the  poor (see Jones, On the Canon, 2, 371, 380). It is impossible to discern any trace of probability in this part of the legend.

It is an interesting fact that the columbaria of “Caesar's household” in the Vigna Qodini, near the Porta S. Sebastiano, at Rome, contain the name Tryphaena, as well as other names mentioned in this chapter, Philologus and Julia (Eccl. 6:15), and also Amplias (Ecc 6:8). See Wordsworth, Tour in Italy (1862), 2, 173.

## Trypho[[@Headword:Trypho]]

             an eminent man, who was seized as a Christian and imprisoned at Nice, about A.D. 50, in company with another, named Respicius. They were soon after put to the rack, which they bore with admirable patience for three hours, and uttered the praises of the Almighty the whole time. They were then exposed naked to the severity of the open air, which benumbed all their limbs, as it was in the very depth of winter.

## Tryphon[[@Headword:Tryphon]]

             (Τρύφων, a not infrequent Greek name of the later age), a usurper of the Syrian throne. His proper name was Diodotus (Strabo, 16:2, 10; Appian, Syr. 68), and the surname Tryphon was given to him, or, according to Appian, adopted by him, after his accession to power (Livy, Epit. 53, 45). He was a native of Cariana, a fortified place in the district of Apamea, where, he was brought up (Strabo, loc. cit.). In the time of Alexander Balas he was attached to the court (Appian, loc. cit., δοῦλος τῶν βασιλέων; Diodor. Fr. 21:ap. Müller, Hist. Gr. Frogm. 2, 17, στρατηγός; 1Ma 11:39, τῶν παρὰ Α᾿λεξ); but towards the close of his reign he seems to have joined in the conspiracy which was set on foot to transfer the crown of Syria to Ptolemy Philometor (1Ma 11:13; Diodor. loc. cit.). After the death of Alexander Balas he took advantage of the unpopularity of Demetrius II to put forward the claims of Antiochus VI, the young son of Alexander (1Ma 11:39), B.C. 145. After a time he obtained the support of Jonathan, who had been alienated from Demetrius by his ingratitude, and the young king was crowned (B.C. 144). Tryphon, however, soon revealed his real designs on the kingdom, and, fearing the opposition of Jonathan, he gained possession of his person by treachery (1Ma 12:39-50), and after a short time put him to death (1Ma 13:23). As the way  now seemed clear, he murdered Antiochus, and seized the supreme power (1Ma 11:31-32), which he exercised, as far as he was able, with violence and rapacity (1Ma 11:34). His tyranny again encouraged the hopes of Demetrils, who was engaged in preparing an expedition against him (B.C. 141), when he was taken prisoner (1Ma 14:1-3), and Tryphon retained the throne (Justin, 36:1; Diodor: Leg. 31), till Antiochus VII, the brother of Demetrius, drove him to Dora, from which he escaped to Orthosia, in Phoenicia (1Ma 15:10-14; 1Ma 15:37-39), B.C. 139. Not long afterwards, being hard pressed by Antiochus, he committed suicide, or, according to other accounts, was put to death by Antiochus (Strabo, 14:5, 2; Appian, Syr. 68, Α᾿ντίοχος- κτείνει...σὺνπόνῳ πολλῷ). Josephus (Ant. 13:7, 2) adds that he was killed at Apamea, the place which he made his headquarters (Strabo, 16:2, 10). The authority of Tryphon was evidently very partial, as appears from the growth of Jewish independence under Simon Maccabaeus, and Strabo describes him as one of the chief authors of Cilician piracy (14, 3, 2). His name occurs on the coins of Antiochus VI, and he also struck coins in his own name. SEE ANTIOCHUS; SEE DEMETRIUS.

## Tryphosa[[@Headword:Tryphosa]]

             (Τρυφῶσα, lixurious), a Christian female at Rome, addressed by Paul (Rom 16:12). A.D. 55. SEE TRYPHENA.

## Tsab[[@Headword:Tsab]]

             SEE TORTOISE.

## Tsabians[[@Headword:Tsabians]]

             (from צָבָא, a host) were those who worshipped the heavenly hosts, that being one of the earliest forms in which idolatry appeared. This species of idolatry first prevailed in Chaldaea, whence it spread over all the East, passed into Egypt, and thence found its way into Greece. The sun, moon, and each of the stars was believed to be a divine intelligence, who exercised a constant influence for good or evil upon the destinies of men. SEE SABIANS.

## Tsabua[[@Headword:Tsabua]]

             SEE HYENA.

## Tsaphtsaphah[[@Headword:Tsaphtsaphah]]

             SEE WILLOW.

## Tschi Version[[@Headword:Tschi Version]]

             SEE OTJI VERSION.

## Tschirner[[@Headword:Tschirner]]

             SEE TZSCHIRNER.

## Tschornaboltzi[[@Headword:Tschornaboltzi]]

             (or rather Tchernolftz), Russian sect, the members of which refuse to take an oath, hold it unlawful to shave the beard, and do rot pray for the emperor and imperial family according to the prescribed form. They have many things in common with the other sects, and believe that the end of the world is at hand. SEE RUSSIAN SECTS.

## Tseba[[@Headword:Tseba]]

             SEE SABAOTH.

## Tsebi[[@Headword:Tsebi]]

             SEE ROE.

## Tselatsal[[@Headword:Tselatsal]]

             SEE LOCUST.

## Tsepha[[@Headword:Tsepha]]

             SEE COCKATRICE.

## Tsephardea[[@Headword:Tsephardea]]

             SEE FROG.

## Tseri[[@Headword:Tseri]]

             SEE BALM.

## Tsing-Chamun-Keaou[[@Headword:Tsing-Chamun-Keaou]]

             or Tea-sect of China (q.v.).

## Tsinnin[[@Headword:Tsinnin]]

             SEE THORN.

## Tsiphoni[[@Headword:Tsiphoni]]

             SEE ADDER.

## Tsippor[[@Headword:Tsippor]]

             SEE SPARROW.

## Tsirah[[@Headword:Tsirah]]

             SEE HORNET.

## Tsiriuph[[@Headword:Tsiriuph]]

             (צירי), or anagram, is a Cabalistic rule according to which various words are formed through the change of any word into others by the transposition of the component letters. Thus בראשית, “in the beginning,” has been anagramatized ברית אש, “a covenant of fire,” to accord with Deu 33:2, “from his right hand went a fiery law for them.” ‘In a Cabalistic book entitled תיקוניםupwards of seventy combinations of this single word are formed by R. Simeon benJochai. The Cabalists say that because the Hebrew letters are spiritual, and simple figures, they can therefore be construed in different ways; but this can be done in any language. Thus Herbert anagramatized the Virgin Mary into Army, as seen in the following two lines:

“How well her name an Army doth present, In whom the Lord of hosts did pitch his tent!” (B.P.)

## Tsiyim[[@Headword:Tsiyim]]

             SEE WILDERNESS, BEASTS OF.

## Tsonkhapa[[@Headword:Tsonkhapa]]

             a Thibetan reformer and monk, was born A.D. 1355, in the district of Amdo. He strictly prohibited ordinary tricks and pretended miracles of charlatanism, and united and reconciled the dialectical and mystical schools of modern Buddhism. He also published most comprehensive works. His  innovations were never universally acknowledged. His followers, however, called Geluckpa, or Galdaupa, are the most numerous, and wear a yellow garb, the others having chosen red. SEE THIBET.

## Tsor [[@Headword:Tsor ]]

             SEE FLINT.

## Tsori [[@Headword:Tsori ]]

             SEE BALM.

## Tubal[[@Headword:Tubal]]

             (Heb. Tubal', תּוּבִל[ תְּבִלin Gen 10:2; Eze 32:26; Eze 39:1], of uncertain signification; Sept. θοβέλ, except in Eze 39:1, where Alex. θοβέρ; Vulg. Thubal, but in Isa 66:19, Italia). In the ancient ethnological tables of Genesis and 1 Chronicles Tubal is reckoned with Javan and Meshech among the sons of Japheth (Gen 10:2; 1 Chronicles 1, 5). B.C. post 2514. The three are again associated in the enumeration of the sources of the wealth of Tyre Javan, Tubal, and Meshech brought slaves and copper vessels to the Phoenician markets (Eze 27:13). Tubal and Javan (Isa 66:19), Meshech and Tubal (Eze 32:26; Eze 38:2-3; Eze 39:1), are nations of the north (Eze 38:15; Eze 39:2). Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 1) identifies the descendants of Tubal with the Iberians, that is-not, as Jerome would understand it, Spaniards, but-the inhabitants of a tract of country between the Caspian and Euxine seas, which nearly corresponded to the modern Georgia. Knobel connects these Iberians of the East and West, and considers the Tibareni to have been a branch of this widely spread Turanian family, known to the Hebrews as Tubal ( Volkertafeld. Genesis § 13). Bochart (Phaleg, 3, 12) makes the Moschi and Tibareni represent Meshech and Tubal. These two Colchian tribes are mentioned together in Herodotus on two occasions, first, as forming part of the nineteenth satrapy of the Persian empire (3, 94), and again as being in the army of Xerxes under the command of Ariomardus the son of Darius: (7, 78). The Moschi and Tibareni, moreover, are “constantly associated, under the names of Mluskai and Tuplai, in the Assyrian inscriptions” (Sir H. Rawlinson, in Rawlinson's Herod 1, 535).

The Tibareni are said by the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (2, 1010) to have been a Scythian tribe, and they as well as the Moschi are probably to be referred to that Turanian people who in very  early times spread themselves over the entire region between the Mediterranean and India, the Persian Gulf and the Caucasus (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 535). In the time of Sargon, according to the inscriptions, Ambris, the son of Khuliya, was hereditary chief of Tubal (the southern slopes of Taurus). He had cultivated relations with the kings of Musak and Vararat (Meshech and Ararat, or the Moschi and Armenia), who were in revolt against Assyria, and thus drew upon himself the hostility of the great king (ibid. 1, 169, note 3). In former times the Tibareni were probably more important; and the Moschi and Tibareni, Meshech and Tubal, may have been names by which powerful hordes of Scythians were known to the Hebrews.

But in history we only hear of them as pushed to the farthest limits of their ancient settlements, and occupying merely a strip of coast along the Euxine. Their neighbors the Chaldeeans were in the same condition. In the time of Herodotus the Moschi and Tibareni were even more closely connected than at a later period, for in Xenophon we find them separated by the Macrones and Mossynoeci (A nab. 5, 5,1; Pliny, 6:4, etc.). The limits of the territory of the Tibareni are extremely difficult to determine with any degree of accuracy. After a part of the ten thousand Greeks, on their retreat with Xenophon, had embarked at Cerasus (perhaps near the modern KerasAn Dere Su), the rest marched along the: coast, and soon came to the boundaries of the Mossynceci (Anab. 5, 4, 2). They traversed the country occupied by this people in eight days, and then came to the Chalybes, and after them to the Tibareni. The eastern limit of the Tibareni was therefore about eighty or ninety miles along the coast west of Cerasus. Two days march through Tibarene brought the Greeks to Cotyora (ibid. 5, 5, 3), and they were altogether three days in passing through the country (Diod. Sic. 14, 30). Now from Cape Jasoniurn to Boon, according to Arrian (Peripl. 16), the distance was 90 stadia, 90 more to Cotyora, and 60 from Cotyora to the river Melanthius, making in all a coast line of 240 stadia, or three days march. Prof. Rawlinson (Herod. 4:181) conjectures that the Tibareni occupied the coast between Cape Yasfin (Jasonium) and the river Melanthius (Melet Irmak); but if we follow Xenophon, we must place Boon as their western boundary, one day's march from Cotyora, and their eastern limit must be sought some ten miles east of the Melet Irmak, perhaps not far from the modern Aptar, which is three and a half hours from that river.

The anonymous author of the Periplus of the Euxine says (33) that the Tibareni formerly dwelt west of Cotyora as far as Polemonium, at the mouth of the Puleman chai, one and a half miles east of Fatsah.  In the time of Xenophon the Tibareni were an independent tribe (Anab. 7:8, 25). Long before this they were subject to a number of petty chiefs, which was a principal element of their weakness, and rendered their subjugation by Assyria more easy. Dr. Hincks (quoted by Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 380, note 1) has found as many as twenty-four kings of the Tuplai mentioned in the inscriptions. They are said by Apollonius Rhodius to have been rich in flocks (Aug. 2, 377). The traffic in slaves and vessels of copper with which the people of Tubal supplied the markets of Tyre (Eze 27:13) still further connects them with the Tibareni. It is well known that the regions bordering on the Pontus Euxinus furnished the most beautiful slaves, and that the slave-traffic was an extensive branch of trade among the Cappadocians (Polyb. 4:38, 4; Horace, Ep. 1, 6,39; Persius, Sat.. 6:77; Martial, Ep. 6:77; 10:76, etc.). The copper of the Mossynoeci, the neighbors of the Tibareni, was celebrated as being extremely bright and without any admixture of tin (Aristot. De Mir. Auscult. 62); and the Chalybes, who lived between these tribes, were long famous for their craft as metal-smiths. We must not forget, too, the copper-mines of Chalvar in Armenia (Hamilton, Asia Min. 1. 173).

The Arabic version of Gen 10:2 gives Chorasan and China for Meshech and Tubal; in Eusebius (see Bochart) they are Illyria and Thessaly. The Talmudists (Yoma, fol. 10, 2), according to Bochart, define Tubal as “the home of the Uniaci (אונייקי),” whom he is inclined to identify with the Huns (Phaleg, 3, 12). ‘They may, perhaps, take their name from AEnoe, the modern Unieh, a town on the south coast of the Black Sea, not far from Cape Yasfn, and so in the immediate neighborhood of the Tibareni. In the Targum of R. Joseph on 1 Chronicles (ed. Wilkins) ויתינייאis given as, the equivalent of Tubal, and Wilkins renders it by Bithynia. But the reading in this passage, as well as in the Targums of Jerusalem and of Jonathan on Genesis 10, is too doubtful to be followed as even a traditional authority. SEE ETHNOLOGY.

## Tubal-cain[[@Headword:Tubal-cain]]

             (Heb. Tu'bal Ka'yin, תּוּבִל קִיַן, apparently of foreign etymology; Sept. ὁ θοβέλ; Vulg. Tubal cain), the son of Lamech the Cainite by his wife Zillah (Gen 4:22). B.C. cir. 3700. He is called “a furbisher of every cutting instrument of copper and iron.” The Jewish legend of later times associates him with his father's song. “Lamech was blind,” says the story as told by Rashi, “and Tubal-cain was leading him; and he saw Cain, and he appeared  to him like a wild beast, so he told his father to draw his bow, and he slew him. And when he knew that it was Cain his ancestor, he smote his hands together and struck his son between them. So he slew him, and his wives withdraw from him and he conciliates them.” In this story Tubal-cain is the “young man” of the song. Rashi apparently considers the name of Tubal- cain as an appellative, for he makes him director of the works of Cain for making weapons of war, and connects “Tubal” with תִּבֵּל, tabbel, to season, and so to prepare skillfully. He appears, moreover, to have pointed it תּוֹבֵלtobel, which seems to have been the reading of the Sept. and Josephus. According to the writer last mentioned (Ant. 1, 2, 2), Tubal- cain was distinguished for his prodigious strength and his success in war.

The derivation of the name is extremely obscure. Hasse (Entdeckungen, 2, 37, quoted by Knobel on Gen 4:22) identifies Tubal-cain with Vulcan; and Buttmann (Mythol. 1, 164) not only compares these names, but adds to the comparison the Τελχῖνες of Rhodes, the first workers in copper and iron (Strabo, 14:654), and Dwalinn, the daemon smith of the Scandinavian mythology. Gesenius proposed to consider it a hybrid word, compounded of the Pers. tupal, iron slag, or scoria, and the Arab. kain, a smith; but this etymology is more than doubtful. The Scythian race Tubal, who were coppersmiths (Eze 27:13), naturally suggest themselves in connection with Tubal-cain.

## Tubiea Es De[[@Headword:Tubiea Es De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris, April 20,1669. After having been admitted doctor at the Sorbonnue, he was appointed one of the king's almoners, under the auspices of Madame de Maintenon, next grand-vicar of cardinal Noailles, and obtained, in 1704, the bishopric of Auxerre. In that city he exhibited his charity during the very severe winter of 1709. He was one of the opponents of the bull Unigenitus, and also one of the twelve bishops who protested against the deposition of Soanen and against the declaration of 1730. Caylus died at Rennes, April 3, 1754. His works were published in 10 vols., from 1750 to 1752. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Tubieni[[@Headword:Tubieni]]

             (Τουβιῆνοι; Alex. Τουβεῖνοι; Vulg. Tubiancei). The “Jews called Tubieni” lived about Charax, 750 stadia from a strongly fortified city called Caspis (2Ma 12:17). They were doubtless the same who are elsewhere mentioned as living in the towns of Toubion (A.V. “Tobie”), which again is probably the same with the TOB SEE TOB (q.v.) of the Old Test.

## Tubingen School, The New[[@Headword:Tubingen School, The New]]

             A very different sera was inaugurated in the University of Tübingen on the appointment of F. C. Baur (q.v.) as professor of theology in 1826. He began to attack the objective positions of Christianity through the Pauline epistles, selecting some of these only as authentic, and pointing out alleged discrepancies between them and other parts of the New-Test. history. His theory, which is summed up in his work on the apostle Paul, is, in brief, that, taking the epistles to the Galatians, the Romans, and the Corinthians especially as guides, we find therein “exposed the fact that there were two parties in the early Church, the Pauline and the Petrine. These struggled for supremacy, and the conflict was a long one. Peter was a thorough Jew, and his side predominated even after, the death of the principal combatants. Judaism was the cradle of Christianity; and the latter was only an earnest, restless, reformatory branch of the former. But it was not an offshoot as yet, for Christianity was essentially Jewish all through its first historic period. The canonical writings of the New Test., which constitute the chief literature of the first two centuries, are the literary monument of Christianity while it was yet undeveloped and undetached from Judaism. These writings are the mediating theology of those distant days. The Petrine party was very strong until the middle of the 2nd century, when it was obliged to yield to, or rather harmonize with, the Pauline. Many causes contributed to bring the two factions together. There was an absence of growth quite incompatible with their respective strength. Alone, they were almost unable to brave the storm of persecution. Finally, for the sake of security and propagation, they laid down their weapons and united under one banner. From this union came the subsequent growth of Christianity. The canonical works so much revered by the Church had been written in the interest of one or the other of these parties. Since the enmity has been destroyed, their literary productions must be considered in the light of history. The Church is therefore much mistaken in attaching importance to the Scriptures, for they were written for a timeserving end, and are quite unworthy of the interest which we attach to them.”

It is obvious how destructive to the essential faith of Christians were these positions, and yet it is wonderful that they were broached with so much assurance, although based upon so trivial a comparison of circumstances. Nevertheless, a numerous circle of disciples clustered around Baur, and they enjoyed his leadership until his death, in 1860. But the writings of both the master and his school were quickly answered by the best  theologians of Germany, such as Thiersch, Dorner, Leckler, Lange, Schaff, Bleek, Hase, Bunsen, and Tischendorf. Yet the effects of the insinuations, suspicions, and criticisms of Baur were for a long time a serious hindrance to the truth. The authors of the movement were disciples of the Hegelian philosophy. Their aim was to explain the origin of Christianity by natural causes alone. In this endeavor they but reproduced in a new and ingenious form the exploded infidelity of a former age. And the primitive doctrine of supranaturalism was again defended by an appeal, as of old and ever, to facts of the inspired records and the instinctive convictions of humanity. Yet some of its champions in this contest were themselves unconsciously infected more or less by the insinuating influences of the new skepticism, and were led to make concessions which later and so under theologians have seen to be unnecessary and untenable.

Meanwhile, the attack upon the fundamental documents of Christianity was resumed in a still more virulent form by D. F. Strauss (q.v.), on his appointment to the theological faculty of Tübingen in 1832, and culminated in his famous Leben Jesu, which boldly impugns the historical truth of the Gospel itself. For the discussion of the controversy resulting, SEE MYTHICAL THEORY. A strong reaction has long since set in against these negative views, even in Tübingen itself so that what has recently been known as “the Tübingen theology” is likely soon to be a thing of the past. See Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 280 sq.; Cook, Monday Lectures, ser. 1; Fisher, Supernat. Origin of Christianity, p. 35. — SEE NEOLOGY.

## Tubingen School, the Old[[@Headword:Tubingen School, the Old]]

             The origin of this school, which became so noteworthy a factor in the development of Protestant theology during the latter half of the 18th century, is associated chiefly with the personality and influence of G. C. Storr (q.v.), professor of theology in the University of Tübingen, and, at a later day, court-preacher at Stuttgart. This scholar gathered about him a number of pupils, whom he impressed with the broad culture and thorough and comprehensive learning as well as logical arrangement and  extraordinary clearness of his lectures, and whom he captivated by his evident piety, dignified demeanor, and unvarying kindness. Storr's dominant elements of character, whether as a man or a scholar, were, however, wholly of the objective class. His piety was not the expression of profound religious feeling, but of rigidly earnest and conscientious principle; and as his heart lacked fervor, so his intellect was deficient in imagination and the true speculative quality. The age in which he lived was a' period of unrest. The orthodoxy of Brentius and Jakob Andrea was beginning to loosen its hold upon the times. J. W. Jager, the learned chancellor (1702-20), had ventured upon the innovation of introducing a more attractive method in theology than that in vogue. Pfaff and Weismann also broke away from the polemical methods of orthodoxy, and sought to impart greater simplicity: and life to theological instruction.

In another direction, the so-called enlightenment or neology of the 18th century was gaining prominence and power, and was rejecting not merely the form, but the substance, of the orthodox teachings. Storr was not able to deny that the crisis which had come upon theology had its origin in very adequate causes; but he could not fully accept all its results, and therefore assumed a position midway between the contending parties, so as to be able to retain much of the substance of the old orthodox theology while adopting much of the methods of the new. He endeavored to base his teaching wholly on the Scriptures, and for that purpose brought together a mass of isolated passages to serve as the basis of his theology; but he had no conception of the organic unity of Scripture, of its living combination into separate principles, and of a consequent genetic unfolding of scriptural truths. Baur strikingly remarks that Storr recognised no canon, but only passages, of the Scriptures. His system was furthermore impaired by the Pelagianizing tendency ‘of his mind, which led him to tone down the contrast between the fundamental doctrines of sin and grace, and to make grave concessions to neology with regard to the doctrines of the atonement and of the person of Christ. His great object was to render Christianity plausible to the destructive criticism of his time; and the endeavor to realize that object occasioned in his bearing a certain indecision and ambiguity of manner, so that his theology is made to seem forced and constrained.

Great attention is given to the discussion of unimportant and particular ideas, while the thought of a connected and organic system of Christianity has no proper recognition in his works. This disposition to expend effort upon subordinate. details is apparent in all his works, and especially in his criticism of Kant's Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Velnunft,  and in the works he aimed against the “accommodation hypothesis” of Semler, Teller, and others. It was his misfortune to want the historical sense, and that attitude of impartiality towards doctrine which would have enabled him to discover the gradual development of scriptural truth. His system of Christian dogmatics and ethics aims to be simply a bringing- together and connecting of the results of exegesis; and this aim is realized by the mosaic-like collocation of isolated passages in such a manner as to justify the above criticism of Baur that Storr had no authoritative rule, but only a fragmentary view of Scripture. In this way he gave expression to the principle of the authority of Scripture upon which he professed to erect his entire system.

The school of Storr was, more particularly, composed of Johann Friedrich Flatt, Friedrich Gottlieb Susskind, and Karl Christian Flatt, all of them pupils successors, and in part colleagues of Storr in the theological faculty (for a more particular notice of these scholars, see the articles under their names). The older Flatt was an acute and learned man, exceedingly conscientious and careful, naturally cheerful, but infirm in body and greatly afflicted by repeated sorrows, in consequence of which he developed a measure of irritability and melancholy in his disposition. He left lectures on Christian ethics and on the Pauline epistles, which were published from notes by his pupils. Susskind devoted his scientific activity chiefly to the elucidation of fundamental questions in doctrines and apologetics considered with reference to the philosophy current in his day. Against Kant and Fichte he discussed the office and the limitations of reason, and against Schelling he endeavored to secure the theistic basis of Christianity. His investigations in the line of doctrine were chiefly concerned with the idea of the possibility of the forgiveness of sins, or, in other words, of the remission of penalty. He also discussed, in a fragmentary way, the theology of Schleiermacher (see Susskind, Vermischte Schriften, 1831). His leading personal traits were great intellectual penetration and energy of the will, united with sternness of manner and the utmost conscientiousness of spirit. He was a master in logic, bold and confident in debate, the dialectician of, his school. His ability was nevertheless impaired by the lack of speculative power and depth. The younger Flatt was rather a receptive than an independently creative character. His earliest work attempted to prove that the Kantian theory of atonement, according to which the forgiveness of sills is determined by, and consequent on, the measure of moral reformation, is not the only reasonable, but also the only allowable, view  under the New Test. He was induced to retract the teachings of that book, and in time became wholly identified with the tendency of Storr and the elder Flatt.

The peculiarity of these theologians lay in the abstract theism beyond which they were not able to advance by reason of the want of true philosophical sense. They employed a pitiless logic to expose the gaps and weaknesses of transcendental speculation, but failed to attain to a living apprehension of their own theism; and, while they defended their theory of revelation with the utmost tenacity, they rendered that theory thoroughly intolerable to reason by numerous provisos, explanations, and modifications. This criticism applies to everything which is peculiar to their teaching, and indicates what is, more than any other feature, the characteristic of their school.

Affiliated to this school, though less closely than the men already named, was Ernst Gottlieb Bengel, professor of historical theology at Tübingen. This scholar passed beyond the ordinary favorable attitude of the school of Storr in his fondness for Socinian views, and was also a Kantianizing, rationalizing supranaturalist. So firmly was he entrenched in such views that he steadily refused to be influenced by any new tendency which the changing philosophy of a new era might bring to bear upon theological inquiry. He scarcely indicated that he knew of the existence of Schleiermacher, and prevented the appointment of Bockshammer who had written an unusually able work on the freedom of the will-to the faculty as the successor of the eider Flatt, because of Bockshammer's departure from the old plan to which Bengel was committed. Other adherents of this school, as Steudel, Christian Friedrich Schmid; etc., remained more faithful to the Storriai ideas in some respects, but were, on the other hand, gradually led -away from the traditional position of the Tübingen school through the influence of the theology of Schleiermacher. New men, new tendencies, new methods, have taken the place of the old, not only with respect to the external fact, but even as regards the results of what was at one time a noteworthy factor in the development of theological science. The Tübingen school has produced, upon the whole, effects much less important to such development than its prominence would seem to warrant.

See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v., and the various names mentioned in this article in Herzog and this Cyclopedia. SEE RATIONTALISM.

## Tuch, Johann Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Tuch, Johann Christian Friedrich]]

             a Protestant divine of Germany, was born Dec. 17, 1806, at Quedlinburg. Having prepared himself for the university at the gymnasium in Nordhausen, he went in 1828 to Halle, where he attended the lectures of Gesenius. Here he also commenced his lectures on Oriental languages and Old-Test. exegesis. In 1839 the Zurich University made him licentiate of theology, while the philosophical faculty of Halle appointed him extraordinary professor. In 1841 he was called to Leipsic, and was made ordinary professor in 1843, having shortly before been honored with the doctorate by the Tübingen faculty. In 1853 he was made third professor and canon of Zeitz, and died as first professor, April 12, 1867. His main work is his learned Commentary on Genesis (Halle, 1838; 2d ed. 1871). He also published Commentationis de Lipsiensi Codice Pentateuchi Syri Manuscripto Particula I (Lips. 1849): —Commentationes Geographicae.  Pars 1, De Nino Urbe Animadversiones tres (ibid. 1845): —Reise des Sheikh Ibrahim el-Khijari elMedeni durch einen Theil Palastinas (ibid. 1850): —Commentatio de Μαισαλώθ ἐν Α᾿ρβήλοις, 1Ma 9:2 (ibid. 1853): —Die Himmelfahrt Jesu (ibid. 1857): —Quaestiones de Flavii Josephi Libris Historicis (ibid. 1859): —Quaestiones de Flavii Josephi loco B. .1 4:8, 2 (ibid. 1860). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 450; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1352; Theol. Universal-Lex. s.v.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift, 1871, pt, 3; Diestel, Gesch. d. alten Testaments in der christl. Kirche, p. 613, 648, 730; Literarischer Handweiserfuir das kathol. Deutschland, 1867, p. 266. (B. P.)

## Tucher, Christoph Karl Goittlieb[[@Headword:Tucher, Christoph Karl Goittlieb]]

             a famous jurist of Germany, was born May 14, 1798, at Nuremberg. He studied jurisprudence at Erlangen, Heidelberg, and Berlin, and after ‘having occupied prominent positions in his profession, he died at Berlin, Feb. 17, 1877. He is known as the author of the following hymnological works: Schatz des evangelischen Kirchenqesanges, der Melodie und Harmonie nach, aus den Quellen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts geschopft, etc. (Stutt. 1840): —Schatz des evangielischen Kirchengesangs im 1. Jahrhundert der Reformation (Leips. 1848, 2 vols). (B. P.)

## Tucker (or Tooker), William, D.D[[@Headword:Tucker (or Tooker), William, D.D]]

             a learned English divine of the 16th century, was born at Exeter. He was educated at New College, Oxford and was admitted perpetual fellow in 1577. In 1585 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Barnstable, in Devonshire. He was eventually made chaplain to queen Elizabeth. Dr. Tucker afterwards became prebendary of Salisbury, and took his degree of D.D. in 1594. He was made canon of the church at Exeter, and was installed dean of Lichfield, Feb. 21, 1604. He died at Salisbury, March 19, 1620. Dr. Tucker was esteemed an excellent Greek and Latin scholar. He was an able divine, a person of great gravity and piety, and well read in curious and critical authors. His publications are, Charisma, sive Ribilium Sanitatum Gratia, etc. (Lond. 1597, 4to), a historical defense of the power of royalty to cure the king's evil: —Q f the Fabric of the Church and Churchmen's Living (ibid. 1604, 8vo): —Singulare (Certamen cum Martino Becano Jesuita (ibid. 1611, 8vo), written in defence of James I against Becan and Bellarmine. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Author s, s.v.

## Tucker, Abraham[[@Headword:Tucker, Abraham]]

             a metaphysical writer, was born in London in 1705, and was educated at Bishop's Stortford School and Merton College, Oxford. He studied for a while at the Inner Temple, but was not admitted to the bar. He died in 1774. He published, Free-will, Fore-knowledge, and Fate; a Fragment by Edward Search (Lond. 1763, 8vo): — Man in Quest of Himself or a Defence of the Individuality of the Human Mind or Self, etc., by Cuthbert Comment, Gent. (763, 8vo). His great work, however, is The Light of Nature Pursued, by Edward Search (1768-78; Cambridge, Mass., 1831, 4 vols. 8vo; with later editions, and an abridgment by William Hazlitt, 1807, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tucker, Elijah W[[@Headword:Tucker, Elijah W]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Dorchester, Mass., March 31, 1810. He was converted at the age of twenty, graduated at Brown University in 1838, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1841, and labored at South New Market, N. H., in 1841 sq.; Chatham, Mass., in 1846  sq.; Essex, Conn., in 1852; Goshen, Conn., 1853-58; Preston, Conn., 1858-65; and Northfield, Conn., in 1865, until his death, July 6, 1866. Mr. Tucker was a direct, earnest preacher, aid a sympathetic, watchful pastor. Revivals resulted from his labors in almost every field. See Cong, Quarterly, 1867, p. 46.

## Tucker, Elisha, D.D[[@Headword:Tucker, Elisha, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Rensselaerville, Albany County, N.Y., Dec. 24, 1794. His early education was limited. He began to preach in 1816, and was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church of Coventry, Chenango County, N.Y., Aug. 19, 1818. Here he continued with great success until Aug. 12, 1822, when he became pastor of the Church at Fredonia, N. Y. He was afterwards pastor of the First Baptist Church in Buffalo from September, 1831, until October, 1836; then of the Second. Baptist Church of Rochester, N.Y., until May, 1841; and of the Oliver Street Baptist Church, New York city until 1848. In 1851 his health became very much impaired, and he began traveling in the hope of improving it, but died Dec. 29, 1853. He was the eldest of six brothers, five of whom entered the ministry. Dr. Tucker published a Sermon Delivered at Fredonia at the Ordination of Mr. Jarius Handy (1826). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:667.

## Tucker, John, D.D[[@Headword:Tucker, John, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Amesbury, Massachusetts, September 19, 1719. He graduated from Harvard College in 1741, studied theology with Reverend Paine Wingate, of Amesbury, and was ordained at Newbury, Massachusetts, November 20, 1745, as colleague-pastor with the Reverend Christopher Toppan. His death occurred March 22, 1792. He was the author of several published sermons and controversial pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:451.

## Tucker, Josiah, D.D[[@Headword:Tucker, Josiah, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, was born at Laugherne, Carmarthenshire, in 1711. He was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1737 became curate of St. Stephen's Church, Bristol, and was subsequently appointed minor canon in the cathedral of that city. On the death of Mr. Catcott, he became rector of St. Stephen's, and in 1758 was created dean of Gloucester. Mr. Tucker was an able advocate of the great political questions of the day, and was bold and determined in the principles, which he advocated. He died Nov. 4, 1799. He wrote, The Elements of Commerce and Theory of Taxes (Bristol, 1753, 4to): —Six Sermons (1772, 12mo): —four tracts, etc., on political and commercial subjects (Glouces. 1774, 8vo): —besides Treatises, etc. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tucker, Levi, D.D[[@Headword:Tucker, Levi, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was horn in Schoharie County, N. Y., July 6, 1804. He studied theology at the Hamilton Institution, graduated June 3, 1829, and  on the 10th of the same month was ordained pastor of the church at Deposit, N.Y. In the summer of 1831 he accepted a call to settle at Blockley (now West Philadelphia), Pa., where he labored with great success, acting also for a while as agent of the Baptist Educational Society of that state, until the spring of 1836, when he removed to Cleveland, O. After remaining there seven years, he was for a while pastor of the Washington Street Baptist Church in Buffalo, and on Dec. 29, 1848, became pastor of the Bowdon Place Church, Boston. His health having become greatly impaired, he resigned his charge in September, 1852, and took a journey to England, France, Italy, and Egypt, whence he returned in the early part of August, 1853, and died on the 23d of the same month. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:786.

## Tucker, Mark, D.D[[@Headword:Tucker, Mark, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Whitestown, N.Y., June 7,1795. He studied at Whitestown, graduated from Union College in 1814, and was instructed in theology by president E. Nott, D.D.; ordained pastor at Stillwater, October 8, 1817, and dismissed in 1823; installed colleague with Reverend Solomon Williams, at Northampton, Massachusetts, March 10, 1824, and dismissed August 16, 1827; called to the Second Presbyterian Church, at Troy, N.Y., October 31, 1827; to the Beneficent Church, at Providence, R.I., in June of 1837, and dismissed March 24, 1856; installed at Vernon, Connecticut, April 15, 1857, and was pastor of this church until 1863. He resided without charge at Ellington and Old Saybrook, and after 1865 at Weathersfield, where. he died, March 19, 1875. He was chosen a director of the American Home Missionary Society in 1832, a vicepresident in 1844, and. was a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions from 1838. See Cong. Quarterly, 1876, page 435.

## Tucker, Silas, D.D[[@Headword:Tucker, Silas, D.D]]

             one of five brothers, all Baptist ministers, was born May 16,1813, baptized in 1833, licensed the next year, studied in the seminary at Hamilton, N.Y., in 1837 became pastor in Cleveland, Ohio, subsequently of other churches in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and died at Aurora, Illinois, November 7, 1872. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Tuckerman, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Tuckerman, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born in Boston, Mass., Jan. 18, 1778, and graduated from Harvard College in 1798. After devoting himself to the study of theology, under Rev. Thomas Thacher of Bedham, he was ordained and installed as pastor in Chelsea, Nov. 4, 1801. While at Chelsea, his attention was drawn to the temptations and necessities of seafaring men, and in the winter of 1811-12 he founded the first society for  the religious and moral improvement of seamen. In 1116 Mr. Tuckerman visited England in search of health, but soon returned without having experienced much apparent advantage from his tour. He resigned his charge at Chelsea in 1826, preaching his farewell sermon on Nov. 4. He immediately entered upon his work as minister at large in Boston, devoting himself to the visitation of the poor and destitute for the remainder of his life. In 1833 he again went to Europe, returning in the following year. He died in Havana, whither he had gone for his health, April 20, 1840. He published a large number of Sermons, Letters, Essays, etc. (1800-38). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:345.

## Tudehope, Archibald[[@Headword:Tudehope, Archibald]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Paisley, Scotland, Aug. 19,1801; graduated at the University of Glasgow in April, 1822; studied theology at the Divinity Hall of the Relief Synod in Paisley; was licensed by the Relief Presbytery of Glasgow in 1828, and ordained pastor of the Church in Annan, in Dumfriesshire, Scotland, Oct. 14,1834. In 1838 he emigrated to the United States, and became pastor of the Ninth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he remained till 1849. He died Dec. 6,1861. He was an instructive preacher, and his sermons to children were specially successful efforts. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 214.

## Tudor Flower[[@Headword:Tudor Flower]]

             SEE TUDOR STYLE.

## Tudor Rose[[@Headword:Tudor Rose]]

             A conventional representation of the rose, found in Third-pointed architectural work, both in wood and stone carvings, adopted in honor of the Tudors.

## Tudor Style[[@Headword:Tudor Style]]

             This name is used by some writers on Gothic architecture, but they do not agree in the application of it. It is variously employed to designate the Perpendicular style throughout its continuance — the latter period of this style-and the mixed style which sprang up on the decline of Gothic architecture, usually called Elizabethan. The term is not very extensively used, and is most commonly understood to mean late Perpendicular work, aid Henry VI‘s Chapel at Westminster is looked upon as the most perfect specimen in this style. The Tudor Flower is a flat flower, or leaf, placed upright on its stalk, much used in Perpendicular work, especially late in the style, in long suites as a crest or ornamental finishing on cornices, etc. The examples differ considerably in detail, but the general effect does not vary much.

## Tudor, Salathiel[[@Headword:Tudor, Salathiel]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bedford County, Pa., in 1789. Converted when a youth, he labored as a local preacher for eleven years; and was received on trial in the Pittsburgh Conference in 1827. In 1829 his health declined; in' 1830 he was a superannuate, and he died Nov. 26 of the same year. As a preacher he was acceptable and useful. “His end was peaceful and glorious.” See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1832, p. 159.

## Tueshimel Erdeni[[@Headword:Tueshimel Erdeni]]

             in Lamaism, is the name for one of the seven sanctuaries which are placed upon the altars in front of the idol. It is a drawing, upon a gold background representing an ambassador of the heavenly kingdom and also the god of the temple.

## Tuet, Esprit Claude[[@Headword:Tuet, Esprit Claude]]

             a French ascetic author, was born about 1745 and died about 1787, and was the writer of a number of religious tracts and sermons, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tufa[[@Headword:Tufa]]

             a porous stone (called travertine when compact) found in calcareous streams, and used, from its lightness, in vaultings, as at Bredon and Canterbury.

## Tuff-taffeta[[@Headword:Tuff-taffeta]]

             a kind of inferior silk used in church-hangings.

## Tuidela, Benjamin (Ben-Jonah) Of[[@Headword:Tuidela, Benjamin (Ben-Jonah) Of]]

             the famous Jewish traveler of the 12th century, is known for his researches on the state of the various colonies of the Hebrew people, both in the East and. in the West. From 1165 to 1173 he traveled in several countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and published his results in his Afassaoth, or Itinerariun, of Benjamin. Among Christians the book has not been favorably received. In the first place, the whole of its complexion is Jewish- recording in every place of his arrival the census, condition, and leading names of his nation; scarcely ever noticing the objects which usually invite the attention of Gentile travelers, such as customs, climate, language, politics, history, etc. In the second place, he commits numerous errors in dates: and names when he does refer to Gentile history; and, thirdly, the farther he advances from home, the more wonderful are his reports concerning the numbers and wealth of the Jews. These considerations have induced every one of his translators to believe that he never quitted Spain, but made a compilation of all the travelers tales he could gather respecting foreign lands. On the other hand, Gibbon (Decline, 5, 348, Milman's ed.) remarks, “The errors and fictions of the Jewish rabbi are not sufficient grounds to deny the reality of his travels.” In our days, however, deeper investigation has certified the reality of the voyage, and the actual truth of many of its details, which are, however, mixed up with much that is fabulous, and accompanied by many incredible tales. This curious book of travels was edited, with a Latin translation, by Arias Montanus at Antwerp in 1622, and by L'Empereur at Leyden in 1633; with an English translation it was published in Purchase's Pilgrims (Loud. 1625, 2, 1437); by Harris, in Collection of Voyages and Travels (ibid. 1744-48), 1, 546-555; by Gerrons (ibid. 1784); by Pinkerton, in his Collection of Voyages and  Travels of the World (ibid. 1804-14), vol. 7; and in Bohn's Early Travels in Palestine (ibid. 1848, p. 63-126). The best edition is that of Asher, The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela (translated, etc.; vol. 1, bibliography and translation, Lond. and Berl. 1840; vol. 2, notes and essays, ibid. 1841). A French translation is given in Bergeron, Collection de Voyages, faits principalement en Asie, dans les XIIe, X1e, XI Ve, et XTVe Siecles (the Hague, 1735, 2 vols.); by Barratier (Amst. 1784, 2 vols.); another transl. appeared at Paris in 1830; a Dutch transl. by Bara (Amst. 1666); and a German transl. in Jewish characters by Arbich (Frankf. —on-the-M. 1711). “See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 1, 117 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico, p. 321 sq. (Germ. transl.); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:214; Braunschweiger, Gesch. d. Juden in d. roman. Staaten, p. 154; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten, p. 289, 371-420; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 2, 54; 3, 363; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, p. 617 (Taylor's transl.); Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 283 sq.; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain, p. 67; Finn, Sephardim, p. 210 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 259; Adams, History of the Jews (Boston, 1812), 1, 238 sq. (B. P.)

## Tuigg, John[[@Headword:Tuigg, John]]

             a Roman Catholic bishop, was born in Cork, Ireland, February 19, 1820. He was educated at All-Hallows College and St. Michael's Seminary, Pittsburgh; ordained in 1850, and appointed to St. Bridget's Church, Pittsburgh but in 1853. became pastor of Altoona. His success here led to his appointment as bishop of Pittsburgh. He was consecrated March 19, 1876, and was soon after charged with the administration of the diocese of Allegheny. He was stricken with paralysis in 1863, and subsequently lived in retirement at Altoona, where he died, December 6, 1889.

## Tuiscon[[@Headword:Tuiscon]]

             in German mythology, was an earth-born god, from whom all Germans are said to have sprung. He was highly esteemed by his son, man. The Druids sacrificed human beings to him. According to the accounts given by Caesar, these sacrifices were made not only in Germany, but throughout the whole of Gaul. Some hold him to be a historic person, others a personified idea.

## Tukkiyim[[@Headword:Tukkiyim]]

             SEE PEACOCK.

## Tukudh Version[[@Headword:Tukudh Version]]

             This version is of a very recent date; and the translation of the four gospels and the epistles of John into that dialect was undertaken by the British and Foreign Bible Society, at the request of the Church Missionary Society, and was made in the year 1872 by the Rev. R. McDonald, who had been laboring among the people with much success. As to the dialect itself, it is spoken by a tribe of Indians on the river Yucon, on the confines of the Arctic region. Mr. McDonald, who has been laboring there for the last sixteen years, has reduced the language to writing, and in his translating efforts has had the assistance of a native Christian. The syllabic characters, which were adopted in the Cree version, were first tried, but the unusually large number of syllables in the language obliged the translator to fall back upon the Roman characters. The following, taken from the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1873, will be of interest to the student: “The Tukudh tribe, which is often known by the name of Loucheux, from a peculiarity in the eyes of some of the natives, is small, not including more than about eight hundred, nearly the whole of whom are under Christian instruction. Their numbers, however, are on the increase, and it is not improbable that some neighboring tribes will become incorporated with them, and thus add considerably to the community. Like most of the North American Indian tribes, the Tukudh Indians have among themselves certain religious beliefs on which it is not impossible to build up the pure theology of the Bible. Their name Tukudh signifies ‘haughty people.' When the geographical position of Mr. McDonald's station at Fort Macpherson is considered, it will not be wondered at that these people are living in primitive simplicity. The edition requested is to consist of five hundred copies, and some of the gospels it is proposed to bind separately.  The expense of the work will be large and the readers few; but when a language has been reduced to written form, and Christian men capable of translating the Scriptures are available, the committee deem it a matter of clear duty to go forward in printing the Word of God, even though but a comparatively small population may be benefited by their labors.” According to the report for 1879, about 810 copies altogether have been circulated among these people. (B. P.)

## Tulchans, or Tulchan Bishops[[@Headword:Tulchans, or Tulchan Bishops]]

             A tulchan was the effigy of a calf, or rather it was a stuffed calfskin, set up before a cow when she was milked under the belief that the animal thereby yielded her milk more freely. The custom has long been discontinued. Under the regent Morton, and after 1572, attempts were made to introduce bishops into the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The men who consented to take the title had bound themselves, as the price of their elevation, to receive only a small part of the revenues, the rest going to Morton and his lordly colleagues. “The bishop had the title, but my lord had the milk.” Such bishops were called tulchans by the people. The first tulchan was John Douglas, appointed to the see of St. Andrew's. Patrick Adamson, who afterwards himself became a tulchan, said in a sermon, “There be three kinds of bishops my lord bishop, my lord's bishop, and the Lord's bishop. My lord bishop was in the papistry; my lord's bishop is now, when my lord gets the benefice, and the bishop serves for nothing but to make his title sure; and the Lord's bishop is the true minister of the gospel.”

## Tulisso[[@Headword:Tulisso]]

             in Prussian mythology, were priests of a lower order, belonging to none of the three higher classes of Grivaites, Siggones, and Wurrkaites. The care of the sick rested with them, whom they either prepared for death, or sought, with their scanty knowledge, to cure or to alleviate their sufferings. They resided among the populace in villages, and were therefore not esteemed very much.

## Tulla Intoon and Halthiorhin[[@Headword:Tulla Intoon and Halthiorhin]]

             According to the Finnish creed, each man bore within him from his birth a divine spirit who was his inseparable companion for life. This spirit became more closely united to its subject in proportion as the latter tore himself away from earthly things to retire into the sanctuary of his soul. The  magician, therefore, aspired to a transcendental ecstasy (tulla intoon), to a great state of excitement of the soul (tulla haltiorhin), in Which he became like the spirit, dwelling in him and entirely identified with it. He used artificial means, e.g. intoxicating drugs, in order to attain to this state of excitement. Lenormant, Chaldaean Magic, p. 254.

## Tulloch, James[[@Headword:Tulloch, James]]

             a Scotch Congregational minister, was the first Dissenter who settled in Scotland. He was tutored by Rev. Mr. Ewing of Glasgow, and sent out under the auspices of the Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home. Mr. Tulloch was settled over the Congregational Church at Bixter in 1808, and did much in establishing new churches and propagating the Gospel. He died Feb. 26, 1862. See (Lond.) Cong. Yearbook, 1864, p. 247.

## Tulloch, John, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Tulloch, John, D.D., LL.D]]

             a minister of the Church of Scotland, was born in Perthshire, June 1, 1823. He was educated at St. Andrews and Edinburgh; became parish minister of Dundee in 1845; of Kettins, in Forfarshire, in 1849; and on the death of principal Haldane; in 1854, became principal of St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews. In 1855 he received the Burnett prize of £600 for an essay on The Being and Attributes of God, which was published under the title Theism. In 1856 he was appointed one of the examiners of the Dick bequest. In 1858 he formally opened the Scotch Presbyterian Church in Paris; in 1859 he was appointed one of her majesty's chaplains for Scotland; in 1862 became deputy clerk of the General Assembly, and in 1875 clerk; in 1878 was elected moderator. He died February 13, 1885. Besides the prize essay, Dr. Tulloch was author of Leaders of the Reformation (1859): — English Puritanism and its Leaders (1861): — Beginning Life (1862): — The Christ of the Gospels and the Christ of Modern Criticism (1864): — Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy (1872, 2 volumes): — Facts of Religion and Life (1876): — Pascal (1876): — The Christian Doctrine of Sin (1877): — Modern Theories in Philosophy and Religion (1884): — Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century (1885).

## Tulloch, Thomas de[[@Headword:Tulloch, Thomas de]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop at Orkney about 1422. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 221.

## Tulloch, William[[@Headword:Tulloch, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was sent by James III into Denmark in 1468 to negotiate a marriage between him and the princess Margaret of that nation. He was bishop of Orkney in 1470. He was made lord privy seal, March 26, 1473. In 1477 he was translated to the see of Moray. He died about 1482. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 222.

## Tully, George[[@Headword:Tully, George]]

             an English divine, was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, and died rector of Gateside in 1697. He was a zealous writer against popery, and was suspended for a sermon he preached and published in 1686. “He was the first clergyman who suffered in the reign of James II in defense of our religion against popish superstition and idolatry.” He is best known as the author of Discourse on the Government of the Thoughts (1693-94, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

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

             a learned English divine, was born in the city of Carlisle July 22, 1620; he entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1634, and obtained a fellowship. In 1642 he was created A.M., and became master of the grammar-school at Tetbury, in Gloucestershire. He afterwards returned to his college, and became a noted tutor and preacher there. He died Jan. 14, 1676.

## Tulu, or Tuluvu[[@Headword:Tulu, or Tuluvu]]

             is the ancient and proper dialect of the long narrow tract of land now called Canara, situated westward of Mysore, between the range of the Western Ghauts and the ocean. Owing to the long subjection of Canara to Karriata princes, the Karnata or Canarese language is now chiefly spoken by the higher classes in the province, while the Tulu still continues the vernacular of the common people, especially in South Canlara. In idiom and structure  it closely resembles the Malayalim language, and it is written in the same characters. In 1834 a missionary station was established by the German Missionary Society at Mangalore, the capital of Canara. In 1844 a translation of the New Test. was made, which was published in 1852. See Bible of Every Land, p. 144. (B. P.)

## Tumanurong[[@Headword:Tumanurong]]

             in the mythology of the Marquesas, was a goddess who descended from heaven and was immediately made queen by the people, who were charmed by her beauty. She married the then ruling sovereign, and gave birth to a son, who was able to speak immediately after his birth.

## Tumblers[[@Headword:Tumblers]]

             a name given to the TUNKER SEE TUNKER (q.v.) in ridicule of their peculiar motions while undergoing the rite of baptism by immersion.

## Tundley, Ralph[[@Headword:Tundley, Ralph]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Alton, Staffordshire, in 1795. He was converted under the influence of the Dissenters, became interested in Sunday-school work, and at the earnest solicitation of the Church at Alton he became their pastor and ministered to them until his death, Feb. 22, 1863. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1864, p. 247.

## Tunic, or Tunicle[[@Headword:Tunic, or Tunicle]]

             a term applied to several articles of clerical dress.

(1.) A dress worn by the subdeacon, made originally of linen, reaching to the feet, and then of inferior silk, and narrower than the dalmatic of the deacon, with shorter and tighter sleeves, and devoid of the stripes or  embroidery of that vestment. For some centuries, however, the assimilation has grown so complete as to render the slight difference between them almost imperceptible. Bishops wore both the tunic and dalmatic at pontifical mass.

(2.) The parva tuinica, or cotta, a linen habit reaching to the knees, used at all kinds of services by simple clerks and others; it differed from the rochet, in being fuller. Amalarius speaks of a blue tunicle of jacinth color, or subucula, worn by the bishop (Rupert says under the chasuble) as emblematical of the seamless robe of Christ.

(3.) A dress worn by monks. SEE COAT.

## Tunicle-ball[[@Headword:Tunicle-ball]]

             a ball of crystal to which tassels were attached, hanging from the shoulders of medieval dalmatics.

## Tunicle-chest[[@Headword:Tunicle-chest]]

             a chest for holding the tunic and dalmatic, and differing in shape from those chests which contained the copes and chasubles of a sacristy.

## Tunis, Jewish Mission At[[@Headword:Tunis, Jewish Mission At]]

             As early as the year 1833, the London Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews commenced missionary operations in Tunis. The first missionary to that place was the late Rev. Dr. F. C. Ewald, who arrived there June 30. He found a Jewish population from 30,000 to 40,000, all living in their own quarter. There was also a large number of Roman Catholics, who had their own church and convent, a Greek community with church and priest, and about fifty Protestants without the means of grace. Mr. Ewald at once commenced divine service, which was attended by almost every Protestant. The Jews being accessible in that place, opportunities were afforded to the missionary to preach unto them the word of God. The Bible in Hebrew' was eagerly sought after and bought by them, and thus the work could be carried on. In 1855 Mr. Page, who succeeded Dr. Ewald, established a school there, which proved a great success. Owing, however, to the removal by cholera of Mr. Page from the scene of his labors, missionary operations had to be suspended for a time, to be resumed again in 1860 by the Rev. Mr. Fenner. In July, 1861, a school was opened for Jewish boys with six scholars, whose number had  increased by the close of the year to ninety-nine, all Jewish youths from seven to eighteen years of age. In 1862 a girls school was established through the benevolence of a Christian lady in the north of England. Since that time missionary operations have been carried on there regularly, and in spite of the efforts made by the Israelitish Alliance to counterbalance the work of the mission, there were 160 boys and 305 girls in attendance at the mission schools during the year 1878-79. Since 1862, 1600 girls and 960 boys have passed through the schools. The popularity of these schools may be best seen from the fact that a notice of the opening of the mission schools after the summer vacation was put up in the principal synagogues of Tunis. In connection with the two-day schools, Sunday schools have also been opened there of late, besides a night school which seems very promising. Some years ago the society built a chapel, where the Protestant community of Tunis is now gathered regularly for divine service, and where the sacraments are administered. According to the last report for the year 1879, there were fourteen persons engaged at this station, viz. two ordained ministers, a colporteur and depositary, a schoolmaster, four assistants, a schoolmistress and four assistants. (B. P.)

## Tunisi[[@Headword:Tunisi]]

             SEE JACOB BEN-CHAJIM.

## Tunkers[[@Headword:Tunkers]]

             (Germ. tunken, “to dip”), a sect of German-American Baptists, called by themselves Brethren. Their name is sometimes erroneously spelled Dunkers. The sect is said to have been founded by Alexander Mack at Schwarzenau, Westphalia, in 1708. Driven from Germany, some of them emigrated to America in 1719, and settled in Pennsylvania. They formed a settlement at Ephrata, Lancaster Co., under the directorship of Conrad Peysel. Here they built a town in the form of a triangle, the houses being three stories in height; and each of them a kind of monastery. They dressed much in the style of monks and nulls, men and women lived in different houses, and they used a vegetable diet, practicing considerable mortification. Although marriage was not forbidden, when couples married they were required to remove from Ephrata. They subsequently settled in Ohio, Indiana, Maryland, Virginia, and several other states. Their doctrines are similar to those of the Mennonites (q.v.), and in dress and manners they resemble the Friends. They use the kiss of charity, feet-washing, laying-on of hands, anointing the sick with oil; are opposed to war, and will not engage in lawsuits. They hold love-feasts, and an annual meeting about Whitsuntide, which is attended by their bishops, teachers, and representatives chosen by the congregations. Universal redemption, though  not an article of faith, is commonly held by them. Some of the more strict sabbatarians, observing Saturday as their day of rest. They oppose statistics, which they believe to savor of pride, and, therefore, trustworthy statements as to their numbers cannot be given; they are supposed to number about 100,000. By reason of their quiet and peaceable lives they have retained a name which was given to them at first, that of “The Harmless People.”

For the denomination there are now published four weekly papers — the Primitive Christian, the Gospel Preacher, the Brethren at Work, and the Progressive Christian. This last is published at Berlin, Pa., by the liberals among the Brethren or Tunkers; and its position is defined (in the Independent of May 8, 1879) as follows:

“We are in full accord with the Church on all Gospel doctrines and practices; but do not believe in any tradition as being worthy of comparison with a divine injunction. In fact, we do not regard a custom one hundred or five hundred years old, whether it originated in the Church or in the world, as possessing any claims upon the attention of Bible Christians. We believe in “nonconformity to the world” from all its sinful practices; but we hold that the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, and that the inventions and discoveries of man are simply the products of the wisdom of God, and should be applied by the Christian to the glorifying of his name. We believe that the time now is when we shall neither in the garb of a hundred years ago nor ill the style of the present age worship the Father; but when the true worshippers shall worship him in spirit and in truth. We believe in self-denial, but not in stoicism; we advocate close communion, but not exclusiveness. In short, we hold that the Word of God is our perfect law, which if we obey we do well.” SEE BAPTISTS, GERMAN.

## Tunnell, John[[@Headword:Tunnell, John]]

             an early Methodist minister, was about thirteen years in the work of the ministry; was elected to the office of an elder at the Christmas Conference in 1784; traveled extensively throughout the United States; was for years the leader of a pioneer band of preachers among the Holston mountains; and died in great peace near Sweet Springs, Va., July 9, 1790. He was buried by Asbury among tie Alleghany heights, a martyr to his work. He  was a mall of solid piety, great simplicity, and godly sincerity; well known and much esteemed both by ministers and people for his indefatigable labors, and his commanding talents as a preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1, 37; Bangs, Hist. of the IM. E. Church, 1, 319; Stevens, Hist. of the M. E. Church, 2, 34, 38, 39, 43, 53, 99, 272, 297, 496.

## Tunstall (or Tonstall), Cuthbert[[@Headword:Tunstall (or Tonstall), Cuthbert]]

             a learned Romish prelate, was born at Hatchford, near Richmond, Yorkshire, about 1474. He entered Balliol College, Oxford, about 1491, but subsequently went to Cambridge and became a fellow of King's Hall. He afterwards went to Padua and took the degree of LL.D. On his return to England, archbishop Warham constituted him vicar general, August, 1511, recommended him to Henry VIII, and in December of the same year collated him to the rectory of Harrow-on-the-hill, Middlesex which he held till 1522. In 1514 he was installed prebendary of Stowlonga, Church of Lincoln, and in the following year admitted archdeacon of Chester. He was made master of the rolls in 1516. Serving as an ambassador to emperor Charles V, he was rewarded on his return (prob. 1519) by a series of preferments. In 1519 he was made prebendary of Bontevant, Church of York; in May, 1521, prebendary of Combe and Hornham, Church of Saram, and dean of Salisbury. He was promoted to the bishopric of London in 1522; was made keeper of the privy seal in 1523; and in 1525 he and Sir Richard Wingfield went as ambassadors to Spain. In July, 1527, Tunstall attended cardinal Wolsey on his embassy to France, and in 1529 was one of the English ambassadors employed to negotiate the treaty of Cambray. On his return he exerted himself to suppress Tyndale's edition of the New Test. In 1530 he was translated to the bishopric of Durham, where he laid out large sums in improving his episcopal houses. At first Tunstall favored the divorce of Henry VIII, but afterwards espoused the cause of the queen. When Henry took the title of supreme head of the Church, Tunstall recommended this course in his injunctions and in a sermon preached at Durham. He also vindicated the king's supremacy in 1533, in a sermon preached before the king on Palm-Sunday. In 1535 he was one of the commissioners for taking the alhuation of ecclesiastical benefices and in 1538 was appointed to confer about the Reformation with the German ambassadors. A new edition of the English Bible was revised by him and Nicholas Heath, bishop of Rochester, in 1541. In December, 1551, he was committed to the Tower on a charge of misprision of treason, and although the bill was thrown out by the House of Commons, he was  brought before a commission (consisting of the chief-justice of the king's bench and six others) and deprived of his bishopric. He continued a prisoner in the Tower during the remainder of Edward's reign. ‘On the accession of Mary, in 1553, Tunstall was restored to his bishopric, but, on account of his mild treatment of the Protestants, was again deprived, July, 1559. He was committed to the custody of Parker, then in possession of Lambeth Palace, who treated him in a very friendly and respectful manner, until he died Nov. 18, 1559. Tunstall was opposed to making transubstantiation an article of faith, and also held the doctrine of justification by faith only. His principal writings are, In Laudem Slatrimonii (Lond. 1518, 4to): —De Arte Supputandi (Lond. 1522, 4to): —Sermon on Royal Supremacy (Lond. 1539, 4to): —Confudtio, etc. (Paris, 1522, 4to): —De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Domini Jesu' Christi in Eucharistia (Lutet. 1554, 4to): — (Compendium in Decem Libros Ethicorum A ristotelis (Paris, 1554, 8vo): —Contra Impios Blasphematores Dei Praedestinationis (Antwerp. 1555, 4to): —Godly and Devout Prayers in English and Latin, etc. (1558, 8vo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tunstall, James, D.D[[@Headword:Tunstall, James, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born about 1710, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became fellow and tutor. In 1739 he obtained the rectory of Sturmer, Essex, and two years later was elected public orator of the university, and was appointed chaplain to Potter, archbishop of Canterbury. In 1744 he was created D.D. at Cambridge; was afterwards collated to the rectory of Great Chart, Kent, and to the vicarage of Minster, Isle of Thanet; both of which he resigned in 1757 for the valuable vicarage of Rochdale, Lancashire, where he remained until his death, March 28,1772. His writings are, Epistola ad Virunm Eruditum Conyers Middleton, etc. (Camb. 1741, 8vo): —Observations on the Present Collection of Epistles between Cicero and Brutus: —Sermon before the House of Commons (May 29,1746): —Vindication of the Power of the State to Prohibit Clandestine Marriages, etc. (1755) : —Marriage in Society Stated, etc. (1755) : —Lectures on Natural and Revealed Religion (published after his death, in 4to). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Tuonela[[@Headword:Tuonela]]

             was, according to the Finnish belief, the river of the country of the dead. — Lenormait, Chald. Magic, p. 258.

## Tuoni[[@Headword:Tuoni]]

             was the father of Kivutar, or Kipu-typo, the Finnish goddess of diseases. —Lenormant, Chald. Magic, p. 259.

## Tupper, Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Tupper, Charles, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Cornwallis, N.S., August 6, 1794. He was baptized by Reverend E. Manning, May 14, 1815, taught school in Cornwallis, was ordained July 17, 1817, labored as a home missionary in several parts of the province, became pastor at Amherst in 1819, at St. John, N.B., in 1825, at Tryon and Bedeque, P.E.I., in 1833, at Amherst again in 1834, where he was also in charge of the grammar school, was principal of the Baptist Seminary at Fredericton, N.B., in 1835-36, returned to Amherst in 1840, made several evangelistic tours through the provinces, became pastor at Aylesford, N.S., in 1851, and in this relation he continued until his death, assisted after 1870 by a colleague. He died at Kingston, Aylesford, January 19, 1881. In January 1827, Tupper became editor of the Baptist Missionary Magazine of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which he continued until 1833, and followed by the Christian Messenger (Halifax, N.S.) in 1837. He published a review of Reverend Dr. G. Burns, of St. John, N.B., on The Subjects and Modes of Baptism (1830): — Baptist Principles Vindicated, in reply to Reverend J.W.D. Gray, of St. John (1844): — A Discussion of the Translation of "Baptizo" and a Vindication of the Action of the Baptist Missionaries in Burmah (1846): — Expository Notes on the Syriac Version of the Scriptures. He was a man of vast linguistic learning. He was one of the pioneers of temperance. See Bill, History of the Baptists in the Maritime Provinces of Canada. (St. John, 1881), page 680 sq.; Baptist Year-book of Maritime Provinces, 1881, page 71. His autobiography appeared in the Christian Messenger, January 2, 1880.

## Tuquoa[[@Headword:Tuquoa]]

             in the mythology of the Hottentots, is the evil spirit causing harm and misery, for whom numerous sacrifices are offered for the purpose of relieving the Hottentots, whom he is said to persecute.

## Tura (Or Turra), Cosimo (Cosime Da Ferrara)[[@Headword:Tura (Or Turra), Cosimo (Cosime Da Ferrara)]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Ferrara in 1406. He was a disciple of Galasso Galassi, and was court-painter in the time of the duke Borso d' Este. He died in 1469. Tura worked both in oil and fresco, and painted in the dry, Gothic style then prevailing. Among his paintings are, Annunciation and Nativity, in the cathedral: —Acts of St. Eustace, Monastery of San Guglielmo: — Virgin and Saints, Church of San Giovanni: —Christ Praying in the Garden, at the Cappuccini: —Madonna with Saints, Berlin Museum. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts; s.v.

## Turban[[@Headword:Turban]]

             Though it is presumable that in a climate like that of Palestine the inhabitants did not expose themselves to the cold of winter or the heats of summer without some covering for the head, there is no certain evidence that any such was in common use. The Hebrews have several words by which articles of head-dress are designated, but they all apparently belong to coverings which were either official or merely ornamental, with the exception of those used by the military.

In the Pentateuch two kinds of head-coverings are mentioned as forming part of the priest's dress, the מַצְנֶפֶתof the high-priest, and the מַגְבָּעָהof the common priests; the former of which was probably a sort of tiara, while the latter may have been a turban, but was more probably a high cap of a flower-like Nape, such as are found among Orientals in the present day  (Bahr, Symbolik des mos. Cult. 2, 66). As these head, coverings (A. V. “bonnets”) were expressly designed for “glory and for beauty” (Exo 28:40), they evidently give us no idea of what was commonly worn on the head. by the people. In the ceremony prescribed for the drinking of the waters of jealousy, the priest is directed to loosen (פרע) the woman's head i.e. to let her hair fall down loosely (Numbers 5, 18); and in the law concerning the leper it is prescribed that his head shall be loosened (פרוע); phraseology which seems to indicate that it was customary in the Mosaic times to bind the hair with a band or fillet, such as we see represented on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. On the other hand, from the stress that is laid in the law concerning the Nazarite on his suffering his locks to grow, and on his hair thus abundantly grown being the crown of God on him (Lev 13:45), it seems fair to infer that the cropping of the hair, and perhaps also the shaving of the head and the wearing of some covering (it may be of artificial hair, as among the Egyptians), was common among the people.

In the other books the terms which occur designating head-dress, besides those which are regal, such as נזרand עטרהSEE CROWN, and those which are military, SEE ARMOR, are the following:

1. צָנַי, tsaniph. This term occurs three times in the Old Test. (Job 29:14;. Isa 62:3; Zec 3:5). In all these cases the usage of the word shows that it refers, not to an ordinary article of dress, but to one which was ornamental and for display. It was probably a turban, the word being derived from צנto roll round or wind. Schrider (De Vest. Mulier. Heb. p. 364) endeavors to prove from the Arabic that this word means a narrow strip wound round the head; but his instances only prove that the Arabic tsinf and tsinfa denote a small band, or the hem of a garment. In Isa 3:22 the fern. tseniphah is used of a female head-dress worn for ornament.

2. פְּאֵר, peer. This word is used of the head-dress of distinguished persons, both male and female (Isa 3:20; Isa 61:3; Isa 61:10; Eze 24:17; Eze 24:23; Eze 44:18). In Exo 39:28 it is used of the priest's head-dress, as also in Eze 44:18. In all the other instances it indicates an article of holiday costume. Saalschtütz suggests that the peer was probably the hat or bonnet, properly so called, and the tsaniph the ornamental headband wrapped round it.

3. צְפַירִת, tsephirdth, from צָפִר, to circle, a circlet or diadem (Isa 28:5); or it may have been a piece of fine muslin wound round the turban for ornament, such as the Orientals still use.

4. לַוְיָה, livyah (Pro 1:9; Pro 4:9). Some regard this as a species of fillet by which the head was bound; but it probably means rather a garland or wreath of flowers.

The examination of these terms has failed to convey to us any information respecting the ordinary every-day costume for the head of the Hebrew people. Probably they were wont simply to throw some part of their dress over their heads when they had occasion to expose themselves to the weather, or to fold a piece of cloth over their heads, as do the Arabs of the present day, reserving such articles as those above named for holiday or festive occasions (Jahn, Biblische Archiologie, I, 2, 2, p. 116; Saalschiitz, Arch. der Hebr. 2, 22). SEE HEAD-DRESS.

## Turchi, Alessandro[[@Headword:Turchi, Alessandro]]

             called Veronese, also L' Orbetto, an Italian painter, was born at Verona (according to Pozzo) about 1578. When a lad his talent was recognised by Felice Riccio, who took him into his study, and carefully instructed him. Leaving Riccio, he went to Venice, where he studied with Carlo Cagliari, and then proceeded to Rome. Here he made his home until his death, in 1648. Turchi excelled in the choice and distribution of his colors, among which he introduced a reddish tint which much enlivens his pictures. At Rome he painted some altar-pieces and other pictures for the churches, the most esteemed of which are in the Church of La Concezione. Among his other principal works at Rome are, The Flight into Egypt, in San Romualdo; The Holy Family, in San Lorenio; and St. Carlo Borromeo, in San Salvatore. There are also to be noticed his Passion of the Forty Martyrs, in San Stefano; and his Pieta at La Misericordia. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts, s.v.

## Turck, Anthony[[@Headword:Turck, Anthony]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was a native of New York State, and of Dutch descent. He was received into the traveling connection in 1793; “a holy and devout man, indefatigable and successful in his labors, subject to great afflictions, temptations, and trials,” but with “increasing sweetness in  communion with God” towards his end, and victory in death. He died March 13,1803. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1, 109.

## Turibio (Turibius), St[[@Headword:Turibio (Turibius), St]]

             is said to have been born Nov. 16, 1538, of good family. Every Christian perfection distinguished him in early youth. He was educated at. Valladolid and Salamanca, was made president of Granada by Philip II, and subsequently became archbishop of Lima, in South America, though still a layman. He was consecrated. in 1581, and proceeded to initiate an excellent administration, during which he founded hospitals, seminaries, and churches, ordered diocesan and provincial synods, traveled in the execution of his duties over the entire country, and displayed great devotion during a contagious pestilence. He is credited with the miraculous cure of several persons who were sick, and with at least one successful raising of the dead to life. He died at Santa, Nov. 23,1606. It is said that his body was brought, undecayed, to Lima after a whole year had passed since his decease, and that it continued to work miracles. He was accordingly beatified in 1679 by Innocent XI, and canonized by Benedict XIII in 1726. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 11:330; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Turin, Council Of (Concilium Turinense)[[@Headword:Turin, Council Of (Concilium Turinense)]]

             was held at Turin, Italy, in 398, or, according to others, in 401, to settle certain differences which had arisen among. the Gallican prelates. The bishops of the province of Aix, Proculus of Marseilles, Simplicius of Vienne, and the bishop of Arles were present. As Turin was at that; time under the metropolitan of Milan, it is conjectured) that Simplicianus of Milan convoked it.

1. The first question settled in the council was that of Proculus of Marseilles, who (although that see was not in the province) desired to be recognised as metropolitan of the province of Narbonne. The council, for the sake of peace, granted to Proculus personally, but, not to his see, the right of primacy which he claimed, declaring, however, that after his death the metropolitan should be a bishop of the province itself.

2. The council took into consideration the differences, between the archbishops of Aries and Vienne, who both, pretended to the primacy of Viennese Gaul. The decision was that he of the two who could prove his  city to be the metropolis of the province as to civil matters, should be considered as the lawful metropolitan, and in the meantime they were exhorted to live in peace.

3. The excuses of the bishops Octavius, Ursion, Remigius, and Triferius were considered. These prelates were accused of having conferred orders irregularly and uncanonically. The council decided that, in this case, indulgence should be granted to the four bishops; but that, in future, any bishops so violating the ancient decrees of the Church should be deprived of the right of ordaining, and of all voice in synodical assemblies; and that those who should be so ordained should be deposed. This canon was confirmed in the Council of' Riez, A.D. 439.

Several other regulations relating to the affairs of the Church were also made, and eight canons in all published. See Mansi, Concil. 2, 1155. — Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.

## Turkey[[@Headword:Turkey]]

             is the largest Mohammedan empire of the world, containing extensive possessions in Eastern Europe, Western Asia, and Northern Africa. Including the provinces in Europe and Africa, which are virtually independent, and only pay an annual tribute to the Turkish government, the Turkish Empire, in 1880, had an area of 2,302,000 square miles, and 47,000,000 inhabitants. In consequence of the treaty of Berlin in 1878, Turkey had to recognize the entire independence of Roumania and Servia, and to consent to the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the government of Austria. Moreover, Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia have become virtually independent of Turkish rule, leaving to the Turkish government only a small territory in Europe which is fully under its control. In Africa, Egypt and Tunis are likewise independent in point of administration. Deducting the dependencies, the Turkish government at present rules over a territory of 1,043,000 square miles, with a population of 23,500,000. In June, 1880, the Supplementary Conference at Berlin declared that in order to carry out the provisions of the treaty of Berlin concerning the rectification of the frontier between Turkey and Greece, Turkey ought to cede to Greece a territory containing about 8292 square miles and 400,000 inhabitants.

Note by the Editor. — For the purpose of enabling our readers to understand more fully the present complicated boundaries of Turkey, we insert a map based upon the one recently issued by Stanford, of Charing Cross, London. It will be perceived that, in consequence of the late Russo- Turkish war, Turkey has lost far more than half her European possessions, which are to be bounded henceforth by the Balkan Mountains instead of the River Save and the eastern Carpathian chain. Romania, Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia, and Montenegro are wholly severed from her. Bulgaria has lost a slice of her territory on the west, given to Servia, and another on the north-east, given to Romania. Montenegro has gained a piece on the north- west from Bosnia, and another on the south-east from Turkey. Bosnia, including the part of Croatia formerly in Turkey, together with Herzegovina, has been occupied by Austria, and is not likely to be restored to Turkey. Greece gains a part of Albania and Thessaly and Russia that part of Romania (bounded by the Pruth and the Danube) adjoining Bessarabia (which she already held). In Asia Russia also acquires a district of Armenia adjoining Batum. Besides, there is created a quasi-independent district of Eastern Romania, within the above narrowed limits of Turkey. Turkey in Europe virtually now consists merely of am part of Romania and a part of Albania. The interior changes ill territory and population made by the Berlin treaty are stated as follows in the London Athenmeum. Estimates of other statisticians vary considerably from these figures tants, to Russia. If we exclude the provinces “indefinitely” to be occupied by Austria, and Eastern Romania, there remain to Turkey in Europe only 74,790 square miles, with 4,779,000 inhabitants, of whom 1,521,500 are Mohammedans. In Armenia Russia takes 10,000 square miles, with about 350,000 inhabitants. Cyprus, entrusted to the keeping of England, has an area of 2288 square miles, and about 150,000 inhabitants. Many of these accessions, however, are already the fruitful source of contention, and some of them will probably have to be taken possession of by force of arms. Greece is at the present moment (Aug. 1880) preparing to do so for her share. It is impossible now to predict what the issue will be.]

The former volumes of this Cyclopaedia have special articles on SEE BULGARIA, SEE EGYPT, SEE ROUMANIA, SEE SERVIA; and on some of the Eastern Churches which are wholly or chiefly found in Turkey, as  the JACOBITES, NESTORIANS, and MARONITES. In the present article, after giving such preliminary information of a general character as the intense interest at present prevailing on the Oriental question seems to demand, we treat, more particularly, of the religions of Turkey proper, so far as they have not yet been discussed in the special articles which have just been referred to.

I. Geographical and Ethnological Features. — The geographical position of the Turkish empire is peculiar, and would, under a strong government, be most advantageous. It connects Europe with Asia, Asia with Africa, the East with the West the Mohammedan with the Christian world. It has an extensive seacoast, which is indented by numerous gulfs and bays, and embraces many excellent harbors; Some parts of this coast were in former times the seat of a very flourishing commerce, which would undoubtedly be revived under favorable circumstances. Almost the entire territory which is subject to direct Turkish rule is noted for its fertility; but Turkish misrule has not only arrested, but diminished, its productiveness. By far the greater portion of the Turkish possessions is situated in Asia. The European possessions have always been much smaller, but as they contained the capital and seat of government, they have hitherto been of much greater political importance. This importance has, however, of late been greatly reduced by the territorial losses which Turkey has sustained by the last Eastern war and the treaty of Berlin. The African part of the Turkish empire consists almost wholly of tributary states; and the farther the territory of one of these states, Egypt, is extended, the smaller becomes the hold the Turkish government has on it. Although ruling over portions of Europe, Asia, and Africa, Turkey is really an Asiatic power.

While the Turks are the ruling race of the empire, they constitute a majority of the total population only in the Asiatic possessions. Even Asiatic Turkey can hardly be said to be an Ottoman land, for the bulk of the people are descendants of the old Seljukian Turks who have been subjected by the Ottoman Turks. In the African dependencies the Turks are hardly represented at all, and in Europe they are almost everywhere in a minority. According to an elaborate article on the ethnographical relations of Turkey in Petermann's Geographische Mittheilungen, 1876, No. 7, the Turks are to be found as a compact population only in three sanjaks, those of Rustchuk, Tulcha, and Varna. These three sanjaks formed part of the vilayet of the Danube. They are less numerous in the Rhodope Mountains. On the shores of the AEgean Sea and the Sea of Marmora, and on the  south-east shore of the Black Sea, they are greatly outnumbered by the Greeks, especially in the direction of Constantinople. It is a remarkable fact that all the sanjaks which contain the most compact Turkish population are now subject to the semi-independent prince of Christian Bulgaria and to the Christian governor of the autonomous province of Eastern Romania. The aggregate number of the Osmanli Turks in Europe, including Bulgaria, Eastern Romania, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, is estimated at about 2,000,000. Exclusive of these provinces, over which the authority of the sultan is not likely to be ever restored, the number of Osmanlis will barely reach 1,000,000 in a total population of about 5,000,000. In Asia the Turkish race is supposed to number more than 8,500,000 of a total population of 17,000,000; but this number embraces many old tribes who have been totally absorbed and merged in the Turks. The Turcomans, who live chiefly in Northern Mesopotamia, and number about 100,000, belong to the same race as the Turks.

Up to the time of the late Eastern war, the bulk of the population in the European dominions of Turkey was made up of five non-Turkish tribes — Roumanians, Servians, Bulgarians, Greeks, and Albanians. The Roumaians, who chiefly inhabit the principality of Roumania, where they number about 5,000,000, have long been semi-independent of Turkey, and became entirely independent by the treaty of Berlin. Only about' 200,000 remain subject to Turkish rule. Outside of Roumania and Turkey, Austria has a Roumanian population exceeding three millions. West and south of the Roumanians we find two branches of the Slavic race, the Servians and the Bulgarians. The Servians embrace the inhabitants of the principalities of Servia and Montenegro, and of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Both Montenegro (q.v.) and Servia (q.v.) are now independent states; Bosnia and Herzegovina have been placed under Austrian administration, and are likely to become soon a part of the Austrian empire. In Bosnia, the landed aristocracy, after the conquest of the country by the Turks, became Mohammedans, in order to save their property and their privileges, but they continue to speak the Servian language. Outside of the present and former dominions of the sultan, Austria has a Servian population of about 4.500,000, called Croatians, Slavonians; Dalmatians, and Slovenians. The large majority of the Servians belong to the Greek Oriental Church; but in Austria and in Bosnia there is also a large Roman Catholic element. According to a recent work by Klaic on Bosnia (Agram, 1878), written in the Croatian language, the population of Bosnia is divided, as regards the  religious denominations, into Orthodox Greek Church, 646,678, or 48.4 percent; Mohammedans. 480,596, or 35.9 percent; Roman Catholics, 207,119, or 15.5 percent; and Jews, 3000, or 2 percent; but in regard to race, 1,291,393 of this population are Slaves, only 2000 Osmanli Turks, 30,000 Albanians, and 11,000 gypsies. Tie Servians of all the different denominations in Austria and the former Turkish dominions are only' now awakening to the full significance of the fact that their common language makes them joint members of one nationality, and a strong movement towards uniting at some future time all these members into one state has set in. Although the Mohammedan Bosnians are strongly opposed to this union movement, as well as to the annexation of their province to Austria, the rule of the Osmanli Turks over the Servian nationality may be said to be at an end.

The second Slavic race of European Turkey is the Bulgarians. They occupy the country south of the Danube, their southern ethnic boundary being a line passing through the towns of Nissa, Prisrend, Ochrida, Kastoria, Niagostos, Salonica, Adrianople, and Burgas, on the Black Sea. The number of Bulgarians is estimated at from three to four millions. After four centuries and a half of oppression, they were considered at the beginning of the 19th century the most wretched people of Europe. Then a marvelous awakening began. SEE BULGARIA. In spite of all oppression, they laid the foundation of a national system of education, and re-established the independence of their national Church. The treaty of San Stefano, March 3, 1878, between Russia and Turkey, provided for the establishment' of' Bulgaria as a tributary Ottoman principality and a national militia. The principality thus constituted would have extended from the boundaries of Servia and Albania to the Black Sea, and from the Danube nearly to the AEgean Sea, taking in about fifty miles of the AEgean coast. It would have included all the predominantly Bulgarian districts, both north and south of the Balkans, containing an aggregate of 79,400 square miles and an estimated population of between five and five and a half millions. But although the Bulgarians would have been the dominant race, a considerable number of Turks, Servians, and Greeks would have been merged in the Bulgarian majority. The treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, greatly modified this plan. The tributary principality of Bulgaria, as constituted by it, contains only 33,000 square miles and about 1,860,000 inhabitants. The Bulgarian districts south of the Balkans were constituted as the autonomous province of Eastern Roumelia, the governor of which must be  a Christian, but is appointed by the Turkish government with the consent of the treaty powers. Eastern Roumelia ,has about 13,664 square miles and 850,000 inhabitants, of whom about 600,000 are Bulgarians, 150,000 Greeks, and 70,000 Turks. The aggregate population of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia reaches about 3,000,000, of whom fully 2,500,000 are Bulgarians, and the remainder mostly Turks and Greeks. The Mohammedan population is estimated at from 800,000 to 950,000, but fully two thirds of them are of Bulgarian descent. The Bulgarians, generally, were greatly dissatisfied with the provisions of the treaty of Berlin, and a strong movement began at once for a reunion of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, which can hardly fail to be ere long successful, and result in the emancipation of the entire Bulgarian population from Turkish rule.

The Greeks, or Hellenes, have a numerical preponderance in the southern part of European Turkey, especially in Thessaly, Epirus, Southern Macedonia, and the islands, the most important of which is Crete. They are the most civilized among the Christian races of Turkey. Their number is estimated at about 1,000,000 in European and 1,000,000 in Asiatic Turkey. The people of the predominantly Greek districts expressed during the late civil war a desire to be annexed to the kingdom of Greece, and the government of that kingdom made in January, 1879, an attempt to occupy these districts. The attempt had, however, to be abandoned at the request of the great powers. The Congress of Berlin expressed a desire that the frontier between Greece and Turkey should be rectified to the advantage of the former power, and offered the mediation of the great powers in case Turkey and Greece should be unable to agree. As this agreement was not reached, the supplementary congress held in Berlin in June, 1880, designated the new frontier between the two states. In Asia, the Greeks are fast occupying the seaports and coast of Asia Minor, from which the Turks are steadily retiring before them, and it is believed by many that a vigorous Greek kingdom in Europe would soon find a legitimate field of expansion along the coast of Asia no less than that of Europe.

The Albanians occupy the country south of the Servians and Bulgarians, and north of the Greeks. Their number is estimated at from 1,200;000 to 2,000,000. More than one half of them have embraced Islam, though it is said that many of the Mohammedan Albanians remain secretly Christian. They are divided into a number of tribes. Some of the most warlike mountain tribes are Roman Catholics. In the frontier districts the Albanians  are greatly mixed with Servians in the north and with Greeks in the south. They opposed with great vigor the cession to Montenegro by the Turkish government of some districts largely inhabited by Albanians, and declared an intention to oppose no less vigorously the cession of some of their southern districts to Greece. The Albanians are the only one of the five non-Turkish nationalities of European Turkey which shows some kind of attachment to the Ottoman government. This must partly be explained by the predominance among them of Mohammedanism, and partly by their determination not to be absorbed by Servians and Greeks. The increasing consolidation of Servians, Bulgarians, and Greeks will, however, cut them off from Constantinople, and make it impossible for them to remain a Turkish province.

A curious fact in the relation of the different races that people European Turkey is the irregular manner in which they are distinguished and mingled. “No locality,” says Baker, in his Turkey, “can be found where the population is exclusively of the same nationality; but a rival race crops up here and there, and jostles its neighbors. We find, for instance, a quarter where the majority of the population are Bulgarians; but among them in considerable numbers are Turks, Greeks, Circassians, and gypsies. In another quarter the majority are Albanians, but they again have to bear the friction of Bulgarians, Wallachians, Greeks, and Turks; and so on all over the country. Each of these nations has its own language, religion, and customs; and it therefore follows that the difficulty of governing the mass lies in a direct ratio to the number of races represented in it.” This irregular distribution of races has, however, been considerably affected by the close of the Eastern war, when, especially, large numbers of Turks and Bulgarians left their endangered homes, and emigrated to districts predominantly inhabited by coreligionists. The Austrian consul Sax (in Oesterreichische Monatsschruffür den Orient, 1878) estimates the number of those who from the spring of 1877 to the close of, 1878 changed their residence at more than one million.

II. Origin and Political History. — The Turks are first heard of in history when they emerged from the regions of Central Asia, and emigrated, early in the Christian sera, to the neighborhood of the Aral and Caspian seas. In the 6th century they formed an alliance with the Roman emperor Justin II; in the 7th they began to learn the Mohammedan religion at the hands of the Saracens. After their conversion to Mohammedanism they rapidly rose in power and influence. One branch, which, after its leader, Seljuk, received  the name of Seljukian Turks, subjugated a large portion of Persia, and thence spread into Syria, Armenia, Georgia, and Lower Egypt. Under Malek Shah, the grandson of Seljuk, the dynasty of the Seljukian Turks was in the 11th century the greatest power in Asia. They gradually pressed their conquests to the West, and from this time a more special and crying persecution of the Christians began. After Malek's death, the empire was divided into smaller states, which became rivals, and were finally extinguished in the 13th century by the irruption of the Moguls under Genghis Khan.

Then the history (of the Ottoman Turks begins. The first mention of them is made at the beginning of the 13th century, when they emigrated, under the name of Oghuze Turks, from the main body in Khorassan, Persia, to the mountains in Armenia, whence a part removed and settled near Angora, still acknowledging the suzerainty of the Seljukian sultan of Iconium. Partly at the expense of the Greeks, partly at that of other Turkish emirs or princes, the leaders of this band, Ertoghrul and his son Othman, or Osman, gradually grew in power. Othman became the most powerful prince in Western Asia and from him his followers took the name by which this branch of the Turks has ever since been designated, that of Ottoman, or Osmanli. Shortly before the death of Othman, in 1326, his armies took Brousa, which became the Asiatic capital of the Ottomans. With Othman's son, Orkhan the Ottoman empire begins. He made himself entirely independent of the Seljukian sultan, though he continued to bear the inferior title of emir. During his reign Gallipoli, in the Thracian Chersonesus, the first acquisition of the Turks in Europe, was conquered, in 1357, and all of Western Asia occupied. He imposed upon the conquered Christian nations the tribute of children, who were brought up in the Mohammedan faith, and out of whom was formed the famous force of the Janizaries, who for three centuries constituted the strength of the Ottoman armies in the reign of Murad I, the successor of Orkhan, Adrianople was taken, which became the European capital of the Ottomans till they captured Constantinople. When the Turks entered Europe, the territory of the Greek empire was almost limited to a quadrangle extending from Constantinople to Adrianople, and from the Black Sea to the Archipelago, to a small part of the coast near Thessalonica, and the larger portion of the Peloponnesus.

The bulk of what subsequently became European Turkey consisted of the empire of Servia, extending from the Danube to the Peloponnesus, and bounded on the west by Bosnia and the Adriatic Sea; and of the kingdom of Bulgaria, extending from the Danube to Adrianople bounded on the east by the Black Sea. The frontier between  Bulgaria and Servia was constantly changing. When the Turks began to get a foothold, Widdin and Sophia were the nearest Bulgarian towns to the frontier. At this time the power of Servia began to go down after the death of Stephen Dushan, its greatest ruler, and Bulgaria began to split up into three separate kingdoms. Thus both were unable to resist the advancing Turks. In 1363 the Bulgarian city of Philippopolis was taken. About 1371 the chief of the three Bulgarian kingdoms, that of Tirnova, became tributary. For a while a Slavic confederation, under the Bosnian king Stephen, won some successes; but in the great battle of Kossova, in 1389, the confederate Bosnians, Servians, Bulgarians, and Wallachians were utterly defeated. Two or three years later, Servia and Wallachia became tributary, and the greater part of Bulgaria was conquered. Murad's son, Bajazet I, was the first to exchange the humbler title of emir for that of sultan, and also the first who attacked Constantinople. The progress of the Turks was arrested by the stunning defeat which they suffered in 1402 at Angora, at the hand of Timur, the famous Tamerlane; but they recovered their power under Bajazet's grandson, Murad II (1421-51), who conquered Thessalonica, Corinth, Patras, and a part of Albania, which was heroically defended by the great Scanderbeg. His son, Mohammed II (1451-81), conquered Constantinople, and thereby destroyed the Greek empire. He reduced, in 1459, Servia from a tributary principality to an Ottoman province; in 1463 Bosnia was annexed; in 1461, the Christian empire of Trebizond, in Asia; in 1466, Caramania; in 1479, the Peloponnesus, which at that time belonged to the Venetians.

In 1480 Otranto, in Italy, was captured; and the design was openly avowed to conquer all of Western Europe and to exterminate Christianity. But Mohammed's death, in 1481, put an end to these schemes; Otranto was soon abandoned, and no further progress was ever made west of the Adriatic. The conquests of Mohammed gave to the Turkish empire about the same extent it had before the late Eastern war. In the whole of the Balkan peninsula only the small mountain district of Montenegro has kept its independence to our own times. Selim the Inflexible (1512-19) warred against Mohammedan enemies, and annexed Syria and Egypt to his dominions. From the last of a line of nominal caliphs Selim obtained a cession of his rights, and ever since the Ottoman sultans have been acknowledged as chiefs of their religion by all Mussulmans of the Sunnite sect. During the reign of Suleiman II (1519-66) the empire attained the greatest extent it has ever had. The larger portion of Hungary was annexed; a Turkish pasha ruled at Buda; and the princes of Transylvania,  Moldavia, and Wallachia became vassals of the sultan. Rhodes was taken from the Knights of St. John, and a large tract of land in Asia from the Persians. With the death of Suleiman the decline of Turkish power began. The reign of Selim II, the Drunkard (1566-74), was marked by the first great reverse of the Ottoman arms-the overthrow of the Turkish fleet by the fleets of Spain and Venice at the battle of Lepanto, in 1571. No lasting conquests of importance were made from this time, except the islands of Cyprus and Crete. The frontier on the north towards Hungary, and in later times towards Russia, went steadily back. The succession of great rulers was stopped. The powers of the sultan became less, the power of the pashas greater. In 1622 a sultan was, for the first time, murdered. In the latter half of the 17th century the Turks began to lose their hold on Hungary. The battle of St. Gotthard, in 1664, was the first great overthrow of the Turks by land.

At the end of the 17th century the Turks had been at war with all their Christian neighbors, and they had lost territory at all points except one. In a war against Poland they had gained Podolia; they had lost, besides Hungary, the Peloponnesus, and Azof. All of these territories, inclusive of Podolia, were given up by the treaties in 1699 and 1700. The peace of Carlowitz, in 1699, marks a point in the decline of the Ottoman power, and the Turks were for the first time compelled to treat with the Christian powers of Europe on equal terms. The wars against Austria, which, with breaks from time to time, had gone on since the battle of Mohacz, 1526, by which the Turks established their rule over Hungary, were ended by the peace of Sistova in 1791. The result was that Hungary was freed from the Turk, but that Servia and Bosnia were left in his clutches. The frontier established by that peace has remained almost unchanged. The most dangerous of all the foreign enemies of Turkey proved to be Russia. The wars between Russia and the Turks began in the middle of the 17th century, and the two countries have ever since appeared as irreconcilable hereditary foes whose interminable conflict could only be ended by the destruction of the one or the other. The wars between Russia and Turkey put oil a very distinctive character when Peter the Great, in 1696, took Azof, the key of the Black Sea. From the time that Mohammed the Conqueror took the Genoese possessions in the Crimea, the Black Sea had been wholly under the power of the Turks. When Azof fell into the hands of the Russians, it remained for a great time the point of contention between the two countries. A new stage in the history of these wars is marked by the famous treaty of Kainarji of 1774, which ended the first war of Catherine II against the Turks. This treaty for the first time. brought the  Ottoman power into some measure of dependence. It gave Russia a firm foothold on the Black Sea, and the important right to remonstrate in behalf of Wallachia and Moldavia, in case of any breach of their privileges by the Turks.

The most prominent feature in the Turkish history of the 19th century is the successful revolt of the subject Christian nations against the Ottoman power. This war of independence began in Servia in the first years of the new century. It was at first a rising against local tyrants who defied the authority of the sultan, but it soon became a war of independence. In 1826 the independence of the country was recognised by Turkey, which was only to receive an annual tribute, and for some time retained the right of keeping garrisons in certain fortresses. The Greek war of independence began in 1821. Finding himself unable to subdue both Greece and Servia, the sultan had to apply for help to his rebellious vassal, pasha Mehemet Ali of Egypt; but the outrages of the Egyptians led to an interference by England, France, and Russia, who, in 1827, in the treaty of London, agreed to make Greece free; destroyed, in November, 1827, at the battle of Navarino, the Turkish and Egyptian fleet, and compelled the sultan to agree to the treaty of London. In the treaty of Adrianople (1829), Turkey had not only to acknowledge the independence of Greece, but the almost complete independence of Moldavia and Wallachia, whose hospodars thereafter held office for lifetime, and to cede several fortresses on the coast of the Black Sea to Russia. Mahmud II (1808-40) was desirous of introducing important reforms, and in 1826 exterminated the Janizaries; but while his reforms did little good to the Christians, they set his Mohammedan subjects against him.

There were Mohammedan revolts in Albania and Bosnia, which were put down in 1831 and 1832; but more important was the rebellion of Mehemet Ali of Egypt, who conquered Syria and other Asiatic possessions of the sultan, and seemed to threaten the very existence of the empire, when (1840) four of the great Christian powers of Europe concluded the treaty of Buda-Pest, and compelled Mehemet Ali to give up his Asiatic conquests. In the Crimean war (1853- 55), Turkey would probably have been crushed by Russia but for the interference of England, France, and Sardinia in its behalf. By the treaty of peace in 1856, the powers which signed it-France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Sardinia-declared that the Sublime Porte was admitted to partake in the advantages of public law and the European concert. This concession was made to the Porte in recognition of the hatti-hamayum  (Feb. 18, 1856), a proclamation which promised to the Christians equal civil rights, but which the Porte found itself no more able to carry out than a preceding reformatory edict, the hatti-sherif of Gulhane of 1853. The approaching collapse of Turkey became more and more apparent. Terrible massacres of Christians in Damascus and Mount Lebanon led, in 1860, to a French intervention. In 1861 Moldavia and Wallachia united themselves, in spite of the treaty of Paris and of the protest of the Porte, into one state, called Roumania.

A powerful impulse was given to the aspiration of the Christians for freedom by the complete victory of the nationality principle in Italy and Germany. As the Italians and Germans had re-established an Italian kingdom and a German empire, thus the Greeks of Turkey expressed a wish for a union with Greece, the Servians began to dream of the re-establishment of a large Servian empire, the Bulgarians of a Bulgarian kingdom, the Roumanians of severing the last tie of connection with Turkey. The first movement in this direction was the insurrection in Crete in 1866, which was suppressed in 1869. The powers which had signed the treaty of Paris held a special conference and recognised the demands of the Porte as just. In 1867 the demand of Servia that the Turkish garrisons be withdrawn from all the Servian fortresses was granted. In 1872 the sultan conceded to the khedive of Egypt two important attributes of sovereignty, the direct hereditary succession and the authorization to make loans. On July 6, 1875, an insurrection broke out in Herzegovina, which gradually kindled the great Eastern war. A series of joint steps were taken by the great powers of Europe to induce the Porte to concede the reform demanded by the Christian insurgents. The most important were, the note of count Andrassy of Dec. 30,1875; the Berlin Memorandum of May 14, 1876; the Constantinople Conference from December, 1876, to January, 1877; and the London Protocol of March 21,1877. On April 24 Russia declared war, and at the beginning of 1878 Turkey was utterly crushed. In the peace of San Stefano of March 3,1878, Turkey had to recognize the entire independence of Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro, to cede some additional territory to Servia and Montenegro, and to consent to the establishment of an independent principality of Bulgaria.

In the case of Bulgaria, these stipulations were considerably modified by the treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, as has already been stated. Bosnia and Herzegovina were placed under Austrian administration, and to Greece the annexation of some Greek districts in Southern Turkey was promised. The introduction of the reforms formally demanded by the great powers of Europe was again promised, and their execution placed  under the guarantee of the great powers. A few weeks before (June 4, 1878), Turkey had concluded a secret treaty with England, which assumed a protectorate over the Asiatic dominions of the sultan as long as Russia would not return its conquests in Armenia. In return, Cyprus was placed under English administration, and the Porte pledged itself to carry through administrative reforms in the Asiatic possessions. Thus Turkey appeared in an entirely helpless condition, and, so far as its European possessions were concerned, in a state of total decay. Among the European powers, only one-the Tory government of England-occasionally used its influence in behalf of the Turkish government. The fall of the Tory ministry in 1880, and the access to power of the Liberal party, which, during the war, had openly expressed its sympathy with the Christian nationalities of the Balkan peninsula, especially with the Greeks, deprived the Mohammedan government of its last hope. As the Turks had been unable to agree with the Greek government about the promised rectification of frontier, the powers which had signed the treaty of Berlin held another special conference at Berlin in June, 1880, and designated the districts which, in their opinion, should be ceded to Greece. The vital power of Turkey appears to be exhausted. A constitution drawn up by Midhat Pasha, and proclaimed Dec. 23, 1876, which promised to the population very extensive rights, failed to make any impression either at home or abroad. The Parliament which met in March, 1877, attracted more attention by its novelty than by its work.

III. National Characteristics and Governmental Policy. — Comparing Turkey with the other states of Europe, we are struck with one very remarkable distinction. In all the other countries of Europe the bulk of the people have learned that they have a common country, and that, however widely their opinions may differ, and however much they may dislike the existing government, they have important interests in common. The Turks have never become a nation. After subjecting many tribes of different race and religion, the exclusive aim of the sultans has been to keep them in subjection, and to extort from them as high a tribute as possible. The effect of Turkey's rule has therefore been most blighting upon every interest of her subjects. Morally, socially, economically, and politically, her dependencies have sunk, under the combined influence of a false, fanatical, and sensual religion, a bigoted, selfish, and imbecile regime, and an ignorant, fatalistic, and effete philosophy, to the lowest possible point of civilized communities. Corruption reigns in every department of state, and  superstition in every form of society. The ruling class, being Turks and Moslems, feel no sympathy with the natives, who are largely Christian and of different races from themselves. Extortion, bribery, chicanery, and treachery have for ages characterized the government, until it has become a festering ulcer and a burning shame upon the face of Europe. But for the intrigues and jealousies among the other European powers, each of which has been anxious to outwit the rest in seizing upon the spoils of “the Sick Man's estate,” Turkey would have been dismembered long ago by foreign interference, or have collapsed in utter ruin by its internal rottenness. England has been largely chargeable for maintaining, by her diplomatic policy, this eyesore and blot upon the map of the world.

Several large territories are but very loosely connected with the empire. Tunis, in Africa, considers itself as a vassal state of the sultan, but without any definite obligation, not even that of paying an annual tribute. Formerly there were two other states of this class, Algeria and Tripoli; but the former has been conquered by France, and the latter has recently come under the direct authority of the sultan. The vassal states which had only to pay an annual tribute, and were otherwise autonomous, were, in 1878, Roumania and Servia, in Europe; Samos, in Asia; and Egypt, in Africa. In 1878 Roumania and Servia became entirely independent, and Bulgaria was erected into a tributary vassal state. In the autonomous province of Eastern Roumelia, the power of the sultan has been almost reduced to the right of appointing a governor.

By the old law of succession, which has been left unchanged by the constitution of 1876, the crown is inherited, according to seniority, by the male descendants of Othman, sprung from the imperial harem. The harem is considered a permanent State institution. All children born in the harem, whether offspring of free women or of slaves, are legitimate and of equal lineage; but the sultan is succeeded by his eldest son only when there are no uncles or cousins of greater age. It has not been the custom of the sultans for some centuries to contract regular marriages. A special feature attending the accession of new sultans to the throne has been the slaughter of brothers and other near kinsfolk who were feared as rivals. Until very recently the will of the sultan was not limited by any law. The precepts of the Koran were regarded as the fundamental law of the empire. The legislative and the executive authority were exercised in the name of the sultan by the grand vizier as head of the temporal government, and the Sheik el-Islam as the head of the Church. The constitution of 1876  pretended to make the sultan a constitutional monarch and to provide for the exercise of the legislative and judicial powers after the model of the West European states; but the constitution thus far (1880) is almost a dead letter. Several Christians, however, have of late held the position of Minister of State. The financial affairs of the government are in a condition of thorough and hopeless disorganization, and the time of the empire's complete dissolution cannot be distant.

IV. Mohammedanism. — The Turks have been a Mohammedan people from the 10th century, and have ever since been the banner-bearer among the Mohammedan states. The sultan is regarded as the head of the Sunnite Mohammedans, SEE SUNNITES not only in Turkey, but as far' as the Sunnite form of Mohammedanism extends. Church and State are so intimately united in Turkey that the judicial and the priestly power are vested in the same officer, the Ulema, who regards the Koran as the sole authority for the decision of ecclesiastical as well as civil causes. “The administration of justice in Turkey is now divided into two parts — that of the Sheri, wherein all judges are Mussulmans, and that of the Nizamiyeh, composed of both Christians and Mussulmans. The head of all the courts of the Sheri is the Sheik el-Islam, who sanctions all their judgments. The judicatory of the Sheri is composed of a high court of appeal (Arzodacy), divided into two chambers (Sudur), one for Turkey in Europe, and one for Asia. At the head of each is a cazi-asker, literally military judge. The cazi- asker is assisted by fourteen honorary chief justices. In the hierarchy of the Ulema the mollahs rank next to the cazi-asker, and after them the cadis. The first in rank are the mollahs of Constantinople, nine in number, and who sit in the court Sheri, at the capital, for a year, being taken in turn from the body of the mollahs. At its head is the mollah of Stamboul. The second in rank is the Mevlevizet, which numbers fifty-seven titularies. The mollah, when on duty, serves for only a year, and then returns to the roll” (Baker, Turkey). Turkish education, until recently, was also in close connection with the State religion. It was organized by sultan, Mohammed I (1451-81), the greatest soldier statesman that the Ottoman empire has produced.

He established elementary schools called mektebs, scattered over his empire in every town and in almost every Mohammedan village, and numerous public-schools or colleges of the higher order, which were called medresses, in distinction from the mektebs, or elementary schools. The mediesses went through ten regular courses of grammar, syntax, logic, metaphysics, philology, the science of tropes, the science of style, rhetoric,  geometry, and astronomy. The taker of a degree in these subjects received the title of danishmend, which, has now been replaced by the term sofia. The degree entitles him to the mastership of one of the minor public schools; but in that case he renounces the prospect of becoming a member of the ‘Ulema, or of any of the higher educational appointments. For this it is necessary to go through a still further course of study, and to pass several examinations. Incentives to work are given in the honors and endowments, which are conferred. The Ulema supplies all the professors of the high-schools, who are called muderris, and from the; same order are chosen all the ministers of justice, including the cazi-askers, the mollahs, and the cadis. The actual priesthood of Turkey takes a very inferior position in the State. The ministers of public worship are called imaums, who officiate at public prayers, and sheiks, or preachers. But the fact that the appointments to the priesthood are allotted to the holders of minor degrees does not mark, on the part of the Turks, any want of respect for their faith. It only arises in consequence of the legal profession being so intimately connected with the Church as expounders of the law of the Koran that they, in fact, form the senior branch of the hierarchy. Dervishes, or Mohammedan monks, are very numerous and are divided into a number of sects. SEE DERVISH.

The Vacouf, or Church property, which belongs to the mosques and other religious institutions and to benevolent foundations, is administered by a special department of the State called the Evkaf, and consists of two classes: 1st Property or its produce actually belonging to such ecclesiastical establishments, and held and received on their account by the Evkaf; and 2nd. Property owned by private persons, but lapsing, in default of direct heirs of the owner, to the Evkaf, and subject, in the meantime, to a small yearly contribution payable to that department; but an owner of Vacouf property having no direct.heirs is not debarred from selling it to a person having such heirs, and so preventing it, for the time, from falling into the Evkaf. By a recent law a private person holding Vacouf property can, on payment of certain fees to the government, have it converted into what is called mulkieh, a title which gives the holder the fee simple of the land, to do with it as he pleases, to leave it by will, and, in default of his doing so, it passes to his next heir. Trustworthy statistics on the religious denominations of Turkey cannot yet be obtained. E.G. Ravenstein, in an article on the population of Russia and Turkey in the Journal of the Statistical Society (Lond. 1877), estimates the total population of European Turkey, exclusive of Roumania and Servia,  but inclusive of Bosnia and Bulgaria, at 9,661,000, which he distributes-as follows among the religious denominations:

EUROPE.

Turkish Mohammedans1,767,500Mohammedans of other nationalities2, 479,500Total Mohammedans4, 247,000Greek Church4,705,450Armenians89,000Roman Catholics426,000Protestants10,000Total Christians5,230,450Jews78,000Gypsies104,750Total9,660,200 ASIA.

Turks6,973,500Other Mohammedans6,299,850Total Mohammedans13,273,350Greek Church1,484,868Armenians735,100Roman Catholics100,100Protestants10,450Maronites, etc.487,000Total Christians2, 817,518Jezides and Kizilbashi62,000Jews106,000Gypsies67,000Total16,325,868A Servian statistician, Jakshitsh, gives the following estimates of the population of European Turkey: Christians in Turkey proper, 2,484,501; in Eastern Roumelia, 559,776; in Bosnia, 780,276; in Bulgaria, 1,196,248;  total; 5,020,801. Mohammedans in Turkey proper, 1,883,127; in Eastern Roumelia, 359,434; in Bosnia, 400,635; in Bulgaria, 760,267; total, 3,403,463. Jews in Turkey proper, 55,018;. in Eastern Roumelia, 3969; in Bosnia, 6968; in Bulgaria, 8959; total, 74,914. Total population of European Turkey, 8,499,178. According to these authorities, the aggregate number of Mohammedans in European and Asiatic Turkey may be estimated at from 15,700,000 to 16,500,000, that of Christians of all denominations at about 8,000,000, that of the Jews at about 200,000. The aggregate population of the African dependencies, owing to the rapid expansion of the Egyptian dominions of late years, was estimated, in 1880, at 20,500,000, nearly all of whom, with the exception of the Copts of Egypt, are Mohammedans. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

V. The Christian Churches of Turkey. — Although the Turks, after the conquest of the Balkan peninsula, displayed all the horrors of Oriental despotism, they did not aim at the extermination of the Christian religion. There is probably no country of Christian Europe which has not imposed, at some time in the course of its history, more severe penalties upon the profession of a dissenting Christian creed than the Turks have done upon the profession of Christianity. The Christians, in their civil relations, found themselves greatly oppressed, but the Turks did not meddle with the internal affairs of the churches. The influence which they usurped by the appointment of the high dignitaries in the Eastern churches was inspired by considerations not of power or proselytism, but of greed. The social advantages which an apostasy to Islam involved gradually induced nearly the whole population of Albania, the entire nobility of the Bosnians, and large numbers of the Bulgarians and other Christian tribes to adopt the religion of the conquerors; but the immense majority of the population of the European dominions of Turkey and large numbers in Asia continued to adhere to the several Christian churches. As the military power of Turkey began to wane, Russia, France, and other powers claimed, and received by treaty, the right of protectorate over the Turkish subjects professing the national religions of the several European countries. In 1839 the sultan, by the hatti-sherif of Gulhane, proclaimed the equality of Christians and Moslems before the law. The provisions of this charter of religious liberty were renewed and extended by sultan Abdul-Mejid in the charter called the hatti-humayum, promulgated in February, 1856. The renewal of the charter was mentioned in the treaty of Paris as the consideration on which the powers admitted Turkey to the company of European states, and  guaranteed to it its rights as an independent and inviolable power. The new Turkish constitution of December, 1876, promised to the professors of all religious denominations full equality of civil rights.

In the first Turkish Parliament, which met in 1877, all the religions of the empire were fairly represented. Thus among the deputies returned from Constantinople were five Turks, four Christians, and one Jew; and of the Christians, one was a Greek, one a Roman Catholic Armenian, and two Gregorian Armenians. In 1878 the treaty of Berlin (art. 62) placed the establishment of the principle of religious liberty to its fullest extent under the guarantee of all the great powers of Europe. When the Turks completed the conquest of the Balkan peninsula, they designated the aggregate of the Christian subjects as rajah (herds), while the different tribes were distinguished as millet (nation). The Mohammedan Turks were, however, so strongly inclined to confound Church and State that they viewed the several millets as so many religious communions. Mohammed II, after the capture of Constantinople, made the patriarch of that city the secular head of all the rajah belonging to the Orthodox Eastern or Greek Church. The civil functions of the patriarch were shared in different degrees by the subordinate bishops, and thus the entire hierarchy of the Greek Church appeared as the actual administrator of the civil interests of the people, and as such were held by the Porte responsible for the loyalty of the population. Besides the millet of the Greeks, there are others for the Armenians, United Armenians, Latins, Protestants, and Jews. Their organization is similar to that of the Greeks. The secular jurisdiction of the Armenian patriarch includes the Jacobites. For various statistical statements of the present Christian population of Turkey, see above.

1. The Greek Church. — When the Turks took, in 1453, possession of Constantinople, the foremost episcopal see of the Eastern Church became subject to their rule. The patriarch of Constantinople had gradually become for the Eastern Church what the patriarch of Rome became for the West. SEE GREEK CHURCH.

When the termination of ecclesiastical communion between the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople became a fixed fact, all of the Orthodox Eastern churches looked upon the patriarch of Constantinople as the most eminent bishop of the Orthodox churches, although many of them, like the churches of Russia, were entirely independent of his jurisdiction. As long as there was a shadow of hope that the Eastern Roman empire would be aided by the Catholic Church of Western Europe in its resistance to the advance of the Turks, several  patriarchs of Constantinople had shown a readiness to reunite with Rome. To the bulk of the clergy and the laity the idea of such a reunion was extremely distasteful, and after the conquest of Constantinople it was entirely abandoned. The sultans claimed the same rights with regard to the appointment of the patriarchs that had been possessed by the Eastern or Byzantine emperors, and the Eastern Church submitted to the demand. Georgius Scholarins, who was elected patriarch soon after the conquest of Constantinople, and assumed the name of Gennadius, accepted from sultan Mohammed II the investiture as patriarch of New Rome. The sultan showed, however, but little respect for the authority of the patriarch, and finally compelled him to resign, notwithstanding the petitions of the faithful in his behalf. The next patriarch, Joasaph, was banished by the sultan because he had refused to acknowledge the unlawful marriage of a Mohammedan minister with the daughter of an Athenian. prince. Patriarch Simon, also living in the second half of the 15th century, was the first who offered to the sultan one thousand ducats for the patriarchate.

This money for the confirmation of the new patriarch is called kharatzion or peskesion; it has not only been always paid since, but the amount was constantly increased, and the Turkish government generally showed a disposition to sell the patriarchate to the highest bidder, and to vacate it as often as possible. Only a few of the patriarchs were allowed to remain in office for a long term; generally, after holding it for a short term, they were either compelled to resign, or they were banished, throttled, or degraded. The habit of the patriarch to purchase the confirmation by the sultans had a most disastrous influence upon the Church. The Simonistic corruption descended from the patriarchs to the archbishops and bishops, who had to pay heavy sums for their confirmation, and, in return, tried to indemnify themselves by extorting as much money as possible from their people. For political reasons, the external form of the Church was changed as little as possible; but in consequence of the corruption prevailing in the high places, the Church fell into great decay. The lower clergy, who were generally destitute of a higher education, showed but little sympathy with the people; and when the government conferred upon them some privileges, they looked with indifference upon the heavy taxes which oppressed the laity. Little resistance was even made by the clergy to the cruel institution of the Janizaries, a military corps formed by the children of Christians, who were taken away from their parents, educated as fanatical Moslems, and used for the compulsory extension of Mohammedanism. In some of the provinces the power of the Christian people to resist the proselytism of the Turks  gradually relaxed. Especially was this the case in Albania, where the Christian population decreased from 350,000 to 50,000, during the period from 1620 to 1650. Among the apostates were even many priests and monks. The subsequent history of the Greek Church of Turkey does not offer many points of great interest.

The growing power of Russia extorted from the Ottoman Porte in a number of treaties the official promise to protect the Christian religion and the Christian churches, and made itself chiefly felt in behalf of the coreligionists of Russia, the Orthodox Eastern Church. Between Constantinople and Rome an entire estrangement continued to exist. At the beginning of the 17th century the patriarch Neophytus II of Constantinople was believed to be favorable to a union with Rome; but no formal negotiations were opened, and none of the following patriarchs of Constantinople has shown any leaning in that direction. All the invitations and overtures that were made by the popes met, in Constantinople, with a firm and decided refusal: thus, in 1848, an invitation from Pius IX, addressed to the entire Eastern Church, for a corporate union with Rome, and another in 1869, addressed by the same pope to tile Greek bishops to attend the Vatican Council, were promptly and firmly declined in Constantinople and throughout the Greek Church. In the Asiatic part of Turkey the patriarch Athanasius IV of Antioch, who was elected in 1686, joined the communion of Rome, and was followed by a part of the clergy and laity.

Thus arose the United Greek Church of Turkey, SEE GREEK CHURCH, UNITED, which, from Syria, spread over all parts of the Turkish Empire. In the 16th century both the Lutheran and the Calvinistic theologians endeavored to establish friendly relations with the Greek Church, and entered into correspondence with several patriarchs of Constantinople. The Lutheran attempts were never attended with any success. The Calvinists completely gained over to their side one of the most gifted patriarchs that have ever occupied the see of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar (q.v.), who went so far as to transmit to Geneva the form of a Calvinistic confession of faith; but, with the violent death of the patriarch, who was strangled, and whose memory was execrated by the Oriental patriarchs, this attempt, too, came to an end, and the Greek Church in Turkey, as well as in other countries, has kept aloof from all corporate negotiations with Protestant churches. In the 19th century the attempts made by the more congenial Anglican churches of the British isles and the United States to establish intercommunion with the various Episcopal churches of the East led to friendly correspondence between the patriarchs of the Greek Church, on the one hand, and the archbishop of Canterbury  and other Anglican bishops, on the other. At the union conferences held at Bonn, Germany, in 1874 and 1875, between Oriental, Anglican, and Old- Catholic theologians, the Greek Church of Turkey was also represented by several theologians. SEE RUSSIA.

Until the establishment of the independence of Greece, the Turkish empire comprised nearly all the Greek churches of the world, except those of Russia and Austro-Hungary. Among the bishops of the Greek Church the patriarch of Constantinople holds the highest rank. He alone is invested by the Turkish government with the attributes of civil head of the entire Church. In regard to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he is, however, only the head of the patriarchate of Constantinople; the other three patriarchs (of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria), as well as the metropolitan of Cyprus and the abbot of Mount Sinai, being independent of him. The three patriarchs named receive in their beraat, or official decree of confirmation, the same rights and privileges as the patriarch of Constantinople; each of them has his own patriarchal synod, which fills the see in case of vacancy. An attempt made by the patriarch of Constantinople to appoint the patriarchs of the three other sees led, from 1843 to 1845, to a violent controversy between the patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarchal Synod of Jerusalem, in which the latter remained victorious.

The three patriarchs communicate, nevertheless, with the Turkish government through the patriarch of Constantinople, and are not even' allowed to come to the capital without his permission. The aggregate territory of these three patriarchates is, however, small, and all the remainder of the Greek churches of Turkey was until recently under the immediate jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. The' establishment of the kingdom of Greece, in 1821, virtually severed the connection of the churches of the kingdom with the patriarch of Constantinople, on whom they had formerly been dependent. The entire independence of the Church of Greece was, however, not proclaimed until 1833, when a synod of the bishops of Greece met for this purpose at Nauplia, and the formal recognition of the independence by the patriarch of Constantinople did not take place until 1850. Servia and Roumania were virtually as independent of the patriarch of Constantinople in ecclesiastical affairs as they were of the sultan in politics. The establishment of their entire political independence, in 1878, entails the complete severance of their ecclesiastical connection with Constantinople. The Bulgarians, although agreeing in doctrine with the Eastern Orthodox Church, were, until 1767, independent of the jurisdiction  of the patriarch of Constantinople, having a primate and patriarch of the national Bulgarian Church at Ochrida; but in 1767 the last patriarch abdicated, and, by the joint efforts of the Turkish government and the patriarch of Constantinople, the Bulgarian Church was not only placed under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Greek patriarch, but entirely denationalized.

Their bishops and priests were dismissed, their sees and parishes were occupied by Greeks, their monasteries and schools were seized, and the revenues appropriated by the Greek communities; but the greatest blow of all was struck in the elimination of the Bulgarian language and literature from all the educational establishments. A strong educational movement for re-establishing the rule of the Bulgarian language in school and Church set in about 1840. It made at once rapid and steady progress in the province of education, and at length, in 1870, led to the reorganization of a national Bulgarian Church. Notwithstanding the most desperate opposition to the Bulgarian movement by the patriarch of Constantinople and the Greek Fanar, the Porte found it necessary to yield to the Bulgarians so far as to issue a firman which constituted, under the title of The Bulgarian Exarchate, a separate spiritual administration, comprising in its jurisdiction the towns and districts of Rustchuk, Silistria, Shumla, Tirnova, Sophia, Vratcha, Lovtcha; Widdin, Nish, Kustenji, Samarkov,Veles (with the exception of about twenty villages and three towns), the sanjak of Slivmia (except a few villages), the district of Sisopolis, the town of Philippopolis, the district of Stanimaka (with the exception of a few villages), and the metropolitan diocese of Philippopolis (except a few monasteries).

The firman further provided that the powers of the exarchate be defined by an organic code, which was to be in conformity on all points with the established laws and religious principles of the Qrthodox Church; but to exclude entirely, on the other hand, all interference, direct or indirect, on the part of the patriarch, with monastic affairs, and more especially with the election of the exarch and the bishops. The exarch was to be named by imperial berat. He was to be bound, in conformity with ecclesiastical rules, to commemorate the name of the patriarch of Constantinople, and the synod of the exarchate was to be bound to obtain the holy oils in use in the Church from the patriarchate of Constantinople. Although the patriarch of Constantinople at first excommunicated all who availed themselves of the firman and connected themselves with the Bulgarian exarchate, the latter rallied more and more all members of the Orthodox Church who were of the Bulgarian nationality. The treaty of Berlin of 1878, which provided for the establishment of a tributary  principality of Bulgaria, and an autonomous province of Eastern Roumelia, in both of which countries the Bulgarians are the predominant race, made the bulk of the Bulgarian nation virtually independent of both the sultan and the patriarch of Constantinople, and cannot fail to complete, ere long, the organization of a national Bulgarian Church, comprising all the Orthodox Christians who speak the Bulgarian language, and enjoying an independence equal to the national churches of Russia, Greece, Roumania, and Servia. The jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople is thereby restricted to those Christians of the Eastern Orthodox Church who are of the Greek nationality. SEE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

The office of the patriarch is intended to be held by the occupant for life; but the Porte may remove him on account of high-treason, and the synod may ask the Porte for his removal on account of bad administration and of heresy. Charges of the first class are very frequent; and as it is the pecuniary interest of Turkish officials to have the patriarchs removed as often as possible, they are always found willing to co-operate in such removal. Depositions of patriarchs are therefore very frequent. The patriarch is assisted by a “Holy Synod”(Jemaat), which consists of from ten to twelve metropolitans, besides the patriarch, its president. The patriarch has the right to select them, with the exception, however, of the metropolitans of Heraclea, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, and Chalcedon, who are members ex officio, and among whom, as they are so near the capital, the patriarchal seal, which consists of four parts, is divided. As the keepers of the patriarchal seal must always be present in Constantinople, the four metropolitans occupy a peculiar position, which the Porte recognises by specially enumerating them in the berat of the patriarch. The patriarch has no right to send them to their dioceses. He may increase the number of the members of the synod, but is not allowed to reduce it below ten. It is customary for eight of the metropolitans who are members of the synod to be present at Constantinople. They are called “the prominent”(ἔγκριτοι), and are addressed as the “holy old ones”(ἃγιοι γέροντες).

In 1847, the Porte desired to add to the synod, for all questions not relating to the doctrine or discipline of the Church, three lay members-the grand logothete Aristarchi; the experience of Samos, Vogoridesi and a rich merchant of Chios, Psychari, generally called Messeyani; but the synod opposed the plan so strongly that it was abandoned by the Porte. According to a habit which is expressly recognised by the sultan, all the patriarchs and metropolitans of the Eastern Orthodox Church who happen to be present  at Constantinople have a right to take part in the debates and resolutions of the Holy Synod. For questions of minor importance, especially such as relate to the administration of the Church, the decision of the patriarch and the four metropolitans who keep the patriarchal seal is deemed sufficient. The Holy Synod is the supreme tribunal for the clergy of-the Greek Church, and serves as a court of appeal from the decisions of the bishops.

Without its consent, the patriarch can give no decision in ecclesiastical or temporal affairs, and appoint no bishop. The synod alone has judicial and punitive power over the patriarch; and the deposition of the patriarch by the Porte, except in cases of high-treason, takes place only at the request of the Holy Synod. The most important right of the synod is the election of a new patriarch. The synod regulates and distributes the ecclesiastical taxes, and keeps the seals of all the monasteries. It has its own seal, consisting of four pieces, one of which is kept by the patriarch of Constantinople, and the other three by metropolitans elected by the synod. The sessions of the synod are generally held on Sundays and holidays, after divine service. Most of its decrees need for their execution a firman of the sultan. When a new patriarch is to be elected, the members of the synod, and the archbishops and bishops present at the time in Constantinople, assemble at the synodicon, or patriarch's palace, which is situated in the Fanar, or Greek quarter, in order to nominate by ballot, in the presence of a commissary of the Turkish government, three candidates for the vacant see. All the candidates must be metropolitans. As soon as the nomination is made, it is communicated to the representatives of the Greek community, who are assembled in the vestibule of the synodicon. This assembly designates by acclamation, and the shout of ἄξιος (worthy), the candidate of its preference. The election, being thus completed, the minutes are signed by all present, and an official report is made to the Porte, which then orders the berat to be drawn up. This official berat, for which a large amount of money has to be paid, enumerates all the rights belonging to the patriarch and the synod. On the day after the election, the new patriarch officially visits the grand-vizier, who presents him with a magnificent suit of clothes, consisting of a caftan (a long silken robe), a cloak, a black capuchon, and a patriarchal hat; moreover, with a finely wrought patriarchal staff and a white horse.

The patriarch pays also to the other ministers of the Porte an official visit. Soon after these visits follows the inthronization, an act of great simplicity, which is performed by the metropolitan of Heraclea. The ecclesiastical rights of the patriarch are very extensive. He appoints, with the concumrence of the synod, all  metropolitans and bishops. He has supreme jurisdiction in all affairs relating to marriage and wills. Complaints against bishops can be decided by the government only with the concurrence of the patriarch. The arrest of a Greek prelate requires the consent of the patriarch and the co-operation of his officers. He has the right, without restraint, to excommunicate any member of the church; to deny ecclesiastical burial, etc. He enjoys the privilege of consecrating the holy oil, and has in all dioceses the right of the stauropegion, i.e. the right, at the foundation of a church or a monastery, to erect a cross on the spot where the altar is to stand, and thereby to subject to his control such church or convent. The civil jurisdiction which the patriarch enjoys as the head of the “Greek nation” (which means, in the official language, all the members of the Eastern Church), is in some respects even more comprehensive because it extends also over the other patriarchal dioceses. This power, however, is on the wane. As has already been indicated, the non-Greek nationalities have either achieved their entire independence of Turkish rule, or, like the Bulgarians, have severed their ecclesiastical connection with the patriarch of Constantinople, whose jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as civil, will be restricted to the Church members of the Greek nationality. The patriarch has his own court, before which especially cases of minor importance are brought, not only between Greeks and Greeks, but also between Greeks and people of other churches, even between Greeks and Turks. An appeal can, however, be had from the patriarch's court to the Turkish courts. The revenue of the patriarch is considerable.

He inherits the property of metropolitans, bishops, priests, monks, and nuns who die without legal heirs. If there are legal heirs, the persons named may bequeath to the patriarch up to one third of their property. Other sources of revenue are the fees for ordination, the tax on the installation of metropolitans and bishops, the annual contributions from the bishops and from the convents which. are immediately subject to the patriarch, smaller contributions from each priest and each layman of his diocese, the fees of his chancery, fees for every marriage and burial, etc. The patriarch has the right to have all these dues collected by special commissaries, who, if necessary, can invoke the aid of the government officials. The patriarch is exempt from ordinary taxes, but has to pay a large sum annually to the government as a special tax, and to make frequent presents to the ministers. The patriarch is assisted in the administration of the patriarchate by a number of officers. They are divided into two choirs — one at the right, and the other at the left. The former consists of three sections, each of which embraces five persons, and is  therefore called a πέντας . All these offices were formerly of great importance, and, with the exception of those which required an ordination or had the superintendence of convents, were in the hands of the noble Greek families, the so-called Phanariotes. The occupants had a vote at the election and deposition of the patriarch. At present, most of these offices are mere titles. The only officer who has still an important political position and considerable influence is the grand logothete (μέγας λογοθέτης), or the grand keeper of the seal. He is elected by the patriarch and Holy Synod from among the Greek notables for lifetime he is confirmed by the Porte, and can only be removed by the concurrent action of both powers. ‘The patriarchate conducts through him all negotiations with the Porte relating to its secular privileges; and all the official communications from the patriarch to the Porte pass through his hands. He has the right to countersign all synodal resolutions relating to the appointment of metropolitans and bishops, and to receive certain fees for drawing up the official documents. SEE PATRIARCHS.

The three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are not subject to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, but are co-ordinate to him. The berat by which they are appointed confers upon them the same rights, and each of them has a synod which has the same rights as the Synod of Constantinople. They are inferior to the patriarch of Constantinople only in so far as they have no civil jurisdiction. The patriarch of Alexandria has jurisdiction over the Greek churches of Egypt, Libya, Arabia, and Nubia; the patriarch of Antioch, who resides at Damascus, over those of Syria, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Isauria, and other Asiatic provinces; the patriarch of Jerusalem, who resides at Galata, a suburb of Constantinople, over those of Palestine. The aggregate territory of the three patriarchates is, however, but small compared with that of Constantinople. Metropolitans with suffragan bishops are rare in the Turkish empire. The name metropolitan or archbishop is generally only a title which confers a higher dignity than the title bishop, but not a greater jurisdiction. The title of metropolitan is especially given to the bishops of the provincial capitals. As bishops must be unmarried, they are generally taken from the monasteries. If a layman is to be ordained a bishop, he has first to take all orders up to priesthood, and then can receive the episcopal ordination only after the expiration of thirty days. The candidate must be thirty years of age, and at his ordination three bishops must be present. Bishops are bound to reside in their dioceses; and if a bishop is absent from  his diocese for more than six months, except it be by order of the patriarch, he is deposed. The bishop has entire control of the Church property of the diocese, and can impose taxes upon his diocesans. Without his permission, no convent can be built within the diocese.

The revenue of metropolitans and bishops is derived from the same sources as that of the patriarch. They receive annual contributions from the priests and the laity of the diocese, besides fees and inheritances. The income of many bishops is considerable. The metropolitans and bishops have also an influential position in the political administration of the empire, as they are, in virtue of their office, members-of the administrative councils, by which the valis of the vilayets are assisted. In 1836, patriarch Gregory VI and the Holy Synod issued a circular in which all bishops were requested to establish in their dioceses an ecclesiastical committee, after the model of the one existing in Constantinople, for consulting on the spiritual interests of the dioceses. All the diocesan committees send reports to Constantinople, and thence receive advice. The committees consist of not less than three members, who are selected from among the educated, virtuous, and zealous clergy. One member of the committee has to examine the candidates for ordination and to instruct and guide the confessors. A second member has to superintend the printing and the sale of books, the ecclesiastical discipline, and the lives of the clergy. No book can be printed without his permission. The third member superintends education and preaching. The secular clergy are mostly uneducated and poor, and, to support themselves and their families, they often carry on some trade, cultivate a farm, and perform other manual labor. The parochial churches are maintained by the congregations, and on every Sunday and holiday collections are taken up for the purpose. The koja bachi, or chief of the congregation, administers the financial affairs, and has, in particular, to take care of the support of the priests, the churches, and the schools. No one can be admitted to a male or female convent without an examination, or before being ten years of age. Besides the monks and nuns who live in convents, there are eremites on Mount Athos, and anchorets in Macedonia. SEE MONKS, EASTERN.

The number of metropolitans and bishops who were subject to the patriarch of Constantinople before the churches of Roumania, Servia, and Bulgaria had severed their connection with him amounted, according to Silbernagl (Veifassung sammflicher Kirchen des Orients [1865]), to 131, of whom 92 belonged to Europe, 21 to Asia, and 18 to the provinces. In consequence of the decay of the Turkish empire, a very large number of  the dioceses are now no longer subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch, which, ere long, may be restricted to the dioceses in which the people are of the Greek nationality. Under the patriarch of Antioch were 12 dioceses, and to this patriarchate also belongs the archbishop of Cyprus, who is exempt, and has under his jurisdiction 5 suffragan bishops. Under the jurisdiction; of the patriarch of Jerusalem are 14 archbishops and bishops, under that of Alexandria, 4. The population, of the patriarchate of Alexandria is reported as only 5000 souls; that of Jerusalem as 15,000; while the patriarchate of Antioch comprises 29,000 families. The total population connected with the Greek or Orthodox Eastern Church of Turkey, after the great territorial changes made in 1878, was estimated at 3,800,000 (see Appletons Annual Cyclopaedia, 1878, art. “Greek Church”); but of this number a considerable part belongs to the Bulgarian dioceses of Eastern Roumelia, which have no longer any ecclesiastical communion with the patriarch of Constantinople. Of the convents of the Church, which are still numerous, the most celebrated are those on Mount Athos (q.v.). Of late, education has begun to make great progress among the population connected with the Greek Church. Two theological seminaries have been established, the one on the island of Chalki, near Constantinople, and the other at Jerusalem; and no one is henceforth to be appointed as bishop who has not been educated at one of these institutions, or is not fully up to the standard of the education there imparted. A flourishing teachers seminary, according to the German model, has been established at Salonica, in Macedonia. SEE EASTERN CHURCH.

2. The Armenian Church. — For more than three hundred years nearly two thirds of ancient Armenia has been under the rule of Turkey, SEE ARMENIA; and, therefore, although the head of the Church (the catholicos of Echmiadzin) is now a subject of Russia (q.v.), the large majority of the adherents of the Armenian Church are still to be found in Turkey. Among the Armenian bishops of Turkey, the patriarch of Constantinople occupies the highest rank; he is inferior only to the catholicos of Echmiadzin. An Armenian diocese was established at Constantinople as early as 1307. Archbishop Joachim, of Bursa, was raised to the rank of patriarch of Constantinople in 1461 by the sultan Mohammed II, and he was at the same time appointed the civil head of the Armenian nation. The patriarch is elected by the notables and the prominent clergymen of the Armenian community of Constantinople, and is confirmed by the Porte. Formerly the Armenian bankers had the ascendency in this assembly; but in 1839 several  Armenian employees of the Turkish government obtained the leading influence. The patriarch is entirely dependent upon these laymen, who appoint a coadjutor, or have him removed by the Turkish government, whenever the please. The new patriarch has to make a profession of faith, which consists of nine articles, the eighth of which designates the patriarch, as the vicar of Christ. The berat which the patriarch receives from the Porte confers upon him a direct power over the priests and laity of his diocese. Like the catholicos, he has the right to ordain bishops and to consecrate the holy oil. With the exception of the patriarch of Jerusalem, he can appoint metropolitans and bishops throughout Turkish Armenia; remove, exile, and recall them; divide or unite their dioceses. The entire property of the Church is under his control; in the administration of it he is, however, limited by the lay synod, which consists of twenty members elected by the people and confirmed by the Porte. Moreover, he is assisted in the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions by a clerical synod consisting of his officials. As he has also civil jurisdiction, he has, like the Greek patriarch, his own court and a patriarchal prison. He is the civil head not only of the Armenian nation, but also of the Syrian Jacobites. All communications between the Turkish government and the Armenians pass through his hands; and even the Armenian patriarch of Sis and the bishops not directly subject to his jurisdiction receive their berat through him. Like the Greek patriarch, he enjoys a number of honorary rights and exemption from taxation, but, in return, has to pay ah annual tribute to the Porte. His revenue consists chiefly of taxes of installation and annual contributions from bishops; fees for ordination, for the holy oil, for marriages; inheritances and donations. Besides the patriarch of Constantinople, the Armenian Church of Turkey has patriarchs at Sis, in the vilayet of Adana, at Jerusalem, and at Aghtamar, on the island of Van.

The first patriarch of Sis was elected in 1440, when the clergy of Sis, after the death of the catholicos Joseph III, feared lest the residence of the patriarch, which had been at Sis since 1294, might be removed to Echmiadzin. Without waiting for a general assembly of the Armenian bishops, the clergy of Sis hurriedly proceeded, conjointly with the people of Sis, to the election of a catholicos. The bishops and vartabeds met, however, in 1441, at Echmiadzin, and elected as catholicos the monk Kyriakos, who was almost generally recognised by the Armenian churches. In order to prevent a permanent schism, the privilege was conferred upon Sis to be governed by a patriarch, on condition, however, that he receive  the holy oil from the catholicos as a sign of his submission. The condition was accepted, and from that time Sis has had its own patriarchs. According to a concordat concluded between the catholicos of Echmiadzin and the patriarch of Sis, the jurisdiction of the latter was to extend over the Armenian churches of Cilicia, Syria, Egypt, and Palestine; but, as the bishop of Jerusalem made himself independent in the middle of the 17th century, his jurisdiction has since been limited to the Armenian churches of Armenia Minor, Cappadocia, and Cilicia. The patriarch of Sis has the title “Patriarch and Primate of Armenia Minor and the Armenians who are in Cilicia, Syria, and Palestine, Minister of the Right and of the Throne of St. Gregory the Illuminator.”

The patriarchate of Jerusalem has been in existence since the middle of the 17th century, when the catholicos Philippos conferred upon the archbishop of Jerusalem the right of consecrating, himself, the holy oil; and the archbishop consequently assumed the title of patriarch, and began to ordain bishops. The patriarch of Jerusalem, however, ceased long ago to exercise these functions; and his powers have been greatly curtailed, as the patriarch of Constantinople calls him to account when he pleases. In order to guard as much as possible his own independence, the patriarch procures from the Turkish government his own berat, and supports in Constantinople an agent of his own. He has to pay an annual tribute, not only to the Porte, but to the pasha of Damascus. He is elected by his suffragan bishops, and has his residence in the monastery of St. James at Jerusalem, His income is derived from the same sources as that of the patriarch of Constantinople, the presents from the pilgrims to Jerusalem constituting an element of special importance.

In 1114 bishop David of Tornik made himself patriarch of Aghtamar, in Lake Van, and assumed the title catholicos. The schism has continued to the present day; but the patriarchate is of little importance, since its jurisdiction extends hardly any farther than Lake Van. The patriarch is elected by the bishops and clergy under his jurisdiction, and is supported by the revenue of the monastery on the island of Aghtamar.

The metropolitans, or archbishops, are not distinguished from the bishops by any greater jurisdiction, but only by some honorary rights. The catholicos can only be elected out of their number. The bishops are regularly elected from the unmarried vartabeds, and only occasionally, and by special permission of the catholicos or the patriarchs, from the monks,  since, according to the Church law, a monk is not to become a bishop. The bishop is generally elected by the clergy and the heads of families, and after the election he is presented for confirmation to the catholicos or the patriarchs, who appoint several (generally three) bishops for examining the candidate. It is required that he be fifty years of age, of legitimate descent for three generations, on both father's and mother's side, and well versed in the Holy Scriptures and the canonical law. Many of the metropolitans and bishops have no, dioceses, but live in convents, and there hold the office of archimandrite. Many of them are at the same time vartabeds. The patriarch of Constantinople, according to the regulations made by the provincial council on Nov. 20, 1830, has under his jurisdiction 18 archbishops, or metropolitans, and 35 bishops. The patriarchate of Sis embraces three towns and forty villages. Towards the close of the 16th century the patriarch of Sis still had 23 archbishops and bishops under his jurisdiction. The diocese of the patriarch of Jerusalem embraces the churches of Palestine, Syria Akra, and Tripolis. His residence, in the monastery of Mar Yakub on Mount Zion, was built in the 11th century, belonged to the Armenians as early as 1238, and has been in their undisputed possession since 1666. Besides the patriarch, 5 bishops and more than 100 priests, live in the monastery. The total number of suffragan bishops is reported to be 14. The diocese of the patriarch of Aghtamar comprises two towns and thirty villages. In the second half of the 17th century he had under his jurisdiction from 8 to 9 bishops residing in the monasteries on the shore of Lake Van. The population connected with the Armenian Church is estimated at about 2,400,000, of whom about 400,000 are in the European dominions of Turkey. SEE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

3. Other Oriental Churches. — Besides the Greeks and Armenians, Turkey has two other Oriental churches the so-called Nestorians and Jacobites. Both have been fully treated in former volumes of this Cyclopedia. SEE JACOBITES; SEE NESTORIANS.

4. The Roman Catholic Church in, Turkey. — There are only a few tribes and congregations in the present dominions of the Turkish Empire, which have always been in connection with the Church of Rome. They are chiefly to be found in Albania. The foundation of other congregations dates from the time of the crusades, which established the Latin Church on a permanent basis in Syria, Palestine, and Cyprus. The rule of the Venetians in the Mediterranean Sea, and the commercial intercourse between the Balkan Peninsula and the Catholic nations of Western Europe increased the  number of Latin congregations in all the large cities of the empire. Finally, the unceasing efforts of the numerous missionaries which the Church of Rome has supported in all parts of the empire have won over fractions of all the various Oriental Christian denominations in which the empire abounds. These fractions have been allowed by the pope to retain a number of national and ecclesiastical peculiarities; and, while they have adopted the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, recognize the pope as the head of the Church Universal, and must be recognised themselves, in the fullest sense of the word, as part of the Roman Catholic Church, they appear, especially in consequence of the retention at divine service of a rite different from the Latin, as a kind of semi-independent division of the Church. A correct view of the actual strength of the Roman Catholic Church in the Turkish Empire is best obtained by reviewing the several rites separately.

The Latin millet embraces the Roman Catholics of all rites, except the United Armenians, who have their own civil head. The head of the Latin millet is a layman, who has the title Vekil (representative). He is assisted by four deputies of the Latin population, with whom he constitutes a permanent council called the Latin Chancery. The functions of this council are similar to those of the Greek patriarch.

(1.) The Latin Rite. — A Latin patriarchate was established at Constantinople in 1203, in consequence of the crusades. The occupant received a rank next to the pope. When Constantinople, in 1453, became the residence of the sultan, the Latin patriarchs transferred the seat of the patriarchate to Venice, and sent to Constantinople as their representative a vicar, who for a long time was only a monk. When the Catholics, in consequence of their increasing number, applied for a bishop, the Propaganda prevailed upon the patriarch to appoint an assistant bishop for Constantinople, and to pay him a regular salary. This bishop sometimes called himself patriarchal vicar, sometimes suffragan of the patriarch. After some time, the Propaganda found it necessary to appoint, in its turn, an apostolical patriarchal vicar. When, after the middle of the 17th century, the patriarch took up his residence at Rome, and the patriarchate of Constantinople became a mere title in partibus infidelium, which was conferred upon a prelate residing in Rome, the apostolical vicar was invested with full jurisdiction over all Catholics of the Latin rite. The population of his diocese, which extends over Thrace and the opposite coast of Asia Minor, is estimated at about 15,000. The larger portions of  the vicariate apostolic (formerly archbishopric) of Sophia, which had before the late war a Latin population of about 8000, and of the diocese of Nicopolis, which had a population of about 3000 are no longer under Turkish rule. Both the towns of Sophia and Nicopolis lie within the new principality of Bulgaria. A considerable portion of the archbishopric of Scopia, or Uskub, in Macedonia (now the western part of Roumelia) has been annexed to Servia. The whole diocese numbered before the war about 8000 Catholics of the Latin rite. Before the enlargement of the principality in 1878, the entire Roman Catholic population, numbering about 4000 persons, was included in the diocese of Belgrade and Semendria, SEE SERVIA, which belonged as a suffragan see to the ecclesiastical province of Antivari.

The two vicariates apostolic of Moldavia and Wallachia, numbering in 1878 an aggregate Roman Catholic population of 114,000, now belong to the independent state of Roumania. The two vicariates of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which embrace the entire Roman Catholic population in the two provinces after which they have been called, were in 1878, by the treaty of Berlin, placed under Austrian administration. The Catholic population in these vicariates is numerous, especially in the northern and north-western districts of Bosnia, which before the conquest of the country by the Turks belonged to Hungary. The bishop of Bosnia fled, in consequence of the Turkish conquest, to Hungary, and established his residence at Deacovar. The occupant of this see still has the title bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium; but, as the Turks did not allow the jurisdiction of a foreign prelate, a vicar apostolic was appointed for the Catholics of the Turkish provinces. The Catholic population is estimated at about 140,000, that of Herzegovina at 42,000. In the European provinces remaining under Turkish rule the Roman Catholic Church has its greatest stronghold in Albania. There are two ecclesiastical provinces, in Albania, Antivari- Scutari and Durazzo. The latter has no longer any suffragan see, and consists only of the archdiocese of Durazzo. The archdiocese of Antivari and the diocese of Scutari were united in 1867, at which time they had an aggregate Roman Catholic population of about 33,000. The suffragan sees of Antivari and Durazzo are Sappa, Pulati, and Alessio, all in Albania, with an aggregate population of about 42,000. The diocese of Belgrade, in Servia, which has already been referred to, also belongs to this ecclesiastical province. The island of Scio, which belongs to Asiatic Turkey, has still an episcopal see, although the number of Roman Catholics is less than one thousand. It is a suffragan see of the archdiocese of Naxos, which belongs to the kingdom of Greece. In the Middle Ages, while this  island was under the rule of the Venetians, it was very flourishing, and the Roman Catholic population was numerous; but during the Greek war of independence nearly the entire Christian population was exterminated or sold into slavery. ‘The population of Cyprus, which in 1878 was placed under English administration, has rapidly increased during the last twenty years, and the Roman Catholic Church there numbers about 10,000 Catholics of the Latin and Greek rites, and 3000 Maronites. The flourishing city of Smyrna, in Asia Minor, has an archdiocese with about 15,000, nearly all of whom live in the capital. The archbishopric in this city was restored in 1818, and has now as a suffragan see the diocese of Candia, which, after being long conferred as a title in partibus infidelium, was restored in 1874. Besides these dioceses, the Church of Rome has an archbishop of Babylon, who resides at Bagdad. For the Roman Catholics of Jerusalem, who were formerly under the jurisdiction of Franciscan monks, an archbishopric was established in 1847, the occupant of which received the title of patriarch.

The number of Roman Catholics in Palestine is estimated at about 15,000. Two “apostolic delegations” have been established, one called “Asiatic Turkey,” and embracing Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, and Armenia Minor, and the other Syria; and two apostolical vicariates, Aleppo and Asia Minor. The number of Roman Catholics in all these dioceses and ecclesiastical districts is small, but the bishops and the comparatively numerous orders display a considerable activity among the Christians of the Oriental rites. Several Catholic congregations have been collected in the commercial towns of the Arabian coast. They are administered by the apostolical vicar of Aden. The number of Catholics in the African dependencies of Turkey is small, but is increasing by immigration from Catholic countries of Europe, especially France and Italy. The French population residing in Egypt in 1877 amounted to 17,000, the Italian to 13,900, the Austrian to 6300; the large majority of all these are Catholics. The patriarchate of Alexandria, like that of Antioch in Asia, is now a mere title conferred upon an Italian prelate who resides in Rome. For the 25,000 Catholics of Tunis there is a vicar apostolic, and for the 5000 of Tripoli a praefect apostolic.

(2.) The Armenian Rite. — The Church of Rome began to gain a firm footing among the Armenians at the time of the crusades. SEE ARMENIAN CHURCH. Although the bulk of the nation always continued averse to a union with Rome, considerable numbers accepted the union, and, retaining the rites of the national Church, were organized into a  United Armenian Church. The Mechitarists (q.v.) have gained for this ecclesiastical community a greater literary distinction than can be claimed by any other Oriental communion. In regard to their political rights, the United Armenians were subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of the National Armenian Church until pope Pius VIII, in 1830, succeeded, with the aid of France and Austria, in making them independent. He erected at Constantinople the see of an archbishop primate for the Catholic Armenians, who was to be immediately subject to the Holy See. At the appointment of the first primate the pope appears to have taken into consideration the national wishes, and to have conceded to them the right to propose three candidates for the vacant see, from whom the pope chose one.

In 1845 the pope appointed Anthony Hassun as successor of the primate, without consulting the nation. By a brief of April 30,1850,.pope Pius IX erected the towns of Ancyra, Artvin, Brousa, Erzrfim, Ispahan, and Trebizond into episcopal sees of the United Armenians, and made them suffragans of the Armenian archbishop of Constantinople. The same brief appointed the bishops of these sees without consulting the nation. The United Armenian nation gave its consent to the establishment of the sees, but refused to recognize the bishops, because they had not previously been consulted. After some time, they yielded this point also, in order to prevent a schism; and the Turkish government, through the mediation of France, gave to the new bishops the necessary berat. When the pope established the see of an archbishop-primate at Constantinople, it was intended to confer upon him also the secular jurisdiction over the Catholic Armenians; but the Porte did not recognize the primate, and clothed, by a berat of 1831, a priest of the Order of Mechitarists with the praefectura nationalis. At the request of the French ambassador, after some time, a patriarch was appointed, but without any ecclesiastical functions, and having only those secular rights which are connected with the offices of the Greek and the Gregorian-Armenian patriarchs.

The patriarch was to be elected by the United Armenian community, and to be confirmed by the Porte. He was to be assisted by a council of administration consisting of twelve members, who were likewise to be elected by the nation and to be confirmed by the Porte. The berat given to the patriarch extended his jurisdiction over all the United Eastern churches; but, in consequence of the religious controversies and inner dissensions which arose, the patriarch lost the right to represent the other Catholic nationalities at the Porte, and this right passed over to the vekil of the Latins. In 1866 Hassun, the archbishop-primate of Constantinople, was elected also patriarch of Cilicia, and assumed as such  the name Anthony Peter IX. Thus for the first time the highest ecclesiastical dignity of the United Armenians, the patriarchate of Cilicia, was united in one person with the civil headship of the United Armenian nation which was attached to the office of the primate of Constantinople. Simultaneously with confirming the new patriarch, pope Pius IX, in July, 1867, issued the bull Reversurus, which abolished the rights that hitherto the United Armenians had enjoyed with regard to the election of their patriarch and their bishops, and reserved for the pope rights hitherto not exercised by him. The opposition which at once manifested itself against this bull led in 1870 to an open schism. The opponents secured the assistance of the Turkish government; Hassun was exiled from Constantinople and from Turkey, and Kupelian chosen in his stead patriarch of the United Armenians. Besides, a number of bishops sympathizing with Kupelian were appointed for United Armenian dioceses. Notwithstanding repeated excommunications by Rome, the party headed by Kupelian remained in opposition to the pope, and assumed a position similar to that of the Old Catholics. in Western Europe. The Kupelians continued for many years to enjoy the patronage and active support of the Turkish government, but never succeeded in bringing over to their side the majority of the United Armenian laity. In 1876 a general amnesty, granted by the new sultan, Murad, on his accession to the-throne, permitted Hassun to return to Constantinople. The schism continued, however, until 1899, when the efforts made by the papal delegates and the ambassador of France secured the submission of Kupelian and the other bishops of the opposition, and the entire end of the schism.

(3.) Other United Oriental Rites. — The Roman Catholic Church has also gained over the entire tribe of the Maronites, as well as portions of the Nestorians and the Jacobites in Asia, and of the Copts in Egypt. The United Nestorians are generally called Chaldeans, while the United Jacobites are designated United Syrians. These United Orientals have already been referred to in the articles SEE MARONITES; SEE CHALDEANS; SEE COPTS; SEE JACOBITES. The aggregate number of these religious denominations is not large. The number of Chaldeans (inclusive of the congregations in Persia) is estimated at from 20,000 to 30,000, that of the Syrians at from 9000 to 30,000, that of the Copts at 10,000. From 1870 to 1879 almost the entire community of the Chaldeans, including their patriarch, and, and all their bishops, was in a state of open rebellion against Rome. The patriarch desired to extend his jurisdiction  over the Christians of St. Thomas in British India, who, like the Chaldeans, are United Nestorians, and number about 100,000. Rome objected to this, desiring the Christians of St. Thomas to remain as heretofore under the jurisdiction of the vicar apostolic of Verapoli, who is of the Latin rite. The Chaldeans, moreover, protested against a Roman bull, issued in 1869, which forbade the patriarch to ordain bishops without the previous approbation of the pope. The Chaldeans had possessed and exercised this right from the time when they joined the communion of Rome, and they denied the right of the pope to abolish it without their consent. The patriarch and the bishops long resisted all the efforts made by Rome. One of their bishops visited India and prevailed upon a large portion of the Christians of St. Thomas to place themselves under his jurisdiction, and withdraw from that of the Latin vicar apostolic of Verapoli. At length, however, they relented in their resistance; and, after the death of patriarch and, the pope succeeded, in 1879, in securing the submission of the Chaldeans, and in the election of a new patriarch who declared himself willing to concede all the demands made by Rome. SEE THOMAS (ST.), CHRISTIANS OF.

(4.) Protestantism. — The most important Protestant churches in the Turkish empire are under the care of American missionary societies. The Rev. Pliny Fisk and the Rev. Levi Parsons were appointed by the American Board in 1818 missionaries to Palestine, and arrived at Smyrna in 1820. In the next year Mr. Parsons went to Jerusalem. A printing-press, designed to print books for, Turkey, was set up at Malta by the Rev. Daniel Temple in 1823, and was removed in 1833 to Smyrna. The Rev. Messrs. William Goodell and Isaac Bird were stationed at Beirut, where they began the Syrian mission in 1823, and opened schools the next year. In the same year the circulation of the Scriptures was forbidden by the government. The station at Jerusalem was suspended for nine years after the death of Mr. Fisk, in 1825, and the mission in Syria was suspended for a short time in 1828. It was soon resumed; the Rev. William Goodell was appointed to Constantinople, and a deputation was sent to visit the Armenian populations of the empire. Mr. Goodell visited the Armenian patriarch and ecclesiastics at Constantinople in 1831, and was at first welcomed by them. Schools were opened near Constantinople, and in 1834 stations were established at Trebizond and Brousa. The Greek and Armenian ecclesiastics became jealous of the progress of the missions, and a strong opposition was instigated against them; but in 1839 the new sultan made  the first of a series of concessions of religious liberty. In 1841 the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin opened a school at Bebek, near Constantinople, which was the beginning of what is now Robert College.

Churches were formally organized at Constantinople, Adabazar, and Trebizond in 1846. In the next year the Protestants were recognised by the government as an independent community, and in 1850 they were accorded a charter, placing them on the same basis as the other Christian communities of the empire. In 1856 the sultan granted, and in 1860 formally proclaimed, the hutti-humayum by which religious liberty and equal rights were conferred upon all classes. The missions in Syria were transferred to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in 1870. The churches of the American Board are distributed through a territory extending from Mosul, on the Tigris, to Monastir, in Macedonia. They are arranged into four missions, which are known as the Eastern Turkey (Armenia), Central Turkey (embracing the country south of the Black Sea), Western Turkey (Asia Minor), and European Turkey (Constantinople, Eastern Roumelia, Bulgaria, and Macedonia) missions, and include 90 churches, with 9890 members. The Presbyterian Church has 19 churches in Syria, with 1493 communicants. The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America has a mission at Latakia, with 171 members; the Free Church of Scotland has two missionaries, with 109 members; an independent Baptist missionary reports a few members, and the Friends have 145 members, all in Syria. The Rev. Samuel Gobat, an agent of the Church Missionary Society, went to Palestine in 1841, and was afterwards appointed Bishop of Jerusalem. He founded schools, which passed in 1877 under the control of the Church Missionary Society. This society returns 9 native Protestant congregations in Palestine, having 1616 members. Other societies engaged in Palestine are the London Jewish Mission, the Jewish Mission of Berlin, the Crischona Mission, and the Kaiserswerth Deaconesses Association.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has a mission in Bulgaria, begun in 1857, which included, in 1889, 12 stations, 116 members, and 51 probationers. The Disciples of Christ appointed a missionary to Constantinople in 1878. The mission of the United Presbyterian Church of North America in Egypt, after twenty-five years of development, has 9 churches and 947 communicants. The Protestant churches have in all in the empire about 385 preaching-places, more than 100 ordained missionaries with as many churches, and about 14,500 communicants. Besides these, the Jewish  mission societies of London, the Established and Free Churches of Scotland, and the Irish Presbyterian Church have stations and schools at Alexandria, Smyrna, Beirut, Constantinople, Salonica, Adrianople, and Rustchuk.

The Protestant religious work is supplemented by efficient schools of every grade. The American Board has 300 common-schools, 16 boarding- schools for girls, and 12 seminaries and training-schools, with a total attendance of more than 17,000 pupils; the Presbyterian Mission in Syria has 1 10 common-schools, 3 high-schools, and 3 female seminaries, with a total of 4950 pupils, a college, and a theological seminary; the Reformed Presbyterian Mission has 659 day-school scholars; the Society of the British Syrian Schools and Bible Mission, 30 schools and 3000 scholars; and in Syria proper, not including Palestine or Asia Minor, there are 11,000 children in evangelical schools, of whom about one-half are girls. In Palestine there are under the control of the Church missionary and other societies some 36 or 37 Protestant schools, which are attended by Mohammedan, Jewish, Druse and Samaritan pupils. The United Presbyterians in Egypt have 82 schools, with 5601 pupils, and 10 theological students in the training-schools. The English Church schools at Cairo and Damietta have 590 pupils. Of the Jewish mission-schools, those of the Church of Scotland return 1792 Jewish and other than British pupils. At the Syrian Protestant College of the Presbyterian Mission at Beirut instruction is given in the English language, while the Arabic is taught as a classic. The college has a faculty of 8 professors, 120 students, and a “medical department which had 23 students in 1877, and which has sent out several graduates, who are practicing as physicians in different parts of the empire. Robert College, near Constantinople, is not immediately connected with any Church organization, but is under Protestant direction, with a board of trustees composed of citizens of the United States. It has a faculty of 15 instructors, including American, European, Armenian, Bulgarian, Greek, and Turkish professors, and registered, in 187879, 151 students, among whom fifteen nationalities and all the religions prevailing in the empire were represented. Instruction is given in the usual collegiate studies and in fifteen ancient and modern languages. The college has a library of 6000 volumes. Central Turkey College, at Aintab, is also an independent Protestant institution, in which instruction is given in the branches of science and literature, the English, Turkish, and Armenian languages.  The American Board has a press at Constantinople, and the Presbyterians have one at Beirut, at both of which religious, educational, and scientific books are published in the languages of the people. The Arabic Bible published at Beirut is circulated in all Mohammedan countries. Other editions of the Bible are published in all the languages spoken in the empire. The whole number of copies of books, tracts, etc., printed at the press of the American Board from the beginning of its operations to 1879 is 2,248,354, comprising a total of 325,503,988 pages, in the Armenian, Armeno-Turkish, Greco-Turkish, and Bulgarian languages; and the whole number of pages printed on the Presbyterian press from the beginning to 1889 is 365,112,219.

The organization of Protestant churches has been generally confined to other than Mussulman populations — chiefly to Greeks, Bulgarians, and Armenians. It was until recently a capital offence, by the Turkish law, for a Moslem to become a Christian. More attention is now given to the evangelization of the Turkish population; but the number of Protestant Turks is still very insignificant. The Protestants have acquired a good reputation in the communities among whom they live, and have gained their esteem and confidence to a degree that is rarely accorded to persons professing a strange religion. SEE SYRIA, MISSIONS IN.

VI. Other Religious Denominations. — The most important of the other religious denominations of the Turkish empire are the Jews. Their old native land, Palestine, is now a part of Turkey in Asia, but the overwhelming majority of its population consists at present of Mohammedans, the total number of Jews in all Asiatic Turkey being estimated at only 50,000, it is believed that their first appearance in European Turkey may have been connected with the conquests of Alexander the Great, who planted many colonies of Jews about his empire. Philo mentions Jews in Thessaly, Bceotia, Macedonia, etc. Luke speaks of them at Thessalonica and Bercea. The Jews have probably been settled in Macedonia from the first emigration to the present time. In consequence of their expulsion from Spain, a large number of Spanish Jews settled in Thessalonica. Paul Lucas says that in his day there were 30,000 in that city, with twenty-two synagogues. The descendants of these Spanish Jews spread throughout the empire; they continue to speak among themselves the Spanish language, but their written correspondence is carried on in Hebrew. The great mass of the Jews in Turkey are Talmudists, but there exists a small section of Karaites (q.v.). The latter have about a hundred  families at Has-Keui, near Constantinople; there are also many in Galicia, and the Crimea; but the great bulk of the Jews of this persuasion are, outside of the Turkish empire, in Galicia and the Crimea. There is also a curious sect of Jews at Salonica called Manaim, which signifies ‘turncoat.' They believe in the fourteenth false Messiah, Sabati Levi, who, to save his life, became with his followers Mohammedans; but these, again, have their religious differences, and are divided into three sects. They are still Jews at heart, but their trifling with two creeds makes them despised and looked down upon. They marry among themselves only, and live together in a particular quarter of the town. There are others of the same sect in parts of Russia.

At Salonica they are Mohammedans ill public and Jews in private life. The-Jews have no hierarchy, but each congregation is independent, and is governed by its own chief rabbi; but they have a representative head at Constantinople, called the khakham-bashi, who is chief of the Israelitish nation in the empire. The khakhambashi at Constantinople has a court or council to assist him in administering both ecclesiastical and civil law. It is divided into two parts-first, the Mejliss-i-rouhani, or spiritual council, composed of six grand rabbins, which, as its name implies, deals with questions relating to the Jewish religion; and, second, the Mejliss-i- jesmdni, or civil council, which deals with questions of civil law, and assists the Turkish courts in any questions relating to Jews. The same organization applies to each grand rabbi, who, in his turn, is assisted by two similar councils. As the Jewish law, like that of the Mohammedan, is explained by the teaching of the sacred books, the establishment of these councils forms a ready means of arriving at a judgment on all religious and civil cases arising in the Jewish community. The khakham-bashi takes rank immediately after the Greek and Armenian patriarchs.

The Jewish population of the Turkish Empire is estimated at 158,000. The poorer are entirely dependent upon the liberality of the upper classes for education and relief in case of want, and the obligation is met in a most commendable spirit. They possess an institution called the ‘Universal Israelitish Alliance,' which is charged with the administration of education, etc. In 1875 the alliance had twenty-one schools throughout the empire, which gave instruction to 2094 children of both sexes, and of this number 809-were admitted gratuitously. The teachers of these schools are educated in the Rabbinical Seminary at Paris, and they give their pupils instruction in foreign languages and all the elements of a first-class education. The elementary schools, or talmudtorla, are crowded with children of both sexes, who are simply taught to read and write”(Baker). The estimates of  the Jewish population in the Turkish empire vary greatly. It has already been mentioned that Baker, in his work on Turkey, gives the total number as 158,000, and that in the Asiatic possessions they are supposed not to exceed 50,000. The Servian statistician Jakshitch estimates the Jews in the immediate European possessions at only 55,000, distributed as follows among the several vilayets: Constantinople, 22,943; Adrianople, 13,492; Salonica, 7409; Monastir, 2566; Kossovo, 1323; Yanina, 4085; Crete, 3200 total, 55,018. The same statistician gives the number of Jews in Roumelia at 3969, in Bosnia at 6968, in Bulgaria at 8959-total in Turkish empire in Europe, 74,914. In the African dependencies, the Jews are chiefly represented in Tunis, where they are supposed to number 45,000 souls. SEE JEWS.

There are a number of sects peculiar to Turkey. The most prominent among them are the Ansarians (q.v.) and the Druses (q.v.). The number of gypsies is estimated at about 200,000.

VII. Literature. — For information on the religious denominations of Turkey, see Baker, Turkey (Lond. and N.,Y. 1878); Audouard, L'Orient etses Peuplades (Paris, 1867); Zur Helle von Samo [a Mohammedan dervish, previously an Austrian diplomatist], Die Volker des osmanischen Reiches (Vienna, 1877); Ubicini, Etudes Historiques sur les Populations Chretiennes de la Turquie d'Europe (Paris, 1867). (A. J. S.)

Postscript. — Since the above was in type, the political situation of Turkey has undergone no material change. The Turks, as well as the natives, made so much opposition to carrying out the provisions of the treaty of Berlin, that a naval demonstration by the great European powers in the Archipelago became necessary in order to compel the surrender to Montenegro of Dulcigno, a seaport of Albania, on the Adriatic. Meanwhile both Greece and Turkey continued their warlike attitude and preparations, both parties declining the mediation of the other powers; but as none of these seemed disposed to aid either of the contestants, the latest advices (April, 1881) are that a compromise of the boundary question will be peaceably effected (by the absolute cession to Greece of a part only of the disputed territory in Albania and Thessaly, as suggested by Turkey and recommended by the other governments), and that thus a new lease of life, for a short time, will be granted to the Turkish rule in Europe.

## Turkey, Versions Of[[@Headword:Turkey, Versions Of]]

             There exist a great many translations of the Scriptures which are used throughout the Turkish empire, but do not properly belong to Turkey alone, as the following list of versions, furnished to us by the Rev. Dr. A. W. Thomson, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society at Constantinople, will show:

Albanian, GhegJudaeo-PolishAlbanian, ToskJudaeo-SpanishArabicKurdishArmenian, ModernMalteseAzerbijanRoumanianBulgarian, GeneralRuss, ModernBulgarian, EasternServianBulgarian, WesternSyriac, ModernCroatianTurkishGreek, ModernTurkish, ArmenoHebrewTurkish, GraecoJudaeo-GermanThese versions have already been treated, more or less fully, in separate articles, or will be found in their proper order in the Supplement. Some of the most important translations — such as the Arabic, Turkish, Bulgarian, and Armenian — have been prepared entirely by American missionaries; and it is very interesting to know how their work is appreciated and regarded by scholars of other countries. The British Quarterly Review, in its January number, 1878, after speaking of the work done by Americans in the Turkish Empire in respect to explorations, literature, and education, medical practice, and the improved condition of woman, thus goes on concerning the Bible translations:

“The most important contribution, however, which the Americans have made to the literature of Turkey is found in the accurate translations which they have made of the Christian Scriptures. These translations are worthy of special notice, because, apart from the religious influence of the Scriptures, they are making a marked impression upon the intellectual life of the various nationalities of Turkey. Fifty years ago there was no version of the Scriptures in any one of the modern languages of that country. The  task of making these translations was not an ordinary one. Regard must be had, on the one hand, to the uneducated classes — the style must be such that the common people would readily understand the meaning; on the other hand, regard must be had to the educated classes — the style must be sufficiently elegant and idiomatic to commend itself to the taste of those who are proud of the literary excellences of their ancient tongues. The Americans may fairly claim that they have succeeded in this difficult task, in respect, at least, to four of the important languages of the country. We refer to the modern Armenian, the Arabic, the Turkish, and the Bulgarian. The Turkish versions have varied somewhat, according as they have been prepared for the Armenians the Greeks, or the Osmanli Turks.

The preparation of the entire Bible in-the Armeno-Turkish language (the Turkish language written with the Armeniani character) was the life-work of the late William Goodell, D.D. The Rev. Dr. Schauffier has given many years to the preparation of a version of the Scriptures in the Arabo- Turkish; or Turkish written with the Arabic character; while at the present time a permanent committee, of which the Rev. Dr. Riggs is chairman, is engaged in an attempt to recast all the Turkish versions of the Bible, and form one that may be printed in any character. We understand that there is one English representative on this committee. The translation of the Scriptures into Arabic is the result of the labors of two accomplished American scholars — Rev. Eli Smith, D.D., and Rev. C. V. A. Van Dyck, D.D. We are assured by many who are capable of judging that this Arabic version of the Scriptures is worthy of the highest praise, and reflects great credit upon the scholarship of the translators. The same is said of the translations of the Bible that have been made into modern Armenian and Bulgarian by the Rev. Elias Riggs, D.D. We cannot forbear quoting an extract from a letter from Dr. Riggs in regard to the time spent on this branch of his work: “You ask,” he says, “in regard to the time devoted to the Armenian and Bulgarian translations of the Bible. In both cases the translations were first issued in parts in small editions, intended partly to supply the existing demand and partly to secure criticisms and to leave room for corrections arising from comparison of the different parts of the Bible. In both cases the whole Bible was finally printed in a single imperial octavo volume, with references. To the Armenian Bible (including the two editions) I gave most of my time for seven years, and to the Bulgarian, more than half my time for eleven years. How long our committee will take to complete the Turkish version it is quite impossible to say. We spent a year on the four gospels. When we remember that these translations are all  made from the original Hebrew and Greek; and when we remember, also, that the translations, when put in their permanent form, have been commended by the best Arabic, Turkish, Bulgarian, and Armenian scholars of Turkey; and when we recall, also, the great obstacles the Americans must have met in carrying these translations through the press at Constantinople and Beirut, we cannot refrain from expressing our appreciation, not only of their high scholarship, but of their persevering diligence and steadfastness of purpose; and we are convinced that generations of men yet to come will join in this hearty commendation.”

This speaks well of the work performed by these American scholars. For reasons stated above, we have confined ourselves in this article to the Turkish version properly so called, and to its transcription into the Armenian and Greek characters.

I. Turkish. — The Turkish language, in its numerous dialectic varieties, is more or less diffused through the vast regions which extend from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of China, and from the shores of the Frozen Ocean to Hindustan. The nations to which this language is vernacular have acted an important part in history; and though their power has now declined, and the Crescent has fallen like a star from heaven, yet a member of this race still occupies the throne of Constantine. The peculiar dialect of this language to which the name of Turkish is generally, by way of preeminence, applied is spoken in European Turkey by the Ottoman or Osmanli Turks, and is the only language which can be employed as a general medium of communication with all the various kindreds of people inhabiting European and Asiatic Turkey. The most ancient Turkish alphabet is the Ouigour, from which the Mongolian is derived; but the modern Turks use the Arabic and Persian characters. Their present alphabet consists of thirty-three letters, twenty-eight of which are Arabic, four are Persian, and one is peculiar to the Turkish.

Like most Oriental languages, Turkish is written and read from right to left two versions of the Scriptures in kindred dialects of the Turkish language appear to have been completed about the same period. One of these versions, executed. by Seaman, and printed in England in 1666, will be noticed in the Supplement, under KARASS. The other, comprising both the Old and the New Test., was the work of Ali Bey, whose history is rather remarkable. His original name was Albertus Bobowsky, or Bobovius. He was born in Poland, in the beginning of the 17th century, and while a youth was stolen by the Tartars and sold as a slave in Constantinople. After having spent twenty years in  the seraglio, he publicly embraced Mohammedanism, at the same time assuming the name of Ali Bey. He became first dragoman, or translator, to Mohammed IV, and was said to be thoroughly conversant with seventeen languages. At the suggestion and under the direction of the famous Levin Warner, then Dutch ambassador at Constantinople, Ali Bey was induced to translate the catechism of the Church of England into Turkish, and afterwards betook himself to the translation of the entire Scriptures into Turkish. The study of the sacred volume was not without effect on the translator; for it is recorded that Ali Bey entertained thoughts of returning to the Christian Church, and was only prevented by death from accomplishing his design. When his version was corrected and ready for the press, it was sent by Warner to Leyden to be printed. It was deposited in the archives of the university of that city, and there it remained for a century and a half, until baron Von Diez, formerly Russian ambassador at Constantinople, drew the attention of Europe to this long neglected translation. He offered his services in editing the MS. to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society; and, meeting with great encouragement to prosecute his design, Mr. Diez immediately addressed himself to the revision of the Old Test. When four books of the Pentateuch were revised he died, and the work of revision was transferred by the society to Kieffer, professor of the Turkish language at the University of Paris and interpreting secretary to the king of France. The new editor disapproved of the plan pursued by his predecessor, particularly of his insertion of vowel-points, and he therefore commenced the work anew, applying himself, in the first instance, to the New Test. He followed the text of the MS. implicitly, without collating it with the original Greek; and thus several errors in the text were inserted in the printed copies, ‘which were, however, soon detected, and gave rise to a printed controversy.

The circulation was immediately suspended, the errors were examined and corrected by a sub-committee, and Prof. Kieffer commenced a laborious and thorough revision of the text by collating every portion, not only with the original, but with the English, German, and French versions; with the Tartar of Seaman and of the Scotch missionaries at Karass; with the versions of Erpenius and of Martyn; and with those in the London Polyglot. The revision was carried on from 1820 to 1828, when the entire Bible, with the embodied corrections, was completed, and obtained the attestation of the most eminent Orientalists in Europe. The work was printed at Paris, and the original MS. was afterwards returned to Leyden. An edition of the Turkish New Test, carefully revised by Mr. Turabi under  the superintendence of Dr. Henderson, was completed by the society in 1853. A subsequent revised edition was printed in 1857. A new version was commenced by the Rev. Dr. Schauffler, and the New Test. was printed in 1866. In 1867 the Psalms followed, to which were afterwards added the Pentateuch and Isaiah.

These are, at present, the parts published of Dr. Schauffler's translation. The entire Bible was completed in 1873. “This work,” says the Annual Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1873, “is of a somewhat extraordinary character, requiring rare powers of scholarship for its execution. It has occupied many years, and the translator has devoted to it the most conscientious and untiring application. It has been the one thing to which his mind and learning have been consecrated. The question has been frequently mooted, and is again under discussion, whether a distinct translation in Turkish is to be published with exclusive reference to the Osmanlis, or whether one and the same text may not be made available both for Osmanlis and for other nationalities speaking the Turkish tongue, but reading their native characters. The latter was the object proposed, when the translation of Dr. Schauffler was commenced; but the views of the translator became modified in the very early stages of his work, and he has aimed to adapt his translation in style to the taste of the Osmanlis, believing that the style common to the Greeks and Armenians speaking Turkish is too coarse and degraded to be met by a version acceptable to the Osmanlis. It is, moreover, alleged that the different nationalities employ the same terms frequently in widely different senses.

This view does not elicit the sympathy or endorsement of many of the missionaries, who still hold to the theory that one text should suffice for all classes, and that two' versions would be injurious to the cause of divine truth, on the ground that it might, with some show of propriety be objected that Protestants had one Bible for the rich and learned and another for the poor and unlearned. It is further contended that the necessity for distinct texts does not exist; that the style of Turkish spoken by the Christian populations has materially improved in dignity, although not level with that of the Osmanlis; and that it would be practicable to educate them to something still higher by means of a version of the Scriptures in pure idiomatic Turkish, without being cast in too lofty and artificial a mould. In order to bring the whole question to some practical and satisfactory solution, it is proposed that a committee be formed, composed of the best Turkish scholars, of which Dr. Schauffler shall be president, and to which the examination of his translation shall be submitted; and that authority be given to call in the aid of such literary  effendis as may be judged desirable.” The committee of joint revisers was formed; but, states the Report for 1874, “after a short experiment the venerable translator (Dr. Schauiffier) resigned his position on the Board of Revisers, and handed over the MS. of the Old Test. to the agents of the British and Foreign and of the American Bible Society, at whose expense the translation has been made. It is an understood thing that the forthcoming Turkish Bible will be based on Dr. Schauffler's work, so that if he should have to regret that the whole will not be printed exactly as it leaves his hand, yet he will enjoy the satisfaction of knowing that he has contributed in a pre-eminent degree to this work, which was the fondest object of his later years; and that his name will go down to future generations associated with one of the hardest tasks ever attempted-the translation of the whole Bible into Osmanli Turkish.” As to the work of the committee, we read in the Annual Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1879 the following: “The revision of the Turkish Scriptures has been completed, and the version may be fairly considered a new translation. The committee began their work in June, 1873, and the last words of the Old Test. were written at eleven o'clock on May 25, 1878.

The object of the committee was to produce a complete Bible for the Turks, which would be simple in language and idiom, and intelligible to the uneducated and acceptable to the learned. The committee was composed of the Rev. Dr. Schauffler (who soon retired from the committee), Dr. Riggs, the Rev. R. H. Weakley, and the Rev. G. F. Herrick, and these called to their help the Rev. Avedis Constantian, pastor of Marash, and two Turkish scholars, one of whom soon withdrew, and was replaced by a very learned man from the banks of the Tigris. One of these Turkish assistants became a firstfruit of the new version. The New Test. was first printed (Constantinople, 1877), and a second edition, in smaller form, was ready in time to send to Russia for the Turkish prisoners; aid the printing of the Old Test. was completed in December, 1878. The Turkish government, to prevent the publication of the version, insisted that each copy should bear the imprimatur of the Imperial Council of Public Instruction, so that the copies go forth with the permission of the Turkish government; and what was meant for a hindrance has turned out to the furtherance of the work. The American Bible Society has shared with this society the labors and expenses of this great work.” As to the MS. of Dr. Schauffler, which, as has been stated above, was handed to the agents of the British and Foreign and the American Bible Society, the translator has completed his final revision. “Two parts,” states the same report,” were not ready in time  to be used by the revision committee, as had been intended. The MSS. of the Old Test. (except the Pentateuch and Isaiah already published) are now deposited in the strong-room of the American Bible House, New York, to the joint account of the British and Foreign and the American Bible Society.”

II. Turkish-Armenian. — This is, properly speaking, a Turkish version, but printed in Armenian letters, and accommodated to the dialectic peculiarities which prevail among the Armenians of Asia Minor. A Turkish version in their peculiar dialect, and written in their characters, was commenced in 1815 by an Armenian archimandrite named Seraphim, in concert with another Armenian. An edition of five thousand copies of the Testament was printed at St. Petersburg in 1819. Mr. Leeves, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, devoted much time and trouble to the preparation of a revised edition. The work was afterwards taken up by the missionaries of the American Board of Missions; and in 1843 the entire Scriptures were printed in Smyrna at the expense of the American Society, the translation having been made by the Rev. W. Goodell. Subsequent editions of the Armeno-Turkish Scriptures have been printed at the American Mission press on behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

III. Turkish-Greek. — This, like the preceding version, is Turkish, but printed in Greek letters. In 1782 the Psalms, translated into Turkish by Seraphim, metropolitan of Karamania, were printed in Greek letters; and in 1810 a Turkish version of the Acts and Epistles was printed in the same character at Venice. In consequence of inquiries instituted in 1818 by Dr. Pinkerton, respecting the state of the Christian inhabitants of the ancient Lydia, Caria, Lycia, Phrygia, Pisidia, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, it was ascertained that these poor people are all Greeks or Armenians, acquainted with no language but that of their Turkish masters. As they were unable to read or write except in their native characters, the British and Foreign Bible Society published the Turkish Testament in Greek letters, the translation having been made by Messrs. Goodell and Bird. This edition was printed at Constantinople in 1828. In order to make it more conformable to the provincial mode of speaking Turkish which prevails among the Greek Christians of Asia Minor, Mr. Leeves, agent of the society, undertook a new and revised version, assisted by Mr. Christo Nicolaides, of Philadelphia, who joined Mr. Leeves in 1832, and from that period to 1839 was uninterruptedly employed in the undertaking. The printing of the entire  Bible was commenced at Syra, and afterwards transferred to Athens. In 1865 the Psalms, revised with great care under the editorial superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Riggs, passed through the press; and in 1870 the whole Bible, with marginal references, was published in Constantinople. See, besides the Bible of Every Land, the Annual Reports of the British and Foreign and American Bible Societies; and Reed, The Bible Work of the World (Lond. 1879). (B. P.)

## Turkish Version[[@Headword:Turkish Version]]

             SEE TURKEY, VERSIONS OF.

## Turkish-Armenian Version[[@Headword:Turkish-Armenian Version]]

             SEE TURKEY, VERSIONS OF.

## Turkish-Greek Version[[@Headword:Turkish-Greek Version]]

             See TURKEY, VERSIONS OF.

## Turkish-Tartar Version[[@Headword:Turkish-Tartar Version]]

             See KARASS VERSION.

## Turlupins[[@Headword:Turlupins]]

             the French name for the SEE BRETHREN OF THE FREE SPIRIT (q.v.). The origin of the word is unknown, though it is thought to be connected with wolfish or predatory habits.

## Turn[[@Headword:Turn]]

             Among the Egyptians the sun was considered in each phase a different god, having its peculiar name, attribute, and worship. Thus the sun during its nocturnal existence was Turn; when it shone in the meridian, it was Ra; when it produced and nourished life, it was venerated as Kheper. Since, according to the Egyptians, the night precedes the day, Tum was considered to have been born before Ra, and to have issued alone from the abyss of chaos. —Lenormant, Chaldaean Magic, p. 81 sq.

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

             a Baptist minister, was born at Whiteburn, Linlithgowshire, Scotland, September 10, 1809. He was religiously trained, graduated from Glasgow University, studied with Dr. Chalmers, preached a year and a half at Westmancotte, Worcestershire, England; came to America in 1833, became pastor at Danbury, Connecticut, for two years, afterwards at Hartford; in 1839 at Boston, Massachusetts, in 1845 again at Hartford, in 1869 preached in various places with much success, in 1872 became secretary of the Connecticut Baptist Association, and died November 20, 1877. He published a number of popular religious works. See Cathcart, Baptist. Encyclop. s.v.

## Turner, Daniel[[@Headword:Turner, Daniel]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born at Blackwater, Hertfordshire, March 1, 1710. He first settled at Reading, and after devoting some years to school-teaching, became, in 1748, pastor of the Baptist Church in Abingdon, Berkshire, which position he filled till his death, Sept. 5,1798. Many of his publications were highly approved; among them were, Compendium of Social Religion (1758, 8vo): — Letters Religious and Moral (1766, 8vo): — Meditations on Scripture (Abing. 1771, 12mo): — Dissertations on Religion (1775, 8vo): — Essays on Religion (1780, 2 vols.; Oxf. 1787, 2 vols. 12mo): — Expositions on Scripture (Lond. 1790, 8vo), See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit, and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             an English prelate of the 17th century, received his education at Winchester School, graduated at New College, Oxford, April 14, 1659, and took his degree of A.M. there in 1663. He received his degree of D.D. July 6, 1669, and in the following December was collated to the prebend of Sneating, in St. Paul's. He succeeded Dr. Dunning to the see of Chichester, and, followed him in, the mastership of St. John's College, Cambridge, April 11, 1670. In 1683 he was made dean of Windsor; was consecrated bishop of Rochester, Nov. 11; and Aug. 23, 1684, was translated to the bishopric of Ely. He was one of the six bishops who joined archbishop Sancroft on May 18, 1688, in refusing to read the Declaration for Liberty of Conscience, and with them was committed, June 8, to the Tower, but was acquitted on  the 29th. Refusing to take the oath when William and Mary ascended the throne, he was deprived of his bishopric, and lived in retirement till his death, Nov. 2, 1700. He wrote, A Vindication of the late Archbishop, Sancroft and his Brethren, etc., Animadversions on the Naked Truth: Letters to the Clergy of his Diocese: — Brief Memoirs of Nicholas Ferrar (2d ed. 1837, 12mo): — Sermons (1681-85). See, Bliss's Wood, Athen. Oxon. 4:545; Burnett, Own Times; Macaulay, Hist. of England, ch. 14:16:xvii; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Turner, James (1)[[@Headword:Turner, James (1)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bedford County, Va., May 7,1759. He was converted in 1789, licensed to preach in 1791, and ordained and installed as colleague pastor with the Rev. James Mitchel, July 28, 1792, in what was then called the Peaks Congregation. He also took charge of the New London Congregation. Here he spent the whole of his ministerial life, and died, Jan. 8, 1828. He was exceedingly attractive as a preacher; a man of real genius; acknowledged to be unrivalled among the clergy of Virginia in his power over the passions of men. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit 3, 581; Foote, Sketches of Virginia, 2d series.

## Turner, James (2)[[@Headword:Turner, James (2)]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Oldham, March, 1782. He was educated at Rotherham. College, and ordained at Knutsford in 1808, which place became the chief center of his exertions. He was for years secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society and the Cheshire Union of Independent Ministers. His judgment and clearness of mind were often consulted in private business, and great confidence was reposed in him. He died May 22,1863. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1864, p. 248.

## Turner, Jesse H[[@Headword:Turner, Jesse H]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bedford County, Va., Jan. 1,1788; was educated in Hampden Sidney College, Va.; studied theology in the Union Seminary, Prince Edward, Va.; was licensed by Hanover Presbytery and ordained by the same in 1813. He began his labors as a missionary in Richmond, Va.; he subsequently preached at Fayetteville, N. C.; Manchester, Va.; and in Hanover County, Va. He died March 13, 1863. He  was a sincere, good man, and successful as a preacher; See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 454.

## Turner, John M., D.D[[@Headword:Turner, John M., D.D]]

             an Anglican missionary bishop, was born in England about 1786; educated at Christ Church, Oxford; in 1823 presented to the vicarage of Abingdon; in 1824 removed to the rectory of Wilmslow, Cheshire; and in 1829 appointed to the bishopric of Calcutta, India, which he held till his death, July 7, 1831. Bishop Turner was a man of exemplary piety, faithful in the discharge of his duties, and much loved and respected by all with whom he was associated. See appendix to the (Lond.) Christian Observer for 1831, page 815; The (Lond.) Christian Guardian, February 1832, page 73.

## Turner, Joseph M. W[[@Headword:Turner, Joseph M. W]]

             an English painter, was born at 26 Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London, April 23, 1775. He became a student, in 1789, of the Royal Academy, and as early as 1799 was elected an associate of the Academy, becoming three years after a full academician. In 1807 he was elected professor of perspective, but failed on account of literary qualifications. He traveled in Scotland, France, Switzerland, and the Rhine countries, and paid three visits to Italy. He died at Chelsea, Dec. 19,1851. He bequeathed a noble collection of his works to the nation, and they were placed in a room in the National Gallery. Among his many works we notice, The Fifth Plague of Egypt: — Tenth Plague of Egypt: — a Holy Family. He also wrote a poem, The Fallacies of Hope. See Ruskin, Modern Painters; Thornbury, Life of Turner (Lond. 1862, 2 vols.; new ed. 1874).

## Turner, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Turner, Nathaniel]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Norfolk, Conn., in 1771; graduated at Williams College in 1798; studied theology with Dr. Catlin; was ordained over the Church in New Marlborough, Mass., in 1799; and died May 25, 1812. See Cong. Quarterly, 1859, p. 46.

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

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Wiverhampton in 1808. His parents were Wesleyans, and it was in connection with that body that he began to labor, at the age of eighteen, as a local preacher. He continued a liberal and zealous member of the Wesleyan community until 1846, when he joined the Independents, and in 18l5 accepted the pastorate of the Independent Church at Evesham, Worcestershire. In 1856 he removed to Southampton, and labored with the Congregational Church until his death, July 26,1861. Mr. Turner was very devoted to his people and pastoral duties, and his pulpit ministrations were, highly prized by all who knew him. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1862, p. 267.

## Turner, Samuel Hulbeart, D.D[[@Headword:Turner, Samuel Hulbeart, D.D]]

             an eminent Episcopal clergyman and scholar, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., Jan. 23, 1790, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1807. He  was ordained deacon in 1811, and priest in 1814; was pastor of a church at Chestertown, Md., from 1812 to 1817; and was elected professor of historic theology in the General Episcopal Seminary, New York, Oct. 8, 1818. He continued with the institution during its stay in New, Haven, Conn., and returned with it to New York in 1821. On Dec. 19 he took the chair of Biblical learning and interpretation of Scripture, in which he continued till his death, Dec. 21,1861. He was also professor of Hebrew language and literature in Columbia College from 1831. He was the author of, Notes on the Epistle to the Romans (N. Y. 1824, 8.vo): — with Dr. Whittingham, Introduction to the Old Testament, transl. from the Latin and German of John Jahn (1827, 8vo): — Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation, transl. from the German of Dr. G. J. Planck (Edinb. 1834,12mo): Companion to the Book of Genesis (N. Y. 1841, 8vo): — Biographical Notices of some of the Most Distinguished Rabbis, etc. (1847, 12mo): — Parallel References Illustrative of the New Testament (1848, 12mo): — Essay on Our Lord's Discourse, etc., John 6 (1851, 12mo): — Thoughts on the Origin, Character, and Interpretation of Scripture Prophecy (1852, 12mo): — Epistle to the Hebrews, in Greek and English (1852, 8vo):Epistle to the Romans (1853, 8vo): — Epistle to the Ephesians (1856, 8vo). See Autobiography of Samuel H. Turner, D.D. (1862, 12mo); Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1862, p. 734; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Turner, Sharon[[@Headword:Turner, Sharon]]

             an English author, was born in London, Sept. 24, 1768. After many years practice as an attorney in the Temple, he retired, in 1829, to Winchmore Hill, where he resided until a few weeks before his death, which occurred in London, Feb. 13, 1847. Mr. Turner is best known by his History of England from the Earliest Period to the Death of Elizabeth, etc. (Lond. 1799-1805). He also wrote, History of Henry VIII, etc. (1826, 4to): — History of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth (1829, 4to): — Sacred Meditations and Devotional Poems by a Layman (1810, 12mo):. — The Sacred History of the World, etc. (1832, 3 vols. 8vo), See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Turner, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Turner, Thomas, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at St. Giles's, Heckfield, in 1591. He was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1623 was presented by his  college to the vicarage of St. Giles's in Oxford. Laud, when bishop of London, made him his chaplain, and in 1629 collated him to the prebend of Newington, Church of St. Paul, and in October following to the chancellorship of the same church. Charles I made him a canon residentiary, and appointed him one of his chaplains in ordinary, giving him the rectory of St. Olave, Southwark, with which he held the rectory of Fetcham, Surrey. At the request of Charles I he accompanied that prince to Scotland to be crowned. In 1641 he was preferred to the deanery of Rochester; but on the death of the king he was stripped of his preferments and treated with indignity. At the Restoration he entered the deanery of Canterbury, August, 1660. He died in October, 1672.

## Turner, William[[@Headword:Turner, William]]

             an English-divine, was born near Broadoak, Flintshire, and for some time previous to going to Oxford he was an inmate of the house of Philip Henry, father of Matthew, the commentator. He took his A.M. at Edmund Hall, Oxford, June 8, 1675. Becoming, afterwards, vicar of Walberton, in Sussex, he resided there in 1697; but the date of his death is uncertain. He published, a History of All Religions (Lond. 1695, 8vo): — Complete History of the Most Remarkable Providences, etc. (1697, fol.). “This curious collection ranks with the similar performances of Clark, and Wanley in his History of the Little World, but is superior perhaps to both in selection and conciseness.”

## Turner, William Hindley[[@Headword:Turner, William Hindley]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Beeston, Leeds, in 1784. He was educated at Rotherham College, and became an exceedingly popular preacher. Mr. Turner's first settlement was at Bury, and after seven years' efficient work he removed to Hindley, where he built up a prosperous and manly ministry. In 1862 growing infirmities led him to resign the stated ministry. He was a disinterested, devoted, and faithful minister of Christ. He died Dec. 8, 1868. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1870, p. 324.

## Turney, Edmund, D.D[[@Headword:Turney, Edmund, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Easton, Connecticut, May 6, 1816. He received his education at the Hamilton Institute, N.Y., and his first pastorate was in the Second Church, Hartford, Connecticut. Subsequently he was pastor in Granville, Ohio, and Utica, N.Y. He became professor of Biblical criticism in the Hamilton Seminary in 1850, and for five years (1853-58) was professor in Fairmount Theological Seminary, Ohio. After preaching without settlement for a few years, lie started, in Washington, in 1865, the first experiment for the education of colored teachers and preachers. With great disinterestedness and self-sacrifice he labored in this department of Christian effort for several years. "He seemed inspired with the conviction that God had specially intrusted this great business to him, and nothing could change his impressions of duty." He died September 28, 1872. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1177. (J.C.S.)

## Turnus[[@Headword:Turnus]]

             in ancient Italian mythology, was the king of the Rutuli, and a son of Daunus and Venelia, who was a niece of queen Amata, wife of Latinus. Her daughter Lavinia, having been destined by fate to AEneas, was the  subject of dispute between the Trojans and the Latins, in which the former were victorious. Turnus, after many wild battles, was finally killed in a duel with AEneas.

## Turpentine-tree[[@Headword:Turpentine-tree]]

             (τερέμινθος, τερέβινθος ; Vulg. terebinthus) occurs only once, viz. in the Apocrypha (Sir 24:16), where wisdom is compared with the “turpentine-tree that stretcheth forth her branches.” The τερέβινθος or τέρμινθος of the Greeks, is the Pistacia terebinthus, terebinth-tree, common in Palestine and the East, supposed by some writers to represent the elâh (אֵלָה) of the Hebrew Bible. SEE OAK. The terebinth, though not generally so conspicuous a tree in Palestine as some of the oaks, occasionally grows to a large size. See Robinson (Bibl. Res. 2, 222, 223), who thus speaks of it. “The butm” (the Arabic name of the terebinth) “is not an evergreen, as often represented, but its small lancet-shaped leaves fall in the autumn, and are renewed in the spring. The flowers are small, and followed by small oval berries, hanging in clusters from two to five inches long, resembling much those of the vine when the grapes are just set. From incisions in the trunk there is said to flow 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. In Palestine nothing seems to be known of this product of the butm!” The terebinth belongs to the natural order Anacardiaceae, the plants of which order generally contain resinous secretions. SEE TEREBINTH.

## Turpin[[@Headword:Turpin]]

             (or Tilpin), a French prelate of the 8th century, of whose early history nothing definite is known, was a monk of St. Denis, and became bishop of Rheims probably in 753, after a long opposition by Milon. He was one of the twelve French bishops present in 769 at the council called at Rome by pope Stephen to condemn the antipope Constantine. About 786 Turpin founded a chapel dedicated to St. Denis, which afterwards became an abbacy. He died Sept. 2,800. He left a genuine letter to pope Adrian I, and a romantic Latin Chronicle of the wars of Charlemagne against the Saracens in Spain, the authenticity of which has been greatly doubted,  although avouched by a declaration of pope Calixtus in 1122. The oldest MSS. of it date from the end of the 11th century, and the first writer who speaks of it is Raoul of Tortoire (1096-1145). The Latin text was published in 1584 by Schard, in his Germanicarum Rerum Chronographi, and French versions have appeared by Raguin (Paris, 1527, 4to; Lyons, 1583, 8vo, etc.), and lately by Ciampi (Florence, 1822, with a dissertation on the author) and Reiffenberg (Brussels, 1836). See Gascon Paris, De Pseudo Turpino (Paris, 1865).

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

             a Scotch prelate, was elected to the see of Brechin in 1178. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 156.

## Turpin, Thomas D[[@Headword:Turpin, Thomas D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Somerset County, Md., June 30,1805. He was converted Sept. 8, 1823; licensed to preach Sept. 12, 1827; admitted on trial in the traveling connection Feb. 7, 1829, and was appointed to Union Circuit; in 1830, to Pendleton; in 1831, to the Savannah mission; in 1832, to the Black Swamp Circuit; in 1833, to May and New River; in 1834, to the Wadmatane and John's Island mission and Orangeburg Circuit; in 1835, to Pee Dee; in 1836, to Laurens; in 1837, again to Pendleton; and in 1838, to the Cambridge and Flat Woods mission, where he died, July 26, 1838. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 2, 665.

## Turquoise[[@Headword:Turquoise]]

             a Persian gem of a peculiar bluish green color, which was very generally used in the Middle Ages for the adornment of every species of sacred vessel, e.g. the chalice, ciborium, altar-cross, miter, and pastoral staff.

## Turret, Touret, or Turette[[@Headword:Turret, Touret, or Turette]]

             a small tower: the name is also sometimes given to a large pinnacle. Turrets are employed in Gothic architecture for various purposes, and are applied in various ways; they also differ very greatly in their forms, proportions, and decorations. In many cases they are used solely for ornament; they are also often placed at the angles of buildings, especially castles, to increase their strength, serving practically as corner buttresses. Occasionally they carry bells or a clock, but one of the most common uses to which they are applied is to contain a newel, or spiral staircase: for this purpose they are usually found attached to church towers, forming an external projection, which very frequently terminates considerably below the top of the tower; but in some districts turrets of this kind generally rise  above the tower, and are finished with a parapet or small spire. Turrets of all dates are sometimes perfectly plain and sometimes variously ornamented, according to the character of the prevailing style of architecture, the upper part being the most enriched, and not infrequently formed of open-work. In the Norman style the lower part is usually square, and this form is continued to the top, but the upper part is sometimes changed to a polygon or circle. Few turrets of this date retain their original terminations, but they appear to have been often finished with low spires, either square, polygonal, or circular, according to the shape of the turret. In the Early English and later styles they are most usually polygonal, but are sometimes square, and occasionally circular. The upper terminations are very various; in the Early English style spires prevail, but in the Decorated and Perpendicular not only spires, but parapets, either plain, battlemented, paneled, or pierced, and pinnacles are used. The peculiar kind of turrets often found attached to small churches and chapels, which have no towers to receive the bells, is designated by the term Bell-gable. SEE SPIRE; SEE TOWER.

## Turretini[[@Headword:Turretini]]

             the name of a family of theologians of Geneva, whose ancestor, Francis Turretin or Turretini, the son of a gonfalonier of Lucca, was expatriated on account of his religion. He came to Geneva in 1579. Among his descendants three men deserve mention in this place.

1. BENEDETTO was born in 1588 at Zurich, became pastor at Geneva in 1612, and professor of theology in 1618. In 1620 he represented the Church of Geneva at the national synod of Alais, which introduced the decrees of Dort into France, and in the following year he was sent to Holland and the cities of the Hanseatic League to solicit aid towards fortifying Geneva, a task in which he was eminently successful. He died in 1631, leaving to the world a number of sermons and theological writings. See Leu, Allgem,. Hist. Lexikon, 18:375; Senebier, Hist, Lit. de Geneve, 2, 136.

2. FRANCOIS was born in 1623, became pastor of the Italian congregation at Geneva, and in 1653 professor of theology. He was sent to Holland on a similar mission to that formerly undertaken by his father Benedetto. He is particularly known as a zealous opponent of the theology of Saumur, SEE AMYRAUT, and defender of orthodoxy in the sense of  Dort. He was also one of the originators of the Helvetic Consensus (q.v.) He left numerous works, the more important of which, were reprinted at Edinburgh in 1847 sq.

3. JEAN ALPHONSE, the son of Fran9ois, was born in 1671, and became the pupil of the Cartesian Chouet and of the Arminianizing Louis Tronchin (q.v.) at Geneva. In 1691 he went to Holland to study church history under Spanheim, and in 1692 he visited England, where he became acquainted with Newton and acquired the English language. On his return to the Continent lie sojourned for a time in Paris, and was admitted to the society of men like Bossuet, Mabillon, Malebranche, etc. He availed himself of this opportunity to study Arabic under the tuition of the abbé Langueme. In Geneva he was received into the ministry at the age of twenty-two, and soon afterwards into the Venerable Compagnie des Pasteurs. His ability as an orator at once commanded attention. He was accustomed to follow the English practice of presenting to the view a leading truth or duty; but he made the application of his discourse with greater unction than the English speakers cultivated, and by thus combining the methods of the Genevan and the English pulpit he became the originator of a new method. The arrangement of his sermons was natural and logical, his statement clear and simple, his manner dignified. In 1697 he was made professor of church history, and in 1701 became rector of the academy. The latter honor was conferred upon him ten times, to which fact we are indebted for ten important addresses delivered on the successive days of promotion. He followed Tronchin, in 1705, as professor of systematic theology, though still retaining his own (historical) chair. He wrote upon almost the whole of dogmatics, and connected with these labors exegetical lectures on parts of the New Test.

The influence of Turretini was especially apparent in the management of the enterprise to bring about the abrogation of the Helvetic Consensus as a binding formula. He kept it before the Venerable Company, the council, and the Two Hundred until a majority were gained over to that project; and he induced Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, to urge the abrogation upon ‘leading men throughout Switzerland, and also to persuade the king of England to address an appeal to the cantons in behalf of the same measure. He was also prominent in promoting fraternal relations between Lutherans and Reformed Christians in Geneva, in recognition of which fact he was made a member of the Royal Academy of Berlin, and awarded a gold medal by the Prussian king.  The principal theological works of Turretini, from: which his tendency may most readily be learned, are, Nubes Testium pro Moderato et Pacfico de Rebus Theol. Judicio et Instituenda inter Protestantes Concordia (1729), with a dissertation on the fundamental articles of the faith annexed. Such articles he describes as “quorum cognitio atque fides ad Dei gratiam salutemque obtinendam necessaria est.” This dissertation exposed Turretini to attack from two different directions: first, from the Jesuit De Pierre, Lyons, 1728, who sought to show that the Reformed Church had no greater reason to renounce the communion of the Church of Rome than that of the Lutheran Church; and, second, from Crinsons, Protestant pastor of Bionens, 1727. A second and more important work is his Cogitationes et Dissertationes Theologicae, in which he displays a liberal type of orthodoxy. He emphasizes the importance of natural theology in genuine Reformed fashion, but holds that revealed religion has for its object merely the supplementing and completing of what natural religion teaches. He recognizes the existence of mysteries in revealed religion, but zealously rejects foreign and scholastic additions in theology. With respect to the doctrine of the divine decrees, he avoids, as he does everywhere, all extreme statements, but lays hold on the elements of practical utility in, the teaching. With reference to the doctrine of Divine Providence, he represented the optimistic Leibnitzian theory. He followed that philosopher also in his rejection of innate ideas. The Cogitationes contained much apologetical material, and earned for their author an honorable place among apologists (see Pelt, Encyclop. p. 391). The form in which his apologetical ideas were given to the French world of readers by Vernet is, it should be noted, revised and altered, in the first editions with the author's consent, as Vernet claimed; but the improvement progressed with each successive edition, and Vernet clearly reveals the deism of the 18th century in his work.

In 1725 Turretini was commissioned to deliver the so called Cloture des Promotions, an address in the French language, together with the charge prescribed by the laws for the occasion, when the Two Hundred and the General Assembly of citizens were to elect the principal magistrates of the State. The twenty-five addresses, which he delivered to these bodies, were highly commended because of the striking and practical ideas with which they were filled. He also took active part in the improvement of the liturgy, in the ordering of week-day services, in the publication of a new edition of the French New Test. (1726), in the forming of a society for the religious  instruction of youth, and finally in the introduction of the public confirmation of catechumens. He rendered important services to the churches of Hungary, Transylvania, the Palatinate, and the Waldenses, and maintained an extensive correspondence with Switzerland, England, Holland, Germany, etc. George II of England and his consort honored him with expressions of their favor, and employed him in works of benevolence. His last years were disturbed by the troubles of Geneva in 1734. He died May 1, 1737. After his death were issued from the press his Comment. Theoret. pract. in Ep. ad Thessalonic. (Basle, 1739): — Prcelectiones on Romans 11 (Geneva, 1741): — and a tractate on the exposition of Scripture (Berlin, 1766). A complete edition of his works appeared in Leeuwarden in 1775. Sources. — Senebier, Hist. Lit. de Genzve, 2, 259; Sayous, Hist. de la Lit. Franc. a l'Etranger, etc. (1853); Cellerier, L'Academie de Geneve (1855); Vernet, Eloge Historique, sur J. A. Tur. in the Bibl. Raisonnee, 21; various biographical dictionaries; and Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Turri[[@Headword:Turri]]

             in the mythology of the Finns, was a god of war and hunting, living in steep rocky caverns, and was worshipped as the god of the nation.

## Turrigera (or Turrita)[[@Headword:Turrigera (or Turrita)]]

             (tower-bearer or towered), in Roman mythology, was a surname of Cybele.

## Turselin[[@Headword:Turselin]]

             (Lat. Tursellinus), HORACE, a learned and indefatigable Jesuit of Rome, was born in 1545, and taught rhetoric in that city twenty years, and was rector of several colleges. He promoted the study of belles-lettres in his society, and died at Rome, April 6, 1599. His principal works are, Life of St. Francis Xavier (best ed. 1596, 4to) History of Loretto (8vo): Treatise on the Latin Particles: Abridgment of Universal History from the Creation to 1598, etc. (best editions are those which have a continuation by father Philip Briet, 1618-61, the best French translations are by abbé Lagneau, Paris, 1757, 4 vols. 12mo).

## Turstine[[@Headword:Turstine]]

             a monk of Caen, in Normandy, who, in 1801, was sent over to England and installed first Norman abbot of Glastonbury Abbey. Through his  influence, William I granted the abbey a charter, restoring its lost lands, and confirming all its privileges. In a general council, he opposed the assumptions of Giso, bishop of Wells, and was so successful that Giso had to go to Glastonbury and there have decided the question of jurisdiction over the two minor monasteries, Muchelney and Etheling. Turstine then turned his attention to the internal arrangements of the abbey, but by his introduction of foreign practices brought about insubordination among the monks. French soldiers were brought in, who slew some of the monks while in the sanctuary. Turstine was obliged to retire to; Normandy in disgrace. William II permitted him to return to the abbey on payment of five hundred pounds in silver, but he seems not to have stayed there. See Hill, English Monasticism, p. 247, 248, 252.

## Turtle, John[[@Headword:Turtle, John]]

             a Wesleyan missionary, was born in the County of Suffolk, England, June 9,1793. He was converted in 1811, commenced to preach in 1815, at Thetford, and in 1817 he received his appointment for the Bahamas, W. I. His first circuit was Eleuthera; next, New Providence; and after that, successively, Turk's Island, Harbor Island, Abaco, Jamaica (1822), Abaco, Eieuthera, and Turk's Island, where he died, Aug. 16,1825. Mr. Turtle cut short his life by his indefatigable labors. He had natural abilities of a high  order, and a spiritual life of beauty and consistency. See Wesleyan Meth. lag. 1828, p. 217; Wesleyan Minutes, 1826.

## Turtle, or Turtle Dove[[@Headword:Turtle, or Turtle Dove]]

             (תּוֹר, tor, so called, no doubt, in imitation of its cooing note; τρυγών), occurs first in Scripture in Gen 15:9, where Abram is commanded to offer it along with other sacrifices, and with a young pigeon (גּוֹזָל, gozal). In the Levitical law a pair of turtle-doves or of young pigeons are constantly prescribed as a substitute for those who were too poor to provide a lamb or a kid, and these birds were admissible either as trespass, sin, or burnt offering. In one instance, the case of a Nazarite having been accidentally defiled by a dead body, a pair of turtle-doves or young pigeons were specially enjoined (Num 6:10). It was in accordance with the provision in Lev 12:6 that the mother of our Lord made the offering for her purification (Luk 2:24). During the early period of Jewish history there is no evidence of any other bird except the pigeon having been domesticated; and up to the time of Solomon, who may, with the peacock, have introduced other gallinaceous birds from India, it was probably the only poultry known to the Israelites. To this day enormous quantities of pigeons are kept in dove-cots in all the towns and villages of Palestine, and several, of the fancy races so familiar in this country have been traced to be of Syrian origin. The offering of two young pigeons must have been one easily within the reach of the poorest, and the offerer was accepted according to what he had, and not according to what he had not. The admission of a pair of turtle-doves was, perhaps, a yet further concession to extreme poverty; for, unlike the pigeon, the turtle, from its migratory nature and timid disposition, has never yet been kept in a state of  free domestication; but, being extremely numerous, and resorting especially to gardens for nidification, its young might easily be found and captured by. those who did not even possess pigeons.

It is not improbable that the palm-dove (Turtur Egyptiacus, Temm.) may, in some measure, have supplied the sacrifices in the wilderness, for it is found in amazing numbers wherever the palm-tree occurs, whether wild or cultivated. In most of the oases of North Africa and Arabia every tree is the home of two or three pairs of these tame and elegant birds. In the crown of many of the date-trees five or six nests are placed together; and sportsmen have frequently, in a palm-grove, brought down ten brace or more without moving from their post. In such camps as Elim a considerable supply of these doves may have been obtained.

From its habit of pairing for life and its fidelity for its mate, the dove was a symbol of purity and an appropriate offering (comp. Pliny, Hist. Nat. 10:52). The regular migration of the turtle-dove and its return in spring are alluded to in Jer 8:7, “The turtle and the crane and the swallow observe the time of their coming;” and Son 2:11-12, “The winter is past… and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.” So Pliny, “Hyeme mutis, a vere vocalibus;” and Aristotle, Hist. An. 9:8, “Turtle- doves spend the summer in cold countries, the winter in warm ones,” although elsewhere (8, 5) he makes it hibernate (φωλεῖ). There is, indeed, no more grateful proof of the return of spring in Mediterranean countries than the voice of the turtle. One of the first birds to migrate northwards, the turtle, while other songsters are heard chiefly in the morning or only at intervals, immediately on its arrival pours forth from every garden, grove, and wooded hill its melancholy yet soothing ditty unceasingly from early dawn till sunset. It is from its plaintive note, doubtless, that David, in Psa 74:19, pouring forth his lament to God, compares himself to a turtle-dove.

From the abundance of the dove tribe and their importance as an article of food, the ancients discriminated the species of Columbidae more accurately than of many others. Aristotle enumerates five species, which are not all easy of identification, as but four species are now known commonly to inhabit Greece. In Palestine the number of species is probably greater. Besides the rock-dove (Columba livia, L.), very common on all the rocky parts of the coast and in the inland ravines, where it remains  throughout the year, and from which all the varieties of the domestic pigeon are derived, the ring-dove (Columba palumbus, L.) frequents all the wooded districts of the country. The stock-dove (Columba cenas, L.) is as generally, but more sparingly, distributed. Another species, allied either to this or to Columba livia, has been observed in the valley of the Jordan, perhaps Colleuconota, Vig. (see Ibis, 1, 35). The turtle-dove (Turtur au'ritus, L.) is, as has been stated, most abundant, and in the valley of the Jordan an allied species, the palm dove, or Egyptian turtle (Turtur AEgyptiacus, Temm.), is by no means uncommon. This bird, most abundant among the palm-trees in Egypt and North Africa, is distinguished from the common turtle-dove by its ruddy chestnut color, its long tail, smaller size, and the absence of the collar on the neck. It does not migrate, but, from the similarity of its note and habits, it is not probable that it was distinguished by the ancients. The large Indian turtle (Turtur gelastes, Temm.) has also been stated, though without authority, to occur in Palestine. Other species, as the well-known collared dove (Turtur risoria, L.), have been incorrectly included as natives of Syria.

The birds of this subgenus are invariably smaller than pigeons properly so called; they are mostly marked with a patch of peculiarly colored scutellated feathers on the neck, or with a collar of black, and have often other markings on the smaller wing-covers. The species Columba Turtur, with several varieties merely of color, extends from the west of Europe through the north of Africa to the islands south of China. The turtle-dove of Palestine is specially the same; but there is also a second, we believe local both migrate farther south in winter, but return very early, when their cooing voice in the woods announces the spring. — Kitto. See Schlichter, De Turture (Hal. 1738); Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 217 sq.; Wood, Bible Animals, p. 419 sq. SEE DOVE.

## Turton, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Turton, Thomas, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Church of England, was born in Yorkshire in 1782. He became a pensioner of Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1801; two years thereafter he removed to St. Catharine's College (then known as Catharine Hall), from which he graduated in 1805. In 1806 he was elected a fellow of his college, and in 1807 became a tutor. In 1822 he was appointed Lucasian professor of mathematics, and in 1826 accepted the college living of Gimingham-cum-Trunch, in the County of Norfolk; but was recalled to the university in the following year by his election to the regius professorship of divinity. In 1830 he obtained the degaery of Peterborough, which office he filled until 1842, when he was appointed dean of Westminster. In 1845 he became bishop of Ely. He died at his residence in London, Jan. 7, 1864. As a controversialist, Dr. Turton has been rarely surpassed. His taste in fine arts was exquisite, and he was the composer of several excellent pieces of Church music. See American Quar. Church Rev. April, 1864, p. 157.

## Turton, William[[@Headword:Turton, William]]

             an English Wesleyan missionaries, was born in the island of Barbadoes, W. I. His father was a planter. His first labors were on the island of Antigua. In 1798 he received an appointment for St. Bartholomew from the English Conference. In 1800 he was sent to New Providence, and labored for the rest of his life on that and adjacent islands. He died at Nassau, May 10, 1818, aged fifty-seven. He was a faithful toiler. See Wesleyan Meth. Mag. 1821, p. 3, 81; Wesleyan Minutes, 1818.

## Tusi[[@Headword:Tusi]]

             SEE PERSIAN VERSIONS.

## Tustin, Septimus, D.D[[@Headword:Tustin, Septimus, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, who died at Washington, D.C., October 28, 1871, was in 1836 chaplain of the University of Virginia, and in 1844 was elected chaplain of the United States Senate. At a later period he was pastor of the. Presbyterian Church in Hagerstown, Maryland, and of the First Presbyterian Church, Germantown, Pennsylvania. He was the delegate from the Old-school Assembly to the New-school Assembly, which sat in Philadelphia in 1863. He was warmly interested in the reunion of the Presbyterian Church.

## Tutanus[[@Headword:Tutanus]]

             in Roman mythology, was a deity who was implored in times of peril and danger for help and protection.

## Tutiani, Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Tutiani, Bartolomeo]]

             an engraver on wood, who is said to have executed some cuts marked with a Gothic monogram of his initials. Bartsch describes only one cut with this mark, Christ Scoffed at by the Jews, in a book (Nuremb. 1515); but there  is no evidence that it was engraved by Tutiani. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Tutilina[[@Headword:Tutilina]]

             in Roman mythology, was a goddess who was said to care for the fields of corn and grain. She had an altar and a pillar in the circus-no temple, however, as she could only be worshipped in the open air.

## Tutilo[[@Headword:Tutilo]]

             a monk of St. Gall and celebrated artist, was contemporary with the great teachers Notker Balbulus and Radbert of St. Gall, and associated with them in friendship and in the work of making St. Gall the foremost seat of the arts and sciences in their day. He was of gigantic stature and full of joyous humor; a magister and presbyter according to the necrology, but none the less a born artist and unquestioned genius. Driven into the world by his artist nature, he nevertheless preserved his piously simple and blameless life. In the monastery itself his strength and geniality determined his position. He was its butler and sacristan, and also the host and companion of visiting strangers, serving in the latter capacity down to A.D. 912.

The Irish bishop or presbyter Mark, and his nephew Moengal (the latter preferably called Marcellus by the monks), visited St. Gall in the middle of the 9th century; and Moengal instructed Tutilo, among others, in the art of music until he became a proficient composer. As an instrumentalist and vocalist he captivated the ear and the heart. He became himself a teacher of music, and in a separate room gave regular instruction to the sons of the nobility in the use of stringed instruments. Nor did he confine himself to sacred music only; but his finest laurels were still gathered in that field. He imitated the Scottish custom of associating instrumental music with vocal in the worship of the Church, and carried it further. Some of the instruments used in the small chapel of St. Gall are pictured in old MSS. which are still extant. His own most especial creation were the so called tropes, i.e. ornamental melodic additions, with texts, to the hymns of the mass, and particularly to its Introit, which were intended to impart a specifically festive character to the hymns for festal days. His Christmas trope Hodie Cantandus is well known. These tropes were widely received and used throughout the Church, and were perpetuated, under various  modifications, down to the 17th century. He also composed hymns and litanies (see the St. Gall MSS. Nos. 37 and 380).

The genius of Tutilo was displayed with equal force in the arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture. He had the independence to work from new, indigenous motives as well as from Roman and Byzantine models and after a traditional type. His fame extended widely, and made it the fashion to procure works from his hand. A statue of the Virgin Mary, erected by him at Metz, was wrought in so exalted a manner as to give currency to the report that the Virgin herself was his instructor. Of his carvings the ivory tables, which Charlemagne kept under his pillow, are especially celebrated. They passed into the hands of archbishop Hatto of Mayence, then into those of Solomon, abbot of St. Gall, and from him into the possession of the monastery. One of them was smooth, and upon its upper surface Tutilo carved the Virgin between four angels, while its lower surface received a portrayal of the legend of St. Gall, in which the saint gives bread to his obedient bear in reward for his labor of bearing wood for fuel. Stumpf, the ancient Swiss chronicler, mentions also an astronomical chart of brass upon which the orbits of the heavenly bodies were beautifully marked, as having been one of Tutilo's masterpieces and as being still in existence in his day. It is now, however, lost. On Tutilo's death he was buried in a chapel which was dedicated to his memory and called by his name; and he was venerated as a saint. The documents of the 11th and 12th centuries always speak of him as a saint; but his worship was soon lost. Sources. — Ekkehard IV (d. 1056), Casus Sancti Galli, reprinted in Pertz, Monum. Germaniae, vol. 2; Arx, Gesch. d. Kantons Sanct Gallen (1810), pt. 1, p. 97-100; Hefele, Wiss. Zustandimsiidw. Deutschlcnd u. in d. nordl. Schweiz, in Theol. Quartalschr. 1838, No. 2. See also Dtmmler, Formelbuch d. Bischofs Salomo III von Constanz, p. 114; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tuttle, Amos C[[@Headword:Tuttle, Amos C]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Monckton, Vt., July 28, 1800. ‘He pursued his preparatory studies in the Academy at Middlebury, Vt.; graduated at Middlebury College in 1827; studied theology privately; was licensed by the Addison County Association June 30, 1829; ordained by an ecclesiastical council Oct.30, 1829; and became stated supply of the Church in Whitehall, N.Y., Sept. 1, 1830. In 1832 he became pastor of the Congregational Church in Hartford, N. Y.; in 1836 he accepted an agency for the Auburn Theological Seminary; in 1837 became pastor of the  Presbyterian Church in Fayetteville, Onondaga Co., N. Y.; in 1841, of a church at Liverpool, N. Y.; in 1844, of the Congregational Church in Sherburne, Chenango Co., N. Y.; in 1856, of the Church in Paw Paw, Van Buren Co., Mich. in 1859, of the Church in Lapeer, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 24, 1862. Mr. Tuttle was a man of more than ordinary mind, well educated, and popular as a preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 308.

## Tuttle, Jacob[[@Headword:Tuttle, Jacob]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Vernon, Morris Co., N.J., Aug. 24, 1786. He was educated at the Bloomfield Academy, N.J.; studied theology privately; taught at the Academy at Newton, Sussex Co., N. J., from 1817 to 1820; was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New Jersey April 27, 1820; ordained and installed pastor of the West Milford Church, Passaic Co., Aug. 14, 1821; and removed to Ohio in 1832, where he engaged in home missionary labors, planting several churches, and was everywhere honored as a true man of God. He died Jan. 6, 1866. He was a successful minister, full of concern for his hearers, and honored of God. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 324.

## Tuttle, Samuel Lawrence[[@Headword:Tuttle, Samuel Lawrence]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Bloomfield, N.J., Aug. 25,1815. He was converted in 1830; pursued his academical studies in Newark, N.J.; graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1836; studied theology at the Auburn Seminary, N.Y.; was licensed by the Newark Presbytery Oct. 8, 1840; ordained pastor of the Caldwell Church, N.J., March 9, 1841; was in the employ of the American Bible Society from 1849 to 1854; became pastor of the Madison Church, Morris Co., N.J., Jan. 3, 1854; agent of the American Bible Society for Western New York from 1862 to i863; and assistant to the secretaries until his death, which occurred April 16, 1866. Mr. Tuttle was an eloquent preacher. The Rev. Dr. Taylor, one of the secretaries of the American Bible Society, gave it as his opinion that there was no person so thoroughly and minutely acquainted with the history and workings of the Bible Society as he. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 327.

## Tuttle, Timothy[[@Headword:Tuttle, Timothy]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at East Haven, Conn., Nov. 29, 1781. He graduated at Yale College in 1808; studied theology with Rev. David Smith of Durham, Conn.; commenced preaching at Durham, N. Y.; and was ordained over the Church in Ledyard, Conn., in 1811. Here he labored until his death, June 6, 1864. Mr. Tuttle was plain in appearance and- manners, yet a man of godly sincerity and of considerable influence. He was an instructive preacher. See Cong. Quar. Rev. 1864, p. 301.

Twelfth-day, (1) the feast of Epiphany, being the twelfth day after Christmas; (2) the old Christmasday.

## Twelfth Day Of The Month[[@Headword:Twelfth Day Of The Month]]

             In the evening service of the Church of England for the twelfth day of any month, the hymn after the second lesson, beginning “God be merciful unto us,” etc., is omitted, because it comes in the regular psalm for the day, and would thus occasion an unnecessary and useless repetition. Stanton, Dict. of the Church, s.v.

## Twelfth-night[[@Headword:Twelfth-night]]

             the eve of the festival of the Epiphany, which occurs exactly twelve days after the feast of Christmas.

## Twelfth-tide[[@Headword:Twelfth-tide]]

             SEE EPIPHANY.

## Twells, Leonard[[@Headword:Twells, Leonard]]

             a learned English divine, was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he proceeded A.B. in 1704. In 1733 the University of Oxford conferred on him the degree of A.M. by diploma, in approbation probably of his Critical Examination, etc. He was at that time vicar of St. Mary's, Marlborough, but in 1737 was presented to the united rectories of St. Matthew's, Friday Street, and St. Peter's, Cheap. He was also a prebendary of St. Paul's and one of the lecturers of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West. He died Feb. 19, 1741 or 1742. His publications in his lifetime were, A Critical Examination of the Late New Text and Version of the Testament, in Greek and English (pts. 1, 2, Lond. 1731; pt. 3, 1732, 8vo): — A Vindication of the Gospel of St.  Matthew (1735, 8vo): — Answer to the Inquiry into the Meaning of Daemoniacs in the New Test. (1737, 8vo): — Answer to the Further Inquiry (1738, 8vo). After his death, his; Sermons at Boyle's and lady Mover's lectures were published for the benefit of his family (1743, 2 vols. 8vo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Nichol, Lit. Anec.; id. Illustr. of Liter.

## Twelve[[@Headword:Twelve]]

             This number was sacred among the Jews, probably because it was that of the tribes (q.v.), or of the months of the year, or (as some think) of the signs of the zodiac. It was symbolical of just proportion, beauty, and stability. It is sometimes used in the general sense of a dozen thus, Jeroboam's garment is ‘said to have been rent into twelve pieces (1Ki 11:30), and Elisha to have ploughed with twelve yoke of oxen, etc

. SEE NUMBER.

## Twesten, August Detlev Christian[[@Headword:Twesten, August Detlev Christian]]

             a Protestant divine of Germany, was born April 11, 1789, at Gluickstadt. in Holstein. He studied theology and philosophy at Kiel, and in 1812 went to Berlin, where he became one of the earliest followers and an intimate personal friend of Schleiermacher. For some time he was professor of languages in one of the colleges at Berlin, but in 1814 he went back to Kiel as professor of theology and philosophy. After the death of Schleiermacher, in 1834, he was called to Berlin to succeed his teacher in the chair of systematic divinity. In 1850 he was appointed Oberkirchenrath, and died Jan. 8, 1876. As a writer, Twesten was the least prolific of all the more eminent German divines. This was owing partly to a certain timidity and conscientiousness, and partly to an unwillingness to publish anything which he had not first thoroughly searched and mastered, and for which there seemed to him no urgent need. He wrote an analytical logic, a critical edition of the three ecumenical creeds and the unaltered Augsburg Confession, essays on Heccius Illyricus, on Schleiermacher's Ethics, etc. But his main work is his Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (Hamb. 1837, 2 vols.), which in its unfinished condition has great and abiding excellences; “for he is, perhaps,” says Schaff, “the clearest thinker and writer among all the systematic divines of Germany. He possesses the gift of didactic exposition and analysis in an eminent degree. His learning is always accurate, minute, and  thoroughly digested; his style transparent, smooth and polished.” The volumes which were published contain-the first, the introductory chapters on religion, revelation, inspiration, the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, the use of reason, the history of dogmatic literature; the second embraces only the doctrine of God, the holy Trinity, the creation and preservation of the world, and angelology. As to his theological standpoint, it is, according to Schaff, “Schleiermacher's system passing over into Lutheran orthodoxy under a modernized form, or the Lutheran scholasticism of the 17th century revived, enlarged, and liberalized by the scientific influence of Schleiermacher and the tolerant spirit of the evangelical union.” See Theol. Universal-Lex. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1353; Schaff, Germany, its Universities, etc. p.320 sq. (B. P.)

## Twi Version[[@Headword:Twi Version]]

             SEE OBJI VERSION.

## Twichell, Pliny[[@Headword:Twichell, Pliny]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Athol, Worcester Co., Mass., Feb. 25, 1805. He was educated at Washington College, Pa.; studied theology in Auburn Seminary, N. Y.; was licensed by the Genesee Presbytery in 1836'; and was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Wyoming, N. Y., in 1841. Here he labored for fifteen years, until 1856, in which year he took charge of East Bethany Church, where he preached until his death, Sept. 15. 1864. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 180.

## Twilight, Alexander L[[@Headword:Twilight, Alexander L]]

             a Congregational minister and teacher, was born at Corinth, Vt., Sept. 23, 1795. By his own exertions he put himself through Randolph Academy and Middlebury College, graduating in 1823. He taught four years in Peru, N. Y.; was licensed to preach by the presbytery in Plattsburg in 1827; taught and preached one year in Vergennes, Vt.; and for eighteen years was principal of the grammar-school in Brownington, Vt., and again from 1852 to 1855. From 1847 until 1852 he taught in Shipton and Hatley, Ontario. He was ordained in Brownington in 1829, and supplied the pulpit there for many years, but was never a regular preacher. He died July 19,1857. Mr. Twilight's great work was as a teacher; in this he was successful and influential. He pursued his purposes with undeviating energy, and built up his pupils in both character and knowledge. He was an able and often eloquent preacher. See Cong. Quar. Rev. 1867, p. 281.

## Twin, Councils Of[[@Headword:Twin, Councils Of]]

             SEE TIBEN.

## Twing, Alin Tabor, D.D[[@Headword:Twing, Alin Tabor, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Topsham, Vermont, February 9, 1811. He spent two years at the University of Vermont; studied theology under bishop Hopkins; was ordained deacon August 21, 1836; was rector of St. Patul's, Vergennes; of Trinity, West Troy, N.Y., and of Trinity, Lansingburgh, for twenty-three years; secretary of the domestic committee of the Board of Missions from 1864 till his death, in New York city, November 11, 1882. See The Church Almanac, 1883, page 115.

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

             a learned Anglican divine, was born in 1734, and educated at Sidney College, Cambridge, being contemporary in that university with Gray, Mason, and Bate. Mr. Twining was well versed in the composition, harmony, and history of the art and science of music. In 1760 he took his degree of A.B., and that of A.M. in 1763. He became rector of White Notley, Essex, in 1768, and of St. Mary's, Colchester, to which he was presented by the bishop of London, in 1770. He died Aug. 6, 1804. Sound learning, polite literature, and exquisite tastes in all the fine arts lost an ornament and defender in the death of this scholar and worthy divine.

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

             a distinguished Nonconforming Calvinistic divine, was born at Newbury, Berkshire, England, in 1575. He was educated at, and became subsequently a fellow of, New College, Oxford. He became chaplain to princess Elizabeth, afterwards queen of Bohemia. After this he was appointed to the curacy of Newbury. In 1643 he was elected prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. He confined himself with great thoroughness to the study of theology, and produced numerous works, among which are the following: Vanitie (1631, 4to): — Vindicia Gratiae, Potestatis, ac Providentice Dei (Amst. 1632, 4to): — Dissertatio de Scientia Media, tribus Libris absoluta (fol.): Morality of the Fourth Commandment (Lond. 1641): Treatise on Reprobation (1646, 4to): — Riches of God's Love to Vessels of Mercy Consistent with his Absolute Hatred, or Reprobation of Vessels of Wrath (Oxf. 1653, fol.). This work was strongly recommended by Dr. Owen, De Causa Dei contra Pelagium. He left a number of works in MS. His death occurred July 20, 1646.

## Two[[@Headword:Two]]

             This number is sometimes used in Scripture in a symbolical sense it typifies the connection between the magistracy and the ministry in the persons of Moses and Aaron; the two systems of idolatry which were learned in Egyptian and Babylonian bondage; the Old and New Tests.; the Jewish and Christian dispensations; and, among the early fathers, the divine and human natures of Christ. Several of the early heretics endeavored to introduce the Persian duality into the Christian system, and they therefore declared that the number two had a more mystic sanctity than any other; Traces of this  delusion may be found so late as the 9th century of the Church. SEE NUMBER.

## Twombly, Israel S[[@Headword:Twombly, Israel S]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charlestown, Mass., Sept. 1,1817. He was educated in Marion County, Mo.; graduated at Lane Theological Seminary in 1852; was licensed by Cincinnati Presbytery the same year, and ordained by Athens Presbytery pastor of the Church in Troy, O. He afterwards became pastor of the Church at Pomerov, O., where he died, Oct. 31,1860. He was a thorough scholar, and an earnest and impressive preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862; p. 198.

## Twyne, Brian[[@Headword:Twyne, Brian]]

             an English divine, was born in 1579, and admitted a scholar of Corpus Christi College in 1594. He was admitted probationer fellow in 1605, and, entering into holy orders, took the degree of B.D. in 1610. In 1614 he was made Greek reader of his college, in which office he acquitted himself with credit, but left his college in 1623. He was afterwards presented to the vicarage of Rye, Sussex, but passed most of his time at Oxford'in reading, writing, and contemplation. He died in. St. Aldate's, July 4,1644. .He published Antiquitatis Academice Oxoniensis Apologia, etc. (Oxon. 1608, 4to).

## Tyana, Council Of (Concilium Tyanense)[[@Headword:Tyana, Council Of (Concilium Tyanense)]]

             was held in 367 in Tyana, a town of Asia Minor. There were present in this council Eusebius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Athanasius of Ancyra, Pelagius of Laodicea, Gregory Nazianzen the elder, and many others who had declared their belief in the consubstantiality of the Son at Antioch in 363. The letters of pope Liberins and the bishops of Italy, Sicily, Africa, and Gaul were read, which had been written to wipe out the disgrace attaching to them on account of the Council of Ariminum. Eustathius of Sebaste, formerly deposed, was reestablished; and a synodical letter written to all the bishops of the East, exhorting them to testify in writing their rejection of the acts of Ariminum, and their adherence to the faith of Nicea. See Mansi, Concil. 2, 836.

## Tychacum[[@Headword:Tychacum]]

             the original name of a Temple of Portune at Antioch, which was turned into a church, and called by the name of Ignatius by Theodosius. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 8ch. 3, § 4. Tyche, in Greek mythology, is identical with Fortuna of the Romans. Pindar calls her a daughter of Jupiter. She possessed at Thebes, and at numerous other places, temples and monuments.

## Tyches[[@Headword:Tyches]]

             in Egyptian mythology, is one of the four protecting domestic spirits which are allotted to each human being during the period of life.

## Tychicus[[@Headword:Tychicus]]

             (Τύχικος for τυχικός, fateful), a companion of Paul on some of his journeys, and one of his fellow-laborers in the work of the Gospel. A.D. 54-64.

(1.) In Act 20:4, he appears as one of those who accompanied the apostle through a longer or shorter portion of his return journey from the third missionary circuit. Here he is expressly called (with Trophimus) a native of Asia Minor (Α᾿σιανός); but while Trophimus went with Paul to Jerusalem (Act 21:29), Tychicus was left behind in Asia, probably at Miletus (20, 15, 38).

(2.) How Tychicus was employed in the interval before Paul's first imprisonment we cannot tell; but in that imprisonment he was with the apostle again, as we see from Col 4:7-8. Here he is spoken of, not only as “a beloved brother,” but as “a faithful minister and fellow- servant in the Lord; and he is to make known to the Colossians the present circumstances of the apostle (τὰ κατ᾿ ἐμὲ πάντα γνωρίσει), and to bring comfort to the Colossians themselves (ἵνα παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν). From this we gather that diligent service and warm Christian sympathy were two features of the life and character of Tychicus. Colossue was in Asia; but from the fact that of Onesimus, who is mentioned immediately afterwards, it is said, ὅς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, whereas Tychicus is not so styled, we naturally infer that the latter was not a native of that city. These two men were doubtless the bearers both of this letter and the following, as well at that to Philemon.

(3.) The language concerning Tychicus in Eph 6:21-22 is very similar, though not exactly in the same words. It is the more important to notice this passage carefully, because it is the only personal allusion in the epistle, and is of some considerable value as a subsidiary argument for its authenticity. If this was a circular letter, Tychicus, who bore a commission to Colossae, and who was probably well known in various parts of the province of Asia, would be a very proper person to see the letter duly delivered and read.

(4.) The next references are in the Pastoral Epistles, the first in chronological order being Tit 3:12. Here Paul (writing possibly from Ephesus) says that it is probable he may send Tychicus to Crete, about the time when he himself goes to Nicopolis.

(5.) In 2Ti 4:12 (written at Rome during the second imprisonment) he says, “I am herewith sending Tychicus to Ephesus.” At least it seems natural, with Dr. Wordsworth, so to render ἀπέστειλα, though Bp. Ellicott's suggestion is also worth considering, that this mission may have been connected with the carrying of the first epistle. (See their notes on the passage.) However this may be, we see this disciple at the end, as we saw him at the beginning, connected locally with Asia, while also co-operating with Paul. We have no authentic information concerning Tychicus in any period previous to or subsequent to these five scriptural notices. The tradition which places him afterwards as bishop of Chalcedon in Bithynia is apparently of no value. But there' is much probability in the conjecture (Stanley's Corinthians, 2nd ed. p. 493) that Tychicus was one of the two “brethren” (Trophimus being the other) who were associated with Titus (2Co 8:16-24) in conducting the business of the collection for the poor Christians in Judaea. As arguments for this view we may mention the association with Trophimus, the probability that both were Ephesians, the occurrence of both names in the Second Epistle to Timothy (see 2Ti 4:20), the chronological and geographical agreement with the circumstances of the third missionary journey, and the general language used concerning Tychicus in Colossians and Ephesians. SEE ASIA; SEE EPHESUS; SEE TROPHIMUS.

## Tycho[[@Headword:Tycho]]

             in Greek mythology, was a daemon similar to Conisalus, generally found represented in company with Priapus.

## Tychonius[[@Headword:Tychonius]]

             a Donatist of the 4th century, who displayed an impartial and sincere desire to arrive at the truth with respect to the controversy between his sect and the Church. He is described as having been learned in the Scriptures, tolerably acquainted with history and with secular literature, and zealously interested in the affairs of the Church. He regarded the Church as the sole divinely provided remedial institution, into which all men must enter if they would attain to salvation; and therefore held that the moral state of the members cannot destroy the value and efficiency of the Church. He was also consistent in protesting against the rebaptism of persons who became Donatists. His views were attacked as heretical by the Donatist Parmenian (q.v.), and drew forth an epistle from Augustine. Tychonius was accused of being a Chiliast, but the charge is probably untrue. A single work from his pen remains, the Liber Septen Regulis, first published by Grynmeus (Basle, 1569), and afterwards in a better edition by Gallandi in the Bibl. Vet. Patrum (Venet. 1772), 8:107-129. The work is designed to serve as a guide to the interpretation of the Scriptures, and some of its rules are still followed by some expositors e.g., the sixth, De Recapitulatione, which teaches that the same thing is sometimes repeatedly narrated or described, especially in the Apocalypse, so that successive narratives do not necessarily refer to successive events. The book furnished Isidore of Seville the idea for his work Sententiarum Libri Tres. As the earliest endeavor to construct a theory of Christian hermeneutics, the work certainly deserves attention. It would appear from Augustine that Tychonius died about 390; but Gennadius (De Script. Eccles. c. 18) fixes a later time. Gallandi furnished a sketch of Tychonius in Proleg. to Bibl. Vet. Patr. VIII, 2, 5, and a more careful notice is given in Tillemont, Memoires pour servir a Hist. Eccl. des Six premiers Siecles (2nd ed. Paris, 1704), 6:81 sq., 145- 150. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tychsen, Olaus Gerhard[[@Headword:Tychsen, Olaus Gerhard]]

             a German Talmudist, was born Dec. 14, 1734, at Tondern, a town in Sleswick. He studied the classical and Oriental languages in the gymnasium of Altona, with the exception of Arabic, which he acquired from a merchant whose business had caused him to reside during many years in North Africa. He finished his theological course at Halle, and was soon afterwards appointed a teacher in G. A. Franke's Orphanage. While so employed he learned the English, Hindostani, and Tamil languages from a  missionary (Schulz). His favorite study, however, was the Rabbinical Talmud, in whose language he was, so proficient as to be able to speak and write with great ease. He was, in April, 1759, appointed missionary to the Jews and Mohammedans, and traveled in that capacity through North Germany, Prussia, Denmark, and Saxony, but without accomplishing anything. In the synagogue at Altona his sermon even earned for him a severe beating. In 1760 Tychsen went to the University of Butzow, in Mecklenburg, as magister legens, and remained there until Butzow was united with the University of Rostock and transferred to the latter place, when he likewise removed thither. He died Dec. 30,1815. Tychsen had earned a great reputation, as is attested by his election to numerous societies and by many flattering testimonials; but this reputation respected simply the extent, and not at all the thoroughness, of his knowledge. He possessed solid acquirements only in the Rabbinical, and joined with them a keen eye and considerable skill for the detection of foreign written characters; but he was deficient in judgment, ready to venture the most improbable hypotheses, and anxious for notoriety.

He is consequently important only as a Talmudist, a numismatist, and an epigrapher. His controversy with Kennicott and Bayer directed attention to him more than any other incident of his careers and it afforded evidence of all the traits described above-his wide learning, obstinate orthodoxy, and want of critical judgment. In this dispute he wrote, Tentamen de Variis Codicum Hebr. Vet. Test. MSS. Generibus (Rost. 1772, 8vo), in support of the Masoretic text: —Befreites Tentarnen, etc. (1774): — and a supplement (1776). He insisted that the Greek versions had been made from a Hebrew text written in Greek characters, and advocated the no less singular theory that the Samaritan Pentateuch had been copied from a Hebraeo-Jewish (Masoretic) text with the vowel-points-the latter in Disputatio Hist. — phil. crit. de Pent. Samarit. etc. (Btitzow, 1765, 4to). In 1779 he published a work to demonstrate the spurious character of all Jewish coins bearing Jewish or Samaritan characters, including those of the Maccabmean period, which drew forth a reply from the Spanish Jesuit Bayer and occasioned a protracted dispute. ‘In the study of Arabic coins Tychsen rendered real service, and began the systematic study of Oriental numismatics. He showed himself a master in the deciphering of inscriptions (see Erkldrung d. arab. Schrif auf d. rom. kaiserl. Kronungsmantel, in the Meckl. — Schwerin. Gelehrten Beitragae, 1780, Nos. 42, 45, and the Inteipret. Inscript. Cufic. in Alarm. Templ. Patriarch. S. Petri Cathedra [Rost. 1787]). Tychsen also published editions ofAl-Makrizi A I-Makrizi Hist.  Monetce Arab. e Cod. Escui'ial. (ibid. 1797, 8vo): — and Tractat. de Legalibus Arab. Ponderibus et Mensuris (ibid. 1800, 8vo). His Elementale Arabicum, etc., is of inferior value, as is also his Element. Syriacum. See Hartmann, Olaus Gerhard Tychsen, etc. (Bremen, 1818 sq.); De Sacy, Biog. Universelle, 47, 120 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tychsen, Thomas Christian[[@Headword:Tychsen, Thomas Christian]]

             a German scholar and professor, was born at Horsbyll, in Sleswick, May 8, 1758; studied at Kiel and Göttingen; traveled over the Continent after having completed his studies; and became professor extraordinary of theology in Göttingen in 1784, through the intervention of Heyne, his patron. In 1788 he was made ordinary professor of philosophy; 1806, councilor; 1817, honorary doctor of theology. He was a member of several learned societies, and director of the Royal Scientific Association of Göttingen. He died Oct. 24,1834. This Trahsen, like Olaus G. Tychsen (q.v.), to whom he was in nowise related, was more prominent as an Oriental and classical scholar and antiquarian than as a theologian. He composed forty-three books and essays, all of which are characterized by learning, thoroughness, and good judgment. We mention, De Hapovaua Christi et Notionibus de Adventu Christi in N.T. Obviis: De Josephi Auctoritate et Usu, etc.: —De Litteratura Hebr.: —Illustr. Vaticin. Joelis. c. 3 (Gött. 1788). The dispute of Olaus Tychsen with Bayer led him also to give attention to the study of Jewish coins. In this pursuit he wrote, De Numis Hebraeo-Samarit. etc., in Nov. Comment. Soc. Reg. Gött. 8:120 sq.: —De Numis Oriental. (1789): — De Numis Hasmoceorum, etc., in Nov. Corn. vol. 12. He furthermore wrote Geschichte d. hebr. Literatur (ibid.). In 1791 he became the collaborator of J. D. Michaelis in the Oriental and exegetical library published by the latter, and his successor beginning with vol. 9. He also completed part 4 of Michaelis's Anmerk. für Ungelehrte and vol. 6 of his Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr. (1792). He edited vol. 6 of Koppe's edition of the New Test., comprising Galatians, Ephesians, and Thessalonians (2nd ed. 1791). A complete list of his works and detailed sketch of his life may be found in Neuer Nekrolog der Deutschen (1834, pt. 2; Weimar, 1836), p. 894-900. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tye, Christopher[[@Headword:Tye, Christopher]]

             an English musician of the 16th century, was born at Westminster, and brought up in the Royal Chapel. He was musical preceptor to prince  Edward, son of Henry VIII. In 1545 he was admitted to the degree of doctor in music at Cambridge, and in 1548 was incorporated a member of the University of Oxford. In the reign of queen Elizabeth he was organist of the Royal Chapel, and a man of some literature. “The Acts of the Apostles,” set to music by Dr. Tye, were sung in the Chapel of Edward VI; but the success of them not meeting the expectation of their author, he commenced the composition of music to words selected from the Psalms of David. The former was published with the following' title, The Actes of the Appostles, translated into Englyshe Metre, etc. (1553, sm. 8vo). He also composed A Notable Historye of Nastagio and Traversari, no less Pitiefull than Pleasaunt (Lond. 1569, 12mo), See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Tyerman, Luke[[@Headword:Tyerman, Luke]]

             an English Wesleyan minister, was born at Osmotherly, February 6, 1820, in 1842 entered the ministry, continuing to preach until 1864, when he became supernumerary, and devoted his attention to literary work. He died March 20, 1889. He was author of The Life and Times of the Reverend Samuel Wesley: The Life and Times of the Reverend John Wesley (3 volumes): — The Oxford Methodists: — Wesley's Designated Successor:  — The Life of the Reverend John Fletcher: — The Life of the Reverend Geo. Whitefield.

## Tyler, Bennet, D.D[[@Headword:Tyler, Bennet, D.D]]

             an eminent Congregational divine, was born at Middlebury, Conn., July 10, 1783. His parents were in humble circumstances, and he worked on the farm until he was fifteen, when an accident disabled him so that it was resolved to send him to college. His own exertions, with some assistance from his father, enabled him to graduate at Yale College in 1804 free from debt. He was converted while at college in the great revival of 1802, studied theology with Rev. Asahel Hoker, and in 1808 was ordained over the Church in South Britain, Conn., where he remained fourteen years. From 1822 to 1828 he was president of Dartmouth College, also performing the duties of college pastor. In 1828 he succeeded Dr. Payson in the pastorate of the Second Church, Portland, Me., where he was greatly beloved. Dr. Tyler was a clear, logical, and pungent preacher, and he specially delighted in doctrinal themes. About this time Prof. N. W. Taylor, of Yale Divinity School, enounced views which were regarded by many New England theologians as unsafe and unsound. Dr. Tyler was his principal opponent, and the long and able discussion which followed belongs to the history of controversy. To offset the influence of the New Haven theology on the young preachers in the state, the Theological Institute of Connecticut was founded at East Windsor in 1833, and Dr. Tyler was chosen its president and professor of theology. He held these positions until his resignation, July 16,1857. He died at East Windsor, after only a few hours' sickness, May 14,1858.

Dr. Tyler was a man of humble and sincere piety, and of a genial and sympathetic nature. In his theological opinions he did not embrace pure  Calvinism, but as modified by Edwards and his school. He was in full sympathy with the traditional theology of New England, and was a straightforward controversialist, avoiding metaphysical speculations and verbal subtleties. In forming his system he began, not with mind, but with the Bible, and he looked for no advances in theology except such as come from a richer Christian experience. His writings are permeated by a spirit of practical religion, and, according to some, checked the influence of Dr. Taylor's views. Dr. Tyler published many sermons and controversial articles and pamphlets. His larger works are as follows: History of the New Haven Theology in Letters to a Clergyman (1837): — A Review of Day on the Will (1837): — Memoir of Rev. Asahel Nettleton, D.D. (Hartford, 1844, 12mo): — Nettleton's Remains (ibid. 1845, 12mo): — The Sufferings of Christ Confined to his Human Nature (N. Y. 1845): — A Treatise on New England Revivals (1846): —Letters to Dr. Horace Bushnell on Christian Nurture (1847-48): — Lectures on Theology (posthumous), with a Memoir by Rev. Nahum Gale, D.D. (his son-in-law) (Boston, 1859, 8vo). See Cong. Quar. Rev. 1860, p. 351 sq. (by A. H. Quint); New-Englander, August, 1859 (by Prof. Lawrence); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tyler, Edward Royall[[@Headword:Tyler, Edward Royall]]

             a Congregational minister and author, was born at Guilford, Vt., Aulg. 3, 1800. He was the son of chief-justice Tyler, two of whose sons became ministers in the Protestant Episcopal Church and one in the Presbyterian. Edward was converted while a clerk in a counting-house in New York, and under the ministry of Dr. Spring. He graduated at Yale College in 1825, studied theology, and was ordained pastor of the South Church in Middletown, Conn., in 1827. Here he was successful in building up the Church, but ill-health induced his resignation in 1832. He was next pastor in Colebrook, Conn., 1833-36. For a year Mr. Tyler was agent of the American Antislavery Society, and from 1838 to its discontinuance in 1842 he was editor of the Connecticut Observer. In 1843 the New Englander was established under his proprietorship and editorship, and he continued in connection with it until his death, except during the periods of his prostration through illness. He died Sept. 28, 1848. Mr. Tyler contributed twenty-two articles to the first six volumes of the New Englander (see these enumerated in that periodical, 6:607). His other publications were, Slavery a Sin per se: —Lectures on Future Punishment (Middletown, 1829, 12mo): — Holiness Always Preferable to Sin: a Sermon (New  Haven, 1829, 8vo). This opposed the position of some of the metaphysical divines of New England, that God sometimes preferred sin to holiness: The Doctrine of Elections: a Sermon (New Haven, 1831, 8vo): — The Congregational Catechism (ibid. 1844, 18mo). Tyler's writings are able, and some were thought at the time to be unsurpassed in their treatment of the subject in hand. Many were produced under the depressing influence of disease. “He was by nature, by culture, and by the grace of God, one of the best sort of men, in whom the elements of character are ennobled by faith and sanctified by devotion. We have seen his uncomplaining patience, his uniform cheerfulness, his kindness and sympathy, his generous impulses, his childlike piety.” See New Englander, 1848, p. 603 sq. (by L. Bacon); Cong. Quar. Rev. 1866, p. 287.

## Tyler, James Endell[[@Headword:Tyler, James Endell]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Monmouth in 1789. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford, where he became fellow, dean, and tutor. Presented to the rectory of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, London, in 1826, he became canon residentiary of St. Paul's in 1845. He died in 1852. He wrote, Indices Attici (Lond. 1824, 12mo): — Oaths, their Origin, Nature, and History (1834, p. 8vo): — Conversations of a Father with his Children (5th ed. 1840, 2 vols. 18mo): — Primitive Church Worship (1840, 8vo): — A Father's Letters to his Son on Confirmation (1843,12mo): — Worship of the B. V. Mary is the Church of Rome (1844, 8vo): — Image worship of the Church of Rome (1847, 8vo): — Meditations from the Fathers of the First Five Centuries (1849, 2 vols. 12mo): — Rector's Address to his Parishioners (1851, 8vo): — Christian's Hope in Death: —Sermons (1852, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tyler, Joseph D[[@Headword:Tyler, Joseph D]]

             a clergyman and instructor of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Brattleborough, Vt. He graduated at Yale in 1829, and pursued a theological course at Alexandria, Va. His organs of hearing having become impaired by disease, he became connected with the Deaf-and-Dumb Asylum at Hartford, Conn., and subsequently became principal of the Deaf- and-Dumb Institution of Virginia. He died at Staunton,Va., Jan. 28, 1852. He was an excellent scholar, and made some graceful contributions to the literature of the day. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1852, p. 142.

## Tyler, William[[@Headword:Tyler, William]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Attleborough, Mass., Jan. 7, 1780, and was educated at Brown University in the class of 1800. For some time after leaving college he was engaged in secular pursuits. Having decided to study theology, he placed himself under the tuition of Rev. Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, Mass., and was licensed to preach in 1818. He was ordained in 1819 as junior pastor of the Congregational Church in South Weymouth, Mass., soon-becoming sole pastor. He remained thirteen years in this place (1819-32). He removed to South Hadley Falls, Mass., in 1832, and was pastor of the Church in that place seven years (1832-39). For several years he performed missionary service, under the direction of the Home Mission Society, in the interior of Massachusetts, having his residence at Amherst. He removed to Northampton, Mass., in 1847, and became the editor of the Courier, published in that place. For several years he resided in Pawtucket, R. I., and represented that town in the convention which met in 1853 to revise the State Constitution. He removed to Auburndale, Mass., in 1863, where he spent the remainder of his life, and where he died Sept. 27,1875. “He was well instructed,” says Prof. Gammell, “in theology, and was particularly interested in local history and antiquities, and on these subjects he was a frequent contributor to magazines and newspapers.” (J.C.S.)

## Tympanum[[@Headword:Tympanum]]

             the triangular space between the horizontal and sloping cornices on the front of a pediment in classical architecture; it is often left plain, but is sometimes covered with sculpture. This name is also given to the space immediately above the opening of a doorway, etc., in mediaeval architecture, when the top of the opening is square and has an arch over it; this arrangement is not uncommon in England in Norman work, and on the Continent is to be found in each of the styles. Tympanums of this kind are occasionally perfectly plain, but are generally ornamented with carving or sculpture. In Continental work the subjects are usually arranged in tiers one above another, and often embrace a great number of figures. Also when an arch is surmounted by a gable-molding or triangular hood mould, the space included between the arch and the mould is termed the tympanum of the gable. — Parker, Gloss. of Architect. s.v.

## Tympe, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Tympe, Johann Gottfried]]

             professor of theology and Oriental languages at Jena, was born in 1699 at Biederitz, near Magdeburg, and died June 28, 1768. He wrote, Forma Velnborum Perfectorum Hebraeorum, Chaldaicorum, Syriacorum atpue Arabicorum Communis et Harmonica in Tabulis Compendio Exhibita et Descripta (Jena, 1728-32): — Progr. quo Indistinctam Antiquorum Ebraeorur Scriptionem esse recens Commentum Morinianum, Certitudini Divinarum Literarum longe Perniciosissimum Ostendit (ibid. 1730): — Tabulma Universae Accentuationis Hebr. — Chald. turn Pros. tun Metr. (ibid. 1740): — Geneseos Prima quinque Capita et Partern Secti Hebraiae et Singulorum Vocum Rationena Grammaticam Secundum Principio Danziano exposuit in Usum Auditorum (ibid. 1727): — De Cultu Divino ad Stata Loca Restricto, etc. (ibid. 1728): — Schediasma, quo Iterandca Editiones Concordantiarum Hebraeo-Chaldaicarum Chr. Noldii Novamque Cone. Pronominum etc. (ibid. eod.): — Formia Arabicorum Verborum Perfectorum Descripta (ibid. eod.): — Diss. let Il de Descensu Nubis Glorice in Sanctuarium ante Consecrationem Aaronis Facto, adversus Talindistas et Veteres Ebrceorum Commentatores (ibid. 1731-33), etc. See First, Bibl. Hebr. 3, 456; Winer, Handb. der theol. Lit. 1, 115, 121; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handb. p. 141. (B. P.)

## Tyndale (or Tindal), William[[@Headword:Tyndale (or Tindal), William]]

             the Bible translator and martyr, was born in the hundred of Berkeley, either at Stinchcomb or North Nibley, Gloucestershire, about the year 1484 (or 1477). At an early period he was sent to Oxford, where he took his degree, and also gave instructions in Magdalen Hall. But he left Oxford for Cambridge, where it is believed that he took a degree. In 1502 he obtained priest's orders, and in 1508 entered the monastery at Greenwich as a friar. He seems to have already formed the design, or even to have actually begun the work, of translating the New Test., and had probably imbibed some of the notions which were beginning to be circulated in favor of reforming the Church.

In 1522 (or 1520) Tyndale is next found as tutor in the house of Sir John Welch, of Little Sodbury, not far from Bristol, where he preached in the villages and towns on the Sabbath, and often disputed with neighboring abbots and other Romish ecclesiastics. Here, too, he translated the Enchiridion Militis of Erasmus, as a present to his host and his lady. His free opinions and discussions soon got him into troublous examinations before the popish dignitaries, but no penalty was inflicted on  him. He took the hint, however, left the county, and went to London, his mind being now fully occupied with the idea of translating the Scriptures. He soon found, as he himself quaintly says, “that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Test.; nay, no place to do it in all England.” In London he sometimes preached at St. Dunstan's-in-the- West, while alderman Humphrey Monmouth took him under his protection, and gave, him an annuity of ten pounds a year to enable him to live abroad, for which ten pounds he was in return to pray for the souls of the alderman's father and mother. Tyndale on leaving England went first to Hamburg.

It is often said that from Hamburg he proceeded to Wittenberg, where he met Luther, who had now thrown off the last vestige of popish thraldom, and that there he completed his translation of the New Test. The statement is apparently not correct, for during 1524 he seems to have remained at Hamburg, and in 1525 he appears to have been first at Cologne and then at Worms. At Cologne Tyndale seems to have commenced to print his first edition in 4to, but after ten sheets were printed the work was interrupted, and the translator and his coadjutors betook themselves to the Lutheran city of Worms, where the quarto was finished, and an octavo edition also issued from the press (1525)'. The prologue to the quarto has been republished under the name of A Pathway to the Scriptures.

The translator's name was attached to neither of the two editions, and he assigns a reason for this omission in his Wicked Mammon, published in 1527. Copies of these versions early found their way into England. In 1526 Tunstall, bishop of London, fulminated his prohibition of them, and two years afterwards a number of copies were collected, nay, some were purchased by the bishop in Antwerp, and burned at St. Paul's Cross. Warham and Wolsey were also dreadfully enraged, and Sir Thomas More was employed to denounce Tyndale, but his genius was foiled in the attempt, and Tyndale won a victory over the learned chancellor. Of the first edition only a fragment now exists, and of the second only two copies, one of them imperfect. Two editions were afterwards printed at Antwerp, and found their way to England in vessels laden with grain. Endeavors were made to seize Tyndale and punish all who had assisted him, but he removed to Marburg, in Hesse, in 1528, and published there a book of great value — The Obedience of a Christian Man. The result of all the English opposition was that, as Fox expresses it, copies of the New Test. came thick and threefold into England. We find Tyndale again at Antwerp in 1529, during which year a fifth edition was printed; the four books of Moses were also translated, printed each at a separate press, and put into  circulation. The enemies of the translator endeavored to decoy him into England, but he was too wary to be so easily entrapped, for he well knew what displeasure Henry VIII felt at his tract called The Practice of Prelates, and what penalty the royal indignation would speedily inflict. After the martyrdom of Frith, Tyndale set himself to revise and correct the version of the New Test., and it was soon thrown off, with this remark in the preface, “Which I have looked over again with all diligence, and compared with the Greek, and have weeded out of it many fautes.”

But his enemies in England, whose power had been shaken by the copious circulation of the English New Test., were the more enraged against him, and conspired to seize him on the Continent, in the name of the emperor. An Englishman named Philips betrayed him, and, acting under such information, the authorities at Brussels seized him, in the house of Pointz, his friend, and conveyed him to Vilvoorden, twenty-three miles from Antwerp. Pointz, who had with difficulty escaped himself, made every effort for him, but in vain. The neighboring University of Louvain thirsted for his blood. Tyndale was speedily condemned, and on Friday, Oct. 6, 1536, in virtue of a recent Augsburg decree, he was led out to the scene of execution. On being fastened to the stake he cried, in loud and earnest prayer, “Lord, open the eyes of the king of England,” and, then was first strangled and afterwards burned. The merits of Tyndale must ever be recognized and honored by all who enjoy the English Bible-for their authorized version of the New Test. has his for its basis. He made good his early boast that ploughboys should have the Word of God. His friends all speak of his great simplicity of heart, and commend his abstemious habits, his zeal, and his industry; while even the imperial procurator who prosecuted him styles him homo doctus, pius, et bonus. The works of Tyndale and Frith were collected and published (Lond. 1831, 3 vols. 8vo). For information respecting Tyndale, his writings, and editions of his translations of the Testament, Pentateuch, etc., see Bliss's Wood, Athen. Oxon. 1, 94; Fox, Acts and Mn.; Biog. Brit.; Walter and Offor, Life of Tyndale; Wordsworth, Eccles, Biog.; Newcome, English Bible Translations; Johnson, Hist. of English Translations of the Bible; Lewis, Hist. of Translations of the Bible into English; Cotton, List of Editions of the Bible in English; Anderson, Annals of the English Bible; Home, Introd. to Study of the Bible; Historical Account of English Versions of Scripture; Watt, Bibl. Brit.; Princeton Rev. 10:321; Christian Rev. 3, 130; North American Rev. 67, 322. For fuller list of literature, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tyndareus[[@Headword:Tyndareus]]

             in Greek mythology, was the husband of the renowned Leda, and was king in Sparta, from which he was driven with his brother Icarius. Hercules placed the fleeing brothers again in possession of their kingdoms. Pausanias saw his grave in Lacedoemonia before the temple of Jupiter Cosmetes (3, 17, 4).

## Tyndaris[[@Headword:Tyndaris]]

             in Greek mythology, was a surname of Helen.

## Tyndarldes[[@Headword:Tyndarldes]]

             in Greek mythology, was a surname of the Dioscuri.

## Tyng, Dudley A[[@Headword:Tyng, Dudley A]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md., in 1825. He graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1843; studied at the Alexandria (Va.) Theological Seminary; became deacon in 1846 and priest in 1849; was first settled as a clergyman in Columbus, O., and afterwards was rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati; in 1854 was pastor of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, where he remained one year, resigning and organizing a new parish called the Church of the Covenant, of which he was minister at the time of his death, which occurred at Brookfield, near Philadelphia, April 19, 1858. See American Quar. Church Rev. 1858, p. 344.

Type.

I. Name. — The Greek word τύπος, from which our type is derived, denotes primarily a blow, then the mark left by a blow, then a mark or print of any kind, then a figure or image; and finally a mould or model, whether that be viewed as the original from which something else has taken its form, or as indicating the form which something not yet existing may assume. In the New Test. the word occurs in several of these senses, and in some passages with a shade of meaning peculiar to itself. In Joh 20:25 it is used to denote the mark which the nails made in our Lord's hands and feet; in Act 7:43 it means a copy or image; in Act 7:44 and Heb 8:5 it signifies a model after which something is made; in Rom 6:17 it denotes a mould from which a form is derived; in Rom 6:14 it conveys the  idea of one person presenting some analogy to another person; and in several places it means an example which others may follow (1Co 10:6; 1Co 10:11; Php 3:17; 1Th 1:7; 2Th 3:9, etc.).

As used by theologians, the word type has received a special technical meaning not exactly equivalent to any of these usages, though approaching to that of Rom 5:14, where Adam is said to be the type of Christ. They mean by it any object, whether office, institution, person, or action, by means of which some truth connected with Christianity was prefiguratively foretold under preceding dispensations. Such an object the apostles call a σκιά, a shadow or adumbration of that which it indicated (comp. Heb 10:1; Col 2:17). This shadow became a type because it presented the model or representation of something yet future. Sometimes, also, the term παραβολή is used with a similar meaning (Heb 9:9; Heb 11:19),

II. Fundamental Principles. — There are certain notions which must be assumed as lying at the basis of typology.

1. Spiritual truths, ideas, thoughts, may be represented By material symbols, whether actions, institutions, or objects. This the usage of all nations establishes. More especially was this a favorite method of communicating thought among the imaginative Orientals; in general, it is found to prevail most in the earlier stages of a people's history, while as yet the use of objects that appeal to the senses is more effective than the use of written documents. In Scripture, frequent instances occur of such symbolical methods of conveying ideas; as, for instance, the placing of the hand under the thigh for confirmation of an oath; the boring of the ear of the servant who declined to avail himself of the liberty brought by the year of jubilee; the rending of the garments in token of grief; and such acts as those of Abijah when, in announcing to Jeroboam the secession of the ten tribes from the house of Solomon, he tore his garment into twelve pieces and gave to Jeroboam ten (1 Kings 9:29); that of Elisha when he indicated to the king of Israel the victories which by divine help he should obtain over the Syrians by commanding him to shoot an arrow from the window eastward after he had placed his hand on the king's hand (2Ki 13:14-19); and those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel when they were signs to the people (Jer 19:1-11; Eze 12:3-16).

2. Such symbolical representations may be employed to convey religious truth. This usage we find also to have prevailed among all nations, especially in the earlier stages of their history. Among the Jews it was abundantly used; not however, according to human caprice or ingenuity, but always in obedience to the express ordinance of God. The symbolical observances of an earlier age introduced into the service of God, it may be presumed, were also of divine appointment, on the general principle that, as God alone can declare what worship he will receive, it is only as he appoints that any service can be properly offered to him.

3. The true religion has in all ages been essentially the same, so that the truths symbolized by the institutions of the earlier dispensations are identical with those more directly and fully made known to us under the Christian dispensation. The substantial identity of the patriarchal and Mosaic religions with the Christian must be assumed in all attempts to argue from the Old Test. to the New, or vice versa, and will not be denied by any who receive these books as divine. From this it necessarily follows that what was taught by symbol under the ancient economies as part of religious truth will be found identical with what is taught in words under the new dispensation.

4. The religion of Jesus Christ is one resting on the facts of his personal appearance and work. Out of these all its truths flow directly or indirectly; and to these they all have respect. Hence the truths taught symbolically to the Old Test. saints, being identical with those of Christianity, must also rest on, and have respect to these facts.

5. A twofold character was thus of necessity given to the religious institutions of the ancient economies. They were primarily symbolical of religious truth. They were secondarily predictive of facts in the future on which these truths rested.

III. Nature of Types. — Proceeding on these data, we may attempt to construct a typology, the design of which shall be to show what are the types in the Old Test. and the correspondence between them and their antitypes in the New Test. The most important step towards this is to determine from the preceding data what is the proper idea of a type. This we would express as follows: A type is an institute or act appointed by God to symbolize a religious truth, and to prefigure by means of analog or  resemblance those facts in the mediatorial work of Christ on which these truths rest. This definition involves the following elements:

1. A type is an institute or act. We use these terms in a wide sense, understanding under the former not only, formal organizations and religious offices, but times, places, implements of religious service; and under the latter not only rites and ceremonies, but special acts, or series of acts determined by the proper criterion to be typical. By this definition, however, persons and things simply as such are excluded. A person per se, or a thing simply as such, cannot possess a symbolical character; and cannot be the σκιά, or prefigurative sign, of another person or thing, much less of a fact or series of facts. A person may sustain atypical office or may perform a typical act, and a thing may be used in a typical service or ceremony, but in and by itself it cannot be a type. This sets aside a whole host of types which the ingenuity of interpreters has constructed out of the historical personages of the Old Test. That many of these sustained typical offices and performed typical acts is admitted; but that they were in themselves-in' their proper individual personality types of our Lord, we cannot believe. The assertion indeed, is to us unintelligible except in a sense which would be profane and untrue —viz. that their personal character and conduct were a representation of the character and conduct of our blessed Lord. It is true that for this doctrine of personal types the authority of the New Test. has been pleaded. But we are unable to find a solitary instance in the New Test. of any historical character mentioned in the Old Test. being brought forward as having been personally a σκιά of Christ or his work. In one passage, indeed Adam is called a τύπος of Christ, but τύπος is not there equivalent to σκιά; and, even if it were, it would not follow that it was Adam as a person who was the type of Christ, for the apostle is speaking throughout that context of our first parent in his official, federal, or representative character. The words of Peter also (1 Peter 3, 21) have been cited as showing that a simple historical occurrence may be the type of a Christian truth; but, whatever the apostle may mean in that passage by calling salvation by baptism the ἀντίτυπον of Noah's salvation by the ark, he certainly cannot mean that the latter was a divinely appointed prefiguration of the former. The utmost that can be drawn from his words is that an analogy subsists between the two, whereby the one is fitted to illustrate the other. The strongest case in favor of the opinion we are opposing is our Lord's representation of himself as the true bread of which the manna was tie prefiguration. We cannot understand this as  intimating less than that the manna was a type of him. Still it was the manna, not as a natural phenomenon; but as a special and peculiar provision made by God for the feeding of the people, that was the type of Christ; and in this divine appointment we find what reduces this under the head of proper types.

2. A type is an institute or act appointed by God, and by him adapted to the end — it is designed to serve. Knowing what in due time was to be exhibited to men by the mission and work of his Son, God could not only predict it in words, but also give by means of symbolical acts and institutes such representation of it as would, in some measure at ‘least, bring before the minds of the ancient saints a lively idea of it. As God alone could do this, it is on his appointment that the whole must rest. “To constitute one thing the type of another, as the term is generally understood in reference to Scripture, something more is needed than mere resemblance. The former must not only resemble the latter, but must have been designed to resemble the latter. It must have been so designed in its original institution. It must have been designed as something preparatory to the latter. The type as well as the antitype must have been preordained; and they must have been preordained as constituent parts of the same general scheme of Divine Providence. It is this previous design and this preordained connection which constitute the relation of type and antitype” (Marsh, Lectures on Criticism and Interpretation, p. 374). By the earlier typologists this condition was neglected, and resemblance was made the sole criterion of the relation between an event or person of the Old Test. and a fact or doctrine of the New Test. as type and antitype. A once popular book written on this plan is that of M'Ewen, On the Types and Figures of the Old Test. But the principle has been carried out to the wildest extent in a work entitled The Typical Testimony to the Messiah, by Micaiah Hill (Lond. 1862).

3. Each act or institute designed by God to serve as typical possessed a symbolical as well as a predictive character. This follows from the position that a type is a sensible emblem or prefigurative token of some spiritual truth, which itself rests upon certain events yet future, but of which events a certain degree of knowledge is possessed by those to whom the type is exhibited. In all such cases a twofold impression is conveyed to the mind: in the first place, that a particular truth already known is symbolically indicated; and, in the second place, that those events on which that truth depends shall certainly take place. In the testimony of God concerning his  Son there are two points-one of fact, and one of doctrine-on both of which we must be instructed before we can really believe that testimony in all its fullness. What God calls us in the Bible to believe is, first, “the truth;” and, secondly, that “truth as it is in. Christ Jesus.” With regard, for instance, to the doctrine of salvation by the atonement, there is, first, the general principle that such a mode of salvation is reasonable, practicable, and intended by God; and, secondly, the matter of fact that such an atonement has really been presented by our Lord Jesus Christ and accepted by the Sovereign and Judge of all. Now it was, of course, the same under the Old- Test. dispensation there were both the doctrine to be announced and the fact to be predicted before a complete statement of saving truth could be laid before the mind; and it was only as both of these were apprehended that the belief of a Jew in the truth became full and intelligent. Hence every type contained at once a symbol of the truth and a prediction of the fact.

It presented to the senses of the beholder an outward sign of a great general truth, and a memorial that in due season the event on which that truth rested would take place. Thus, for instance, in the case of sacrifice, there were both a symbol and a prediction. The slaying of the animal and the burning of its flesh were emblems of the great truth that the sinner whose substitute that animal had become deserved death and subsequent agony, as well as of the general truth that God's plan of saving men from that desert was by the substitutionary offerings of another. All this, however, would have been of no avail to the sin-burdened Israelite, who knew well that no mere animal could make atonement for the sins of man, had not that act prefigured and predicted the great sacrifice for sin on the part of the Lamb of God. But, pointed forward to this, his faith obtained an object upon which to rest, and he was enabled to rejoice in the salvation of God. So, also, with regard to the immediate consequences of sacrifice. When a Jew had committed a trespass against the Mosaic law, he had to offer certain sacrifices before he could enjoy his civil and political rights. Immediately, however, on presenting these, he stood rectus in curia; he was acquitted of the sin he had committed, and restored to his civil privileges. With this a mere carnal and worldly Jew was content. But to the pious believer all this was only the symbol and type of something spiritual. It reminded him that his sins against God had made him guilty and excluded him from the divine favor — it directed him to the need of a sacrifice for sincere God would forgive his transgression; and it assured him-that; just as by sacrifice he had been restored to his place in the Jewish State, so by the great sacrifice he might be restored to the divine favor, and  to a place in that spiritual kingdom of which the Jewish-nation was the type.

4. Though resemblance to that which it is designed to prefigure does not constitute the only, or even the primary, condition, of a. type, it is obvious that this must form a very important element in the adaptation of the type to serve its designed end. Hence we may expect to find some obvious analogy not only between the symbol and that which it symbolizes, but also between the divinely appointed act or institute and that which it was designed to prefigure.

On the other hand, as there must be a similarity or analogy between the type and the antitype, so there is also a disparity or dissimilitude between them. It is not in the nature of type and antitype that they should agree in all things; else, instead of similitude, there would be identity. Hence the apostle, while making Adam a type of Christ. yet shows how infinitely the latter excelled the former (1Co 15:47). So the priests of old were types of Christ, though he infinitely excelled them both as to his own person and as to the character of his priesthood (see Hebrews 7, 8, 9, 10). Chrysostom observes (Hom. 61, in Cen.) that there must be more in the type than in the antitype. Hence the distinction must be observed between total and partial types. This distinction (Ecumenius also draws in commenting on Hebrews 7 p. 829. He says: ῾Ο τύπος οὐ κατὰ πάντα ισος ἐστὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾷ (ἐπεὶ και αύτὸς ἀλήθεια εὑρίσκεται, καὶ ταυτότης μᾶλλον ἢ τύπος), ἀλλ᾿ εἰκόνας ἔχει τινὰς καὶ ἰνδάλματα” A type does not express that which it represents. in every minute particular, for then, instead of similitude, there would. be identity, but it contains certain outlines and assimilations of the antitype.” Cyril of Alexandria, in Amos 6 p. 315, also observes on this subject: ῾Ο τύπος οὐκ ἀλήθεια, μόρφωσιν δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσφέρει “A type is not the very truth itself, but its representation.”

IV. Relation to other 1Modes of Teaching. — Having thus indicated the nature of a type, we would now point out the relation' of this mode of teaching divine truth to other modes employed in Scripture more or less akin to it.

1. Relation to Prophecy. — Type stands related to prophecy as its parallel. Like it, it teaches a present, truth, and announces a future fulfillment of it like it, also, it has in its capacity of a type one definite meaning and one definite fulfillment, to both of which it was intended and designed to point.  The difference between a prophecy and a type lies only in this, that the former teaches by words, the latter by things; the former, that is, by an artificial combination of signs, the latter by a scenical representation of the whole truth' at once. A word is the symbol of an idea; a type is the symbol of some principle or law, and the prediction of some great general fact in- the economy of redemption. SEE PROPHECY.

2. Relation to Parable. — From the word παραβόλη being used to designate a type, it may be inferred that the connection between the two is intimate. A type, in fact, may be viewed as a sort of acted parable. Let us suppose, for instance, that our Lord, instead of describing in words the conduct and circumstances of the prodigal son, had, by the help of suitable actors and scenes, made the whole to pass before the eves and ears of his auditors, the lesson would have been conveyed to them much in the same way as the truth concerning himself was conveyed to the ancient Jews by the typical rites of the Mosaic economy. In neither case is the lesson new, nor fully to be understood without an elucidatory comment; the object of both being to impress vividly a truth, otherwise reasonable or familiar, upon the minds of those to whom it is presented. There is this difference, however, between such a representation and a type--that the former, being merely doctrinal, would be exhausted in inculcating a present truth, while the latter would, with the doctrine, incorporate a prophetic reference to some great event yet to happen on which the doctrine was based. SEE PARABLE.

3. Relation to Comparison. — The New-Test. teachers occasionally, for the sake of illustrating their meaning, introduce a comparison, drawn from some well-known fact in the history of the Jewish people, between which and the point they are discussing there exists some obvious analogy. In this way our Lord makes use of the fact of Moses erecting the brazen serpent in the wilderness for the purpose of illustrating his own character as a deliverer, who was to be “lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (Joh 3:14-15). On another occasion he instituted a comparison between his own case, as about to be consigned for a season to the tomb, and that of Jonah, “who had been three days and three nights in the belly of the fish” (Mat 12:40). From this it has been hastily concluded that these events, and others alluded to in the New Test. in a similar manner, were real types and prefigurations of the facts they are brought to illustrate. It is obvious, however, that there is a great difference between a historical event — whether occurring in the  natural course of things, or by the special interposition of the divine power, and which a subsequent writer or speaker may make use of to illustrate, by comparison, some fact or doctrine of which he is treating and a symbolic institute expressly appointed by God to prefigure, to those among whom it was set up, certain great transactions in connection with that plan of redemption which, in the fullness of time, he was to unfold to mankind. In the two cases above referred to there is the absence of any express evidence that the events recorded possess any other than a simple historical character. In the case of the brazen serpent, indeed, we have divine appointment; but along with the appointment we have the specific mention of the purpose for which it was set up, which was not to teach any religious truths at all, or to form any part of religious worship, but simply that it might act as an instrument of cure to the Israelites who were bitten by the fiery flying serpents. SEE BRAZEN SERPENT.

Yet even in this case it is clear from the whole tenor of the narrative that the act was significant of more than a mere physical remedy; and our Lord's reference to the event confirms its higher import. — It is also possible that such a thing as the brazen serpent. might possess a symbolical character; but if any will from this argue that it really had such a character, .and that it was a symbol of Christ, it will be incumbent upon him, in the first place, to show some evidence in favor of his inference, and in the next, to explain how it should come to pass that the express symbolical antithesis of the Messiah, the serpent, could form part of an institute intended to prefigure his work as the Savior of men. As to the case of Jonah, we do not find in it so much as the appearance of anything typical; and, indeed, it would have been very strange had God caused the prophet to perform an actions typical of the burial and resurrection of Christ, under circumstances in which there was no human being to receive any instruction by it except himself. A type is an acted lesson visible representation of invisible truths. To its utility, therefore, spectators are as indispensable as actors; and where the former are not present, to say that God appoints the latter to go through their performance is to charge him with doing something in vain. SEE SIMIILITUDE.

4. Relation to Allegory. — “An allegory,” says bishop Marsh, “according to its original and proper meaning, denotes a representation of one thing which is intended to excite the representation of another thing.” Adopting this as a just explanation, it is obvious that type and allegory are closely allied. In both there is an original representation which has a meaning of its  own, and there is the use of that for the purpose of calling up to the mind the conception of another thing analogous to the former. The two, however, are very distinct. They differ in two respects: the one is that the subject of an allegory is a mere historical event occurring in the ordinary course of things, whereas a type is an act or institute expressly appointed by God to teach some important truth; the other is, that the allegorical sense is a fictitious meaning put upon a narrative for the sake of illustrating something else, whereas the explanation of a type is its true and only meaning, and is adduced solely for the sake of unfolding that meaning. Thus Paul, in order to explain the doctrine of the covenants, allegorizes the anecdote of Sarai and Hagar recorded by Moses, making Sarai represent the Abrahamic or new or everlasting covenant, and Hagar the Sinaitic or old covenant (Gal 4:24-25). In the same way he allegorizes the fact of the water from the rock following the Israelites through the wilderness, speaking of it as representing Christ in the blessings he coifers upon his church (1Co 10:4). These allegorizings, ( ἀλληγορούμενα) are only comparisons without the form; and their use is obviously merely to explain one thing by another. The radical difference between the exposition of a type and an allegorical interpretation of history, is apparent from ‘the use which the apostle makes of them respectively, His allegorizings are mere illustrations on which, by themselves, nothing is built; whereas his typical explanations are all brought forward as forming the basis of arguments addressed to those who, admitting the type, were thereby pledged to the admission of the truths it embodied. SEE ALLEGORY.

V. Interpretation of Types. — As a general rule it may be laid down that we should always expect to find in the antitype something higher and more glorious than in the type (Chrysost. in Genes. Horn.35. μὴ πάντα ἀπαίτει ἐν τῷ τύπῷ· οὐδὲ γὰρ ¨ν εἴη τύπος εἰ μέλλοι παντὰ ἔχειν τὰ τῇ ἀληθείᾷ συμβαίνοντα). This follows from the nature of the case. For if the design of a type be by outward symbols to foreshadow spiritual truths, it follows that, in proportion ash the thing signified is more valuable than the mere sign, and as things spiritual and eternal are more glorious than things material and transitory, the type must be inferior in value and in majesty to that which it is designed to prefigure.

More specific rules having reference especially to the Mosaic ritual are—

1. The symbolical ritual, as a whole and in its individual parts, can set forth only such ideas and truths as accord with the known, and elsewhere clearly announced, principles of Old-Test. theology.

2. An accurate knowledge of the outward constitution of each symbol is an indispensable condition of its interpretation; for, as the sole object of the symbol is to convey spiritual truth by sensible representations, to attempt to discover the former before we understand the latter is to endeavor to reach an end without using the means.

3. The first step in the interpretation of a symbol is the explanation of its name; for, as this is generally given with a direct reference to the idea symbolized, it forms of itself a sort of exponent of the symbol to which it is affixed.

4. Each symbol expresses, in general, only one grand idea; at the same time, of course, including all subordinate ideas that may be involved in it. Thus, in the case of sacrifices, a variety of truths are presented to the mind, but all going to make up the one grand truth, which that rite symbolized.

5. Each symbol has always the same fundamental meaning, however different may be the objects with which it is combined. Thus, for instance, the act of purification has the same symbolical meaning, whether it is- performed upon a person or an animal, or upon a material object.

6. In interpreting a symbol, we must throw out of view all that is merely necessitated by the laws of its physical condition, and that does not serve to help out the symbolical representation. Symbols have often accessories of two kinds the one consisting of such as are in themselves symbolical, and which go to make up the sum total of the representation; the other, of such as are, from the nature of things, required by the material objects composing the symbol for their continued existence. Thus, in the case of the candlestick in the sanctuary, it was provided that it should have branches and knops and flowers, and also that it should be supplied with snuffers and snuff-dishes. Now, of those accessories the former were not indispensable to its serving the purpose for which it was designed — that of giving light; but they, having each a symbolical meaning, added to the symbolical effect of the whole; whereas the latter were merely required in order to prevent the lights from dying out for want of cleansing. Keeping this distinction in view, we need not be afraid of going too minutely into the explanation of the Mosaic rituals Everything, in fact, of which it was  composed was a symbol; with the single exception of such things as the earthly, physical condition of the substance or persons employed rendered indispensable. Nay, even these, from belonging to a typical institute, such as the nation of Israel was, acquired a sort of secondary typical character; just as the ordinary events of Israelitish history have for the same reason a spiritually doctrinal character. SEE SYMBOL.

VI. Examples of Types. — In tracing out who and what typified or shadowed forth Christ and his salvation under the antediluvian, patriarchal, and Mosaic dispensations, we must be careful not to substitute the suggestions of our own imaginations for the intimations of' Scripture. We must endeavor to learn the mind of God as to what actually constitutes a type, either by the ex-press declarations of Scripture, or by the obvious analogy, which subsists between things under the Gospel and its antecedent dispensations. Thus guarding ourselves, we may notice the various types by which God was pleased, at all times, in a sense, to preach the Gospel to mans kind.

1. Among individual persons, before the law, Adam, Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, Abraham, Isaac, and Joseph were eminently typical of Christ, but only in certain relations. Again, under the law, Moses, Joshua, Samson, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Jonah, Zerubbabel, and Joshua the high- priest were, in many points, singularly types of Christ.

2. The first-born, the Nazarites, prophets, priests, and kings were typical orders of persons.

3. Under the head of things typical may be noticed Jacob's ladder, the burning bush, the pillar of cloud and fire; and, in the opinion of some, the manna, the rock, and the brazen serpent.

4. Actions typical were the deliverance out of Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, the sojourn in the wilderness, the passage over the Jordan, the entrance into Canaan, and the restoration from Babylon.

5. Rites typical were circumcision, various sacrifices, and sundry purifications.

6. Places typical were the land of Canaan, the cities of refuge, the tabernacle, and the temple.  The above types were designed to shadow forth Christ and the blessings of his salvation; but there were others also which pointed at our miseries without him. There were ceremonial uncleannesses the leprosy, for instance was a type of our natural pollution.

See Michaelis, Eltwurf der typischen Gottesgelahrtieit (Gött. 1763); Keach, Tropologia, p. 225-237; Suicerj Thesaur. 2, 1337; Mather, Types of the Old Test. (Lond. 1705) Bahr, Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus (Heidelb. 1837, 2 vols.); Chevallier, Hulsean Lecture for 1826; Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture (Edinb. 1854, 2 vols.); and other works cited by Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. col. 1803 sq., and by Maicom, Theol. Index, s.v. SEE MESSIAH.

## Tyng, Stephen Higginson, D.D[[@Headword:Tyng, Stephen Higginson, D.D]]

             an eminent Protestant Episcopal divine, was born at Newburyport, Massachusetts, March 1, 1800, being the son of Hon. Dudley Atkins, but  assumed the name of his relative, James Tyng, whose estate he inherited. He graduated at Harvard College in 1817; engaged for some time in commercial pursuits; afterwards studied theology; was ordained in 1821; and was rector successively in Georgetown, D.C. (1821-23); in St. Anne's Parish, Maryland. (1823-29); in St. Paul's, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1829-33); in the Church of the Epiphany in the same city (1833-45); and thereafter in St. George's, New York city, until 1878, when, on account of failing health, he was made pastor emeritus. He died at Irvington, N.J., September 4, 1885. Dr. Tyng was one of the most evangelical, popular, and useful preachers of his denomination. He was editor at different times of The Episcopal Recorder, The Theological Repository, and The Protestant Churchman, while he was also the author of several religious and homiletical works, including observations made during a visit to Europe.

## Tyng, Stephen Higginson, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Tyng, Stephen Higginson, D.D (2)]]

             an eminent Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Newburyport, Massachusetts, March 1, 1800; graduated from Harvard College in 1817, and for two years was engaged in a mercantile life; in 1819-21 he studied theology at Bristol, R.I.; was rector at Georgetown, D.C., 1821-23; at Queen Anne Parish, Maryland, 1823-29 at St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, 1829-33; Church of the Epiphany, 1833-45; St. George's Church, N.Y., 1845-78; in 1878 he was retired as pastor emeritus, and died September 4. 1885. For several years he was editor of the Episcopal Recorder and the Protestant Churchman. He is the author of numerous volumes.

## Typhoeus[[@Headword:Typhoeus]]

             TYPHON SEE TYPHON (q.v.).

## Typhon[[@Headword:Typhon]]

             (Typhos, Typhoem, Typhoeus, and Typhaon), in Greek mythology, was a monster of remote antiquity, at one time thought to have been a destructive gale of wind, at another time represented as a giant of the earth, ejecting volcanic-flames. Homer places him in the country of Arim, buried in the earth, which Jupiter strikes with lightning. Hesiod represents Typhaon and Typhocus as two different and distinct beings. Typhaon is the son of Typhocus, a mighty wind, who with Echidna begets the dog Orthrus, Cerberus the Lernsean hydra, and Chimsera. Typhocus is the youngest son of Tartarus and Ga. with one hundred dragon-heads, frightfully sparkling eyes, and hideous voice. He attempted to gain sovereignty over gods and men, but Jupiter bound him with lightning, and he now lies under Etna. In Egyptian mythology Typhon is the Greek name for the evil spirit represented by the dog-star, originally the influence that brought to Egypt the blessing of a yearly overflow of the banks of the river Nile, without which the country could not flourish. When the worship of Isis and Osiris came into practice, the dog-star was designed to be the destroyer of the life of nature by heat and now Typhon became an evil god, whose names and titles upon monuments were destroyed, because he was believed to be the enemy and persecutor of Osiris (q.v.). Typhon owned Nephthys as his wife, who by him gave birth to Anubis. His real Egyptian name is stated differently as Set or Sutekh.

## Typhrestus[[@Headword:Typhrestus]]

             in Greek mythology, was the son of Sperchins, after whom a city in the Trachinian province was named.

## Typycum[[@Headword:Typycum]]

             (Gr. Τύπικον), a Greek term for (1) a book of rubrics; (2) a selection from the Psalter; (3) a Sunday service in the Oriental Church.

## Tyr[[@Headword:Tyr]]

             in Norse mythology, is one of the supreme deities of Northern antiquity, a son of Odin and Frigga, and brother of Thor. As the god of boldness, wisdom, and strength, he was implored by the Heldians as well as by the Skaldians for his favor, and was worshipped with Thor and Odin. At the end of the world he will combat with the hell-dog Garm, and each will kill the other. Several antiquarians are inclined to identify him with Tuiscon.

## Tyrannus[[@Headword:Tyrannus]]

             (Τύραννος, sovereign), the name of a man in whose school or place of audience Paul taught the Gospel for two years, during his sojourn at Ephesus (see Act 19:9). A. D. 52, 53. The halls or rooms of the philosophers were called σχολαί among the later Greeks (Liddell and Scott, s.v.); and as Luke applies that term to the auditorium in this instance, the presumption is that Tyrannus himself was a Greek, and a public teacher of philosophy or rhetoric. He and Paul must have occupied the room at different hours; whether he hired it out to the Christians or gave them the use of it (in either case he must have been friendly to them) is left uncertain. Meyer is disposed to consider that Tyrannus was a Jewish rabbi, and the owner of a private synagogue or house for teaching (בֵּית מַדְרָשׁ). But, in the first place, his Greek name, and the fact that he is not mentioned as a Jew or proselyte, disagree with that supposition; and, in the second place, as Paul repaired to this man's school after having been compelled to leave the Jewish synagogue (Act 19:9), it is evident that he took this course as a means of gaining access to the heathen; an. object which he would naturally seek through the co-operation of one of their own number, and not by associating himself with a Jew or a Gentile adherent of the Jewish faith. In speaking of him merely as a certain Tyrannus (Τυρ®ννου τινός), Luke indicates certainly that he was not a  believer at first; though it is natural enough to think that he may have become such as the result of his acquaintance with the apostle. Hemsen (Der Apostel Paulus, p; .218) throws out the idea that the hall may have belonged to the authorities of the city, and have derived its name from the original proprietor. See Seelen, De Schola Tyranni, in his Medit. Exeg. 3 615 sq.; Wallen Acta Pauli Ephesin. (Gryph. 1783). SEE PAUL.

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

             in Greek mythology, was one of the Pterelaidse, who were slain in the contest against the sons of Electryon.

## Tyrbenus[[@Headword:Tyrbenus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a surname of Apollo.

## Tyre[[@Headword:Tyre]]

             (Heb. Ts6r, צוֹר[r צֹר, 1Ki 5:1; Psa 83:7; Psa 87:4; Eze 26:15; Eze 27:3; Eze 27:8; Eze 27:32; Eze 28:12; Hos 9:13; Zec 9:3; the form likewise found in inscriptions, Gesenius, Monum. Phrien. p. 261]; Sept., New Test., Josephus, and other writers, Topot; A.V. “yrus” [q.v.] in Jeremiah, Ezekiel [usually], and the minor prophets [except Joel]; SEE TYIAN ), a celebrated commercial city of antiquity (Jos 19:29; 2Sa 24:7; Isa 23:1; Eze 26:15; Eze 27:2, etc.), situated in Phoenicia, on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea, in latitude 330 17' N. (Smythe, Mediterranean, p. 469). Although not the oldest, it was the greatest of the Punic cities, both in size and power. SEE PHOENICIA.

I. The Name. — Its Hebrew name, Tsôr, signifies a rock, which well agrees with the site of Sur. the moderin town on a rocky-peninsula, formerly.an island. From the word “Tsôr” were derived two names of tle city, in which the first letters differed from each other, though both had a feature of their common parent 1st, the Aramaic word Tura (טֻרָא) whence the Greek word Turos, probably pronounced Tyros, which finally prevailed in Latin, and, with slight changes, in the modern languages of the West; and, 2nd, Saca, or Sarra, which occiirs. in Plautus (Truc. 2, 6, 58, “purpuram ex Sara tibi attuli”), and which is familiar to scholars through the well-known line of Virgil, “Ut gemma bibat, et Sarrano dormiat ostro” (Georg. 2, 506; comp. Aul. Gell. 14:6; Silius Italicus, 15:203; Juvenal, 10:30). Accordingi to a passage of Probus (ad Virg. Georg. 2, 115), as quoted by Grote (Hist.  of Greece, 3, 353), the form “Sara” would seem to have occurred in one of the Greek epics now lost, which passed under the name of Homer. Certainly this form accords best with the modern Arabic name of Sur.

II. Ancient Relations. —

1. Old Tyre. — There is no doubt that, previous to the siege of the city by Alexander the Great, Tyreu was situated on an island; but, according to the tradition of the inhabitants, if we may believe. Justin (11, 10), there was a city on the mainland before there was a city on the island; and the tradition receives some color from the name of Palsetyrus, or Old Tyre, which was borne in Greek times by a city on the continent, thirty stadia to the south (Strabo 12, 11, 24). But a difficulty arises in, supposing that Paletyrus was built before Tyre, as the word Tyre evidently means “a rock,” and few persons who have visited the site of Palaetyrus can seriously suppose that any rock on the surface there can have given rise to the name. To escape this difficulty, Hengstenberg makes the suggestion that Palaetyrus meant Tyre that formerly existed, “quae q uo udam fuit;” and that the name was introduced after the destruction of the greater part of it by Nebuchadnezzar, to distinguish it from that part of Tyre which continued to be in existence (De Rebus Tyiriorum, p. 26). Movers, justly deeming this explanation unlikely, suggests that the original inhabitants of the city on the mainland possessed the island as part of their territory, and named their city from the characteristic features of the island, though the island itself was not then inhabited (Das phoniische Alterthum, II, 1, 173).

This explanation is possible; but other explanations are equally possible. For example, the Phoenician name of it may have been the Old City' and this may have been translated “Palaetyrus” in Greek. Or, if the inhabitants of the mainland migrated to the island, they may afterwards, at some time or other, have given to the city which they left the name of Old Tyre, without its being necessarily implied that the city had ever borne simply the name of Tyre. Or some accidental circumstance, now beyond the reach of conjecture, may have led to the name. This again would tally with the remark of Grote, who observes (loc. cit.) that perhaps the Phoenician name which the city on the mainland bore may have been something resembling Palaetyrus in sound, but not coincident in meaning. It is important, however, to bear in mind that this question regarding Palaetyrus is merely archaeological, and that nothing in Biblical history is affected by it.  Nebuchadnezzar necessarily besieged the portion of the city on the mainland, as he had no vessels with which to attack the island; but it is reasonably certain that, in the time of Isaiah and Ezekiel the heart or core of the city was on the island. The city of Tyre was consecrated to Hercules (Melkarth), who was the principal object of worship to the inhabitants (Quintus Curtius, 4:2; Strabo, 16:757); and Arrian, in his History, says that the temple on the island was the most ancient of all temples within the memory of mankind (2, 16). It cannot be doubted, therefore, that the island had long been inhabited. With this agree the expressions as to Tyre being “in the midst of the seas” (Eze 27:25-26); and even the threat against it that it should be made like the top of a rock to spread nets upon (see Des Vignoles, Chronologie de L'histoire Sainte [Berlin. 1738], 2, 25). As, however, the space on the island was limited, it is very possible that the population on the mainland may have exceeded the population on the island (see Movers, loc. cit. p. 81).

2. Connection with Sidon. — Whether built before or later than Palaetyrus, the renowned city of Tyre, though it laid claims to a very high antiquity (Isa 23:7; Herod. 2, 14; Quintus Curtius, 4:4), is not mentioned either in the Iliad or in the Odyssey; ‘but no inference can be legitimately drawn from this fact as to the existence or non-existence of the city at the time. when those poems were composed. The tribe of Canaanites that inhabited the small tract of country which. may be called Phoenicia proper was known, by the generic name of Sidonians (Jdg 18:7; Isa 23:2; Isa 23:4; Isa 23:12; Jos 13:6; Eze 32:30); and this name undoubtedly included Tyrians, the inhabitants being of the same race, and the two cities being less than twenty English miles distant from each other. Hence when Solomon sent to Hiram king of Tyre for cedar-trees out of Lebanon, to be hewn by Hiram's subjects, he reminds Hiram that “there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber like the Sidonians” (1Ki 5:6). Hence Virgil, who, in his very first mention of Carthage, expressly states that it was founded by colonists from Tyre (En. 1, 12 ), afterwards, with perfect propriety and consistency, calls it the Sidonian city (ibid. 1. 677, 678; 4:545; see Des Vignoles, loc. cit. p. 25). In like manner, when Sidohians are spoken of in the Homeric poems (I7. 6:290; 23:743; Od. 4:84; 17:424), this might comprehend Tyrians; and the mention of the city Sidon, while there is no similar mention of Tyre, would be fully accounted for if it were necessary to account for such a circumstance at all in a poem  by Sidon's having been in early times more flourishing than Tyre. It is worthy, likewise, of being noted that Tyre is not mentioned in the Pentateuch; but: here, again, though an inference may be drawn against the importance, no inference can be legitimately drawn against the existence, of Tyre in the times to which the Pentateuch refers. SEE SIDON.

3. General Characteristics. — As already intimated, Tyre was composed of two distinct parts or towns in historical times; the one situated on the mainland, or continental Tyre, and one on the island opposite, from four to thirty stadia (Pliny, Strabo) distant from each other. According to Pliny, the circumference of both was reckoned at about nineteen Roman miles, the island town comprising about twenty-two stadia. The town on the shore was called Palaetyrus, not from its having been founded before Island Tyrus for this, indeed, we may assume to have been the first of the two (Reland, Vitringa, Hengstenberg, etc.) — but from the circumstance of its having achieved a high renown long before its much less favorably situated island-sister. Constantly exposed to earthquakes and deluges-occupying a space naturally circumscribed, and rendered still more so by the erections necessary for the purple-fisheries and manufactories-and cut off from the easy means of export and import by caravans that belonged to the opposite city, Island-Tyrus was by far inferior in importance. In fact, only one (the western) part of the island had been built over up to the time of Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon —viz. the “Old Town” (τὸ ἄστυ), which probably served as harbor, a place for arsenals and magazines, to Palsetyrus, that by this time had sent out colonies already to Tartessus and the northern coast of Libya. The other part of the island, or rather a small island by itself, which has now ceased to be such, and which was first joined to the city as the “New Town” by Hiram, had till then probably been inhabited only by the priests attached to the sanctuary of Melkart. Besides these two there was a third town or suburb, the Eurychoros (esplanade), formed by means of substructions on the eastern side of the rock. Palaetyrus, extending from the river Leontes on the north to the Ras el-Ain on the south, covered with all its outlying parts the whole available maritime strip of land, and lay in one of the most fertile and blooming plains of Phoenicia (comp. Hos 9:13, שטולה בנוה, “planted in a pleasant place;” or William of Tyre, Fertilitate prsecipua et amcenitate quasi singularis, habet planitiem sibi continuam divitis glebse et opimi soli,” Hos 13:3). It was watered by several aqueducts, which carried the stream from the fountain-group situated in ‘the plain itself (head of the well, Ras al-  Ayin), not only through the whole territory of the continental city, but, probably by means of subterranean pipes, also into the island-city. Without this supposition it would hardly be credible how the latter, which, up to the siege by Shalmaneser (before the 8th century), had subsisted on rain-water only collected in cisterns and open canals (ὑδραγωγοί) from the Ras, could have stood the long sieges by Nebuchadnezzar (thirteen years) and of Alexander, who naturally stopped the over ground supplies, without apparently once suffering from want of water.

Possibly we may, in a certain annual rite called the “Wedding of the land-water to the sea-water,” still kept up by the inhabitants, see a faint reminiscence of this ancient juncture. Here also stood the ancient royal palace and the first sanctuary of Hercules, though the most celebrated one lay on the island opposite. The happy mixture of land and sea scenery thus exhibited by the two cities in the time of their prosperity is graphically described by Nonnus, a learned Egyptian antideologist of the end of the 4th Christian century: “The sailor furrows the sea with his oar, as the ploughman the soil; the lowing of oxen and the song of birds answer the deep roar of the main; the hamadryad among the tall trees hears the voice of the Nereid calling to her from the waves; the breeze from Lebanon, while it cools the rustic at his midday labor, speeds the sailor seaward.” “O Tyrus,” exclaims the prophet (Eze 27:3, etc.), “thou hast said, I am of perfect beauty; thy borders are in the midst of the sea, thy builders have perfected thy beauty.” The poets call her “a virgin bathing in the sea, a Tartessus-ship swimming upon the ocean, an island on shore, and a city in the sea withal,” etc. Above all, however, Nonnus makes his Indian hero get into ecstasies at the primeval fountains, especially those where the water ‘gushing out of the depths of the earth, returns every hour;” and he mentions three distinct sources or water-nymphs “Abarberea, the fertile; Kallirrhoe, the sweet; and Drosera, the rich and bridal one.”

The description of Tyre in the prophecy of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 27; Ezekiel 10) receives striking illustration from what we believe to be its earliest coins. These coins were held to be most probably of Tyre or some other Phoenician city, or possibly of Babylon, on numismatic evidence alone, by Mr. Burgon, of the British Museum. They probably date during the 5th century B.C. — they may possibly be a little older-but it is most reasonable to consider them as of the time of, and issued by, Darius Hystaspis; The chief coins are octodrachms of the earlier Phoenician weight, bearing, on the obverse, a war-galley beneath the towered walls of a city, and, on the reverse, a king  in a chariot, with an incuse goat beneath. This combination of galley and city is exactly what we find in the description of Tyre in Ezekiel, which mainly portrays a state-galley, but also refers to a port, and speaks of towers and walls. SEE NAVIGATION.

III. History. —

1. The early history of Tyre is so completely shrouded in mythical mystery that a rational reconstruction of it is next to impossible. We hear of kings of Phoenicia whose very names mostly prove them to be mere types of deities, or special tribes, such as Agenor, Phoenix, Phalis, Sidon, Tetramnestus, Tennes, Strato, Abdalominus (a word spelled in many different ways, the only reasonable orthography of which, however, must be Abd-Alonim [Heb. Elyonim], עבד עליוני, “servant of the highest ones, or gods”). Abibal, however, is called the first king of Tyre, and the predecessor of Hiram (Hierom, Suram, etc..), the Biblical Chiram, with whom, indeed, begins what to us is approximately the historical period of Phoenicia. We have already mentioned the calamity in consequence of which the Sidonians, hitherto the mightiest power of Phoenicia, were obliged to leave their capital and seek refuge in neighboring Tyre. This took place about B.C. 1200, and very soon after that period Tyre assumed the hegemony. Before the time of Samuel we already hear of the princes (Suffetes) of Tyre oppressing the Israelites (Jdg 10:12).

In the Bible, Tyre is named for the first time in the book of Joshua (Jos 19:29), where it is adverted to as a fortified city (in the A. V. “the strong city”), in reference to the boundaries of the tribe of Asher. Nothing historical, however, turns upon this mention of Tyre; for it is indisputable that the tribe of Asher never possessed the Tyrian territory. According to the injunctions of the Pentateuch, indeed, all the Canaanitish nations ought to have been exterminated; but, instead of this, the Israelites dwelt among the Sidonians or Phoenicians, who were inhabitants of the land (Jdg 1:31), and never seem to have had any war with that intelligent race. Subsequently, in a passage of Samuel (2Sa 24:7), it is stated that the enumerators of the census in the reign of David went in pursuance of their mission to Tyre, among other cities, which must be understood as implying, not that Tyre was subject to David's authority, but merely that a census was thus taken of the Jews resident there.

2. But the first passages in the Hebrew historical writings, or in ancient history generally, which afford glimpses of the actual condition of Tyre are in the book of Samuel (2Sa 5:11), in connection with Hiram king of Tyre (B.C. 980-947) sending cedar-wood and workmen to David, for building him a palace; and subsequently in the book of Kings, in connection with the building of Solomon's temple. One point at this period is particularly worthy of attention. In contradistinction from all the other most celebrated independent commercial cities out of Phoenicia in the ancient and modern world, Tyre was a monarchy, and not a republic; and, notwithstanding its merchant princes, who might have been deemed likely to favor the establishment of an aristocratical commonwealth, it continued to preserve the monarchical form of government until its final loss of independence. Another point is the skill in the mechanical arts which seems to-have already been attained by the Tyrians. Under this head, allusion is not specially made to the excellence of the Tyrians in felling trees; for, through vicinity to the forests of Lebanon, they would as naturally have become skilled in that art as the backwoodsmen of America. But what is peculiarly noteworthy is that Tyrians had become workers in brass or copper to ant extent which implies considerable advancement in art. In the enumeration of the various works in brass executed by the Tyrian artists whom Solomon sent for, there are lilies, palm-trees, oxen, lions, and cherubim (1Ki 7:13-45). The manner in which the cedar-wood and fir-wood were conveyed to Jerusalem is likewise interesting, partly from the similarity of the sea voyage to what may commonly be seen on the Rhine at the present day, and partly as giving a vivid idea of the really short distance between Tyre and Jerusalem.

The wood was taken in floats to Joppa (2Ch 2:16; 1Ki 5:9), a distance of less than seventy- four geographical miles. In the Mediterranean, during summer, there are times when this-voyage along the coast would have been perfectly safe, and when the Tyrians might have reckoned confidently, especially at night, on light winds to fill the sails which were probably used on such occasions. From Joppa to Jerusalem the distance was about thirty-two miles, and it is certain that by this route the whole distance between the two celebrated cities of Jerusalem and Tyre was not more than 106 geographical, or about 122 English, miles, Within such a comparatively short distance (which by land, in a straight line, was about twenty miles shorter). It would be easy for two sovereigns to establish personal relations with each other, more especially as the northern boundary of Solomon's kingdom, in one direction, was the-southern boundary of Phoenicia. Solomon and Hiram  may frequently have met, and thus laid the foundations of a political alliance in personal friendship. If by messengers they sent riddles and problems for each other to solve (Josephus, Ant. 8, 5, 3; Cont. — Apion. 1, 17.), they may previously have had, on several occasions, a keen encounter of wits in convivial intercourse. In this way, likewise, Solomon may have become acquainted with the Sidonian women who, with those of other nations, seduced him to polytheism and the worship of Astarte in his- old age. Similar remarks apply to the circumstances which may have previously occasioned the strong affection of Hiram for David (1Ki 5:1).

However this maybe, it is evident that under Solomon there was a close alliance between the Hebrews and the Tyrians. Hiram supplied Solomon with cedar-wood, precious metals, and workmen, and gave him sailors for the voyage to Ophir and India; while, on the other hand, Solomon gave Hiram supplies of corn and oil, ceded to him some cities, and permitted him to make use of some havens on the Red Sea (1Ki 9:11-14; 1Ki 9:26-28; 1Ki 10:22). Under Hiram, Tyre not only attained to its fullest glory and renown among its sister-states, but the capital itself, enlarged by him into three distinct towns, received its fullest share of palaces, temples, and public edifices, and its two roadsteads and two harbors probably date from this period. It is at this period also when the joint trading expeditions to Ophir are recorded to have taken place, in which the Tyrians furnished the: pilots and mariners. Hiram himself seems altogether to have been a very refined, pious, and peaceful monarch. Hardly any wars are recorded during his lifetime, arid his reported interchange of problems with the “wisest of mankind” points to is renown as a bel esprit. These friendly relations survived for a time the disastrous secession of the ten tribes, and a century later Ahab married a daughter, of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians (1Ki 16:31), who, according to Menander (Josephus, Ant. 8:13, 2), was a daughter of Ithobaal, king of Tyre.

3. Hiram was followed, according to Menander (in Josephus) and Theophilus, by Baleastartus, whose four sons reigned after him for short periods. First came, Abdastartus (939-931), who, in consequence of a palace revolution, was followed on the throne for twelve years by a soil of his nurse-a period of internal sedition and general lawlessness having intervened, during which (so Justin tells us) all the free citizens of Tyre were murdered by the slaves. Astartus, the eldest son of Baleastartus, succeeded to the government, and ruled from 918 to 907, when a third brother, Astarymus, was made king. He was murdered nine years later by  Phaletus, his youngest brother, who, after a brief reign of nine months, was put to death by Ithobaal, priest of Astarte, in whose family the kingdom henceforth became hereditary.

This Ithobaal, the Ethbaal of Scripture, whose daughter was married to Ahab, is called by Josephus “king of Tyre and Sidon,” a sign of the supremacy which Tyre had acquired in his day. The drought reported to have taken place in Judaea under Ahab seems to have also touched Phoenicia, and such was Ithobaal's piety that at his supplication thunder-claps were heard, followed by copious rains. It was chiefly before his reign (898-866) that Tyre commenced to spread its colonies as far as Africa, Spain, etc. owing, in the first instance, probably to the danger of life and uncertainty of circumstances into which the country had been plunged bb the internal conflicts. But Ithobaal himself seems to have, encouraged colonization, and, in order to prevent the overcrowding of the old cities, to have built a number of new cities. Balezor, his son, succeeded in 865, and was followed by his son Mutton, the office of high-priest devolving on his second son, Sicharbaal. Mutton died in 833, and left two children, Elissa (Dido) and Pygmalion, who were to share the kingdom between them, while Elissa by her marriage with Sicharbaal, was to unite the high-priesthood with the crown. To this arrangement, however, the people, averse to the supreme priestly power, demurred, and Pygmalion was declared sole king. Elissa's husband having been killed, for the sake of his treasures, by the new king, and herself being-deprived of her dominion, she is said to have entered into a conspiracy with the aristocratic party, and, in the ninth year of Pygmalion's reign, assisted and followed by her brother Barca and the principal families of the land, to have reached Carthage (New Town, קרת חדשא), a colony founded some time, before by the Sidotians (about B.C. 813), and to have completely rebuilt it and laid the foundation for a power which contended with mighty Rome for the empire of the worlds.

4. The political existence of Palestine, Syria, and Phoenicia, which instead of making a joint desperate stand, kept on intriguing and plotting against each other Phoenicia, moreover, being hated and despised by her allies for her iniquitous trade in slaves kidnapped among her neighbors, chiefly in Judaea-was henceforth doomed. From this time commenced denunciations, and, at first, threats of retaliation (Joe 3:4-8; Amo 1:9-10); and, indeed, though there might be peace, there could not be sincere friendship between the two nations. But the likelihood of the denunciations being fulfilled first arose from the progressive conquests of the Assyrian  monarchs. It was not probable that a powerful, victorious, and ambitious neighbor could resist the temptation of endeavoring to subjugate the small strip of land between the, Lebanon and the sea so insignificant in extent, but overflowing with so much wealth, which by the Greeks was called Phoenicia. Accordingly, when the king of Assyria had taken the city of Samaria, had conquered the kingdom of Israel and carried its inhabitants into captivity, he turned his arms against the Phoenician cities.

At this time Tyre had reached a high point of prosperity. It possessed the island of Cyprus, with the valuable mines of the metal “copper” (so named from the island), and apparently the city of Sidon was subject to its sway. But the Assyrian king seems to have taken advantage of a revolt of the Cyprians; and what ensued is thus related by Menander, who translated the archives of Tyre into the Greek language (see Josephus, Ant. 9:14, 2):” Elulaeus reigned thirty-six years (over Tyre). This king, upon the revolt of the Kittaeans (Cyprians), sailed with a fleet against them, and reduced them to submission. On the other hand, the king of the Assyrians attacked in war the whole of Phoenicia, but soon made peace with all, and turned back. On this, Sidon and Ace (i.e. Akko or Acre) and Palsetyrus revolted from the Tyrians, with many other cities, which delivered themselves up to the king of Assyria. Accordingly, when the Tyrians would not submit to him, the king returned and fell upon them again, the Phoenicians having furnished him with sixty ships and eight hundred rowers. Against these the Tyrians sailed with twelve ships, and, dispersing the fleet opposed to them, they took five hundred men prisoners. The reputation of all the citizens in Tyre was hence increased. Upon this the king of the Assyrians, moving off his army, placed guards at their river and aqueducts to prevent the Tyrians- from drawing water. This continued for five years, and still the Tyrians held out, supplying themselves with water from wells.” But there can hardly be a doubt that Tyre, as well as the whole of Phoenicia, very soon was made tributary to Assyria, like all the neighboring countries, and the calamities brought upon them all alike by the uninterrupted war expeditions of the Assyrian monarchs could not but be felt also by the dependencies and colonies. These fell more or less about this time into the hands of new settlers, from whom again Carthage, somewhat later, wrested a part for herself.

5. After the siege of Tyre by the Assyrians (which must have taken place not long after B.C. 721), Tyre remained a powerful state with its own kings (Jer 25:22; Jer 27:3; Eze 28:2-12), remarkable for its  wealth, with territory on the mainland, and protected by strong fortifications (Eze 28:5; Eze 26:4; Eze 26:6; Eze 26:8; Eze 26:10; Eze 26:12; Eze 27:11; Zec 9:3). Our knowledge of its condition thenceforward until the siege by Nebuchadnezzar depends entirely on various notices of it by the Hebrew prophets; but some of these notices are singularly full, and especially the twenty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel furnishes us, on some points, with details such as have scarcely come down to us respecting any one city of antiquity, excepting Rome and Athens. One point especially arrests the attention, that Tyre, like its splendid daughter, Carthage, employed mercenary soldiers (Eze 27:10-11). This has been the general tendency in commercial cities on account of the high wages which may be obtained by artisans in a thriving community, compared with the ordinary pay of a soldier, and Tyre had been unable to resist the demoralizing temptation. In its service there were Phoenicians from Arvad, Ethiopians obtained through the commerce of Egypt, and hardy mountaineers from Persia. This is the first time that the name of Persia occurs in the remains of ancient literature, before its sons founded a great monarchy on the ruins of the Chaldean empire. Independently, however, of this fact respecting Tyrian mercenary soldiers, Ezekiel gives interesting details respecting the trade of Tyre. On this head, without attempting to exhaust the subject, a few leading points may be noticed. The first question is as to the countries from which Tyre obtained the precious metals, and it appears that its gold came from Arabia by the Persian Gulf (5, 22) just as in the time of Solomon it came from Arabia by the Red Sea. SEE OPHIR.

Whether the Arabian merchants, whose wealth was proverbial in Roman classical times (Horace, Od. 1, 29, 1), obtained their gold by traffic with Africa or, India, or whether it was the product of their own country, is uncertain; but so far as the latter alternative is concerned, the point will probably be cleared up in the progress of geological knowledge. On the other hand, the silver, iron, lead, and tin of Tyre came from a very different quarter of the world, viz. from the south of Spain, where the Phoenicians had established their settlement of Tarshish, or Tartessus. As to copper, we should have presumed that it was obtained from the valuable mines in Cyprus; but it is mentioned here in conjunction with Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, which points to the districts on the south of the Black Sea, in the neighborhood of Armenia, in the southern line of the Caucasus, between the Black Sea and the Caspian. The country whence Tyre was supplied with wheat, was Palestine. It may be added that the value of Palestine as a wheat country to Tyre was greatly enhanced by its proximity, as there was scarcely a part of  the kingdom of Israel on the west of the river Jordan which was distant more than a hundred miles from that great commercial city. The extreme points in the kingdom of Judah would be somewhat more distant, but the wheat probably came from the northern part of Palestine. Tyre likewise obtained from Palestine oil, honey, and balm, but not wine apparently, notwithstanding the abundance of grapes and wine in Judah (Gen 49:11). The wine was imported from Damascus, arid was called wine of Hebron, which was probably not the product of the country adjoining the celebrated city of that name, but came from the neighborhood of Damascus itself (see Porter, Handbook for Syria, 2, 495; comp. Athenaeus, 1, 51). The Bedawin Arabs supplied Tyre with lambs and rams and goats, for the rearing of which their mode of life was so well adapted. Egypt furnished linen for sails, and doubtless for other purposes, and the dyes from shellfish, which afterwards became such a source of profit to the Tyrians were imported from the Peloponnesus (comp. the Laconicas purpuras of Horace, Od. 2, 18, 7, and Pliny, 9:40). Lastly, from Dedan, in the Persians Gulf, an island occupied possibly by a Phoenician colony, horns of ivory and ebony were imported, which must originally have been obtained from India (Ezekiel 27). SEE COMMERCE.

6. When the iron grasp of Assyria began to relax, the Chaldaeo-Egyptian contest brought still greater miseries upon that unfortunate Syro- Phoenician coast, and Phoenicia, still nominally ruled by Tyre. The Phoenicians, it would appear, had allied themselves to the Egyptians, who under Psammetichus had seized upon Philistia, and were about to assist Pharaoh-Necho in his further conquest of the Tyro-Palestinian states. When, therefore, at Carchemish, the Egyptians had been defeated by the Chaldaeans, the latter instantly followed up their victory by occupying Syria, Palestine, and Phoenicia, and selling a great number of the inhabitants of the latter, about B.C. 605. A league having been formed between these states to throw off the foreign yoke, gave rise to a new Chaldean expedition against them under Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 25:22; Jer 27:3; Jer 47:4), which ended with the destruction of Jerusalem (B.C. 588) and the reduction of the sea-coast except Tyre. For thirteen years Nebuchadnezzar besieged it by water and by land, but with what degree of success is still a matter of debate. Hitzig, Gesenius, Heeren, Winer. Kenrick and others hold that the siege was a failure. It is certain that the fall of Tyre is mentioned in no ancient history-neither by Josephus, nor by the Tyrian historian Menander, nor by Philostratus. Berosus, indeed,  affirmed that Nebuchadnezzar “subdued all Syria and Phoenicia,” but Tyre is not expressly mentioned. Nay, Jerome says persons who had examined Greek and Phoenician histories, especially the writings of Nicolaus Damascenus, find no mention of the siege at all, but the reply of the father is only a retort upon the peifidia et mendacia of profane writers. Jerome's own assertion is, “Deus praedixerat, hoc sufficit.” The question then comes to be, whether the oracle of Ezekiel implies the capture of Tyre. The most graphic descriptions of this siege are found in Eze 26:7-12; Eze 26:17; Eze 28:2; Eze 29:18, etc. The prophet's language, “Son of man, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled; yet he had no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it.

Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, “Behold I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and he shall take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey and it shall be the wages for his army. I have given him the land of Egypt for his labor wherewith he served against it, because they, wrought for me, saith the Lord God” (Eze 29:18-20), would seem to imply that Nebuchadnezzar had failed; that his army had put forth all its energies, till “every head was bald” by the constant pressure of the helmet, and “every shoulder peeled” by the hard labor of the trenches and siege work, but that he had been disappointed, that he got no wages that the rich booty of the city did not fall into his possession, and that therefore Egypt was to afford him compensation “as a spoil,” “a prey,” “and wages for his army.” But surely the author or the collector of these. oracles could not so contradict himself and his own utterances as to affirm, as in 26:7-21, and then deny, the capture of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar. The narrative of Berosus and Jerome is accepted by Movers, and Ewald, the latter of whom says that Jerome's statement “quite agrees with the brief words of Ezekiel.” It may also be replied, with Havernick, Hengstenberg, Fairbairn, and others, that the meaning is that Nebuchadnezzar, though he took the city, yet found no fitting recompense, as, according to Jerome, the inhabitants had removed all their valuable property to the island. That he took Palaetyrus seems certain, though there is no proof of Jerome's assertion that, in his assault upon the island, he had nearly completed a dam, and had erected warlike engines on it.

It is plain, too, that Tyre made submission to the Chaldaean king. Many of the Tyrian royal family resided afterwards at Babylon, perhaps as hostages, and several of them were asked by the Tyrians at different times and crises to come and reign over them. These facts are proofs of the Chaldaean conquest, and that it was  more than such' a capitulation as is admitted by Niebuhr, Dunker, Kenrick. and others (Niebuhr, Gesch. Assur's, p. 216; Dunker, Gesch. des Alterthums, 1, 172; Kenrick, Phoenicia, p. 390; see Pusey, On Daniel, p. 288). Moreover, Isaiah, in his oracle against Tyre, specifically declared that it should be destroyed, not by the power which then threatened, but by the Chaldaeans, a people “formerly of no account” (23:13). The more detailed predictions of the prophet Ezekiel were delivered a hundred and twenty years later, B.C. 588. Tyre was not taken till the fifteenth year after the captivity, B.C. 573, more than seventeen hundred years, according to Josephus, after its foundation. Its destruction then must have been entire; all the inhabitants were put to the sword or led into captivity, the walls were razed to the ground, and it was made a “terror” and a desolation. It is remarkable that .one reason assigned by Ezekiel for the destruction of this proud city is its exultation at the destruction of Jerusalem. “I shall be replenished now she is laid waste” (Eze 16:2). This clearly indicates that its overthrow was posterior to that event and, if we take the seventy years during which it was; predicted by Isaiah (Isa 23:15) that Tyre should be forgotten to denote a definite term (which seems the most natural sense), we may conclude that it was not rebuilt till the same number of years after the return of the Jews from Babylon. That it was continental Tyre, and not insular Tyre, which Nebuchadnezzar besieged appears from the description of the siege which we have given us by Ezekiel; for we find that the king: cast up a mound against it, and erected engines to batter down the walls (Eze 28:8-10).

But that the city on, the island then, escaped this fate is manifest; from the Phoenician histories. But as to the latter also, at least; a show of submission, if not a subjection — leaving the native sovereigns on the throne, and their wealth and naval power untouched — was what Nebuchadnezzar gained when he ended the “wageless” siege (comp. Eze 29:17). Once more Nebuchadnezzar armed, at the end, of this war, against Egypt, but Pharaoh. Apries, swiftly marching upon Phoenicia, subduing it, and destroying its fleet, prevented this expedition. In this expedition; Apries besieged Sidon, fought a naval battle with Tyre, and reduced the whole of the coast of Phoenicia, though this could not have had lasting effects (Herod. 2, 161; Diod. 1, 68, Movers, as phonische Alterthum, 2, 451). The rule of Nebuchadnezzar over Tyre, though real, may have been light and in the nature of an; alliance; and it may have been in. this sense that Merbal, a subsequent Tyrian king, was sent for to Babylon (Josephus, Cont. Apion. 1, 21). At this time the ancient constitution of Tyre was changed. Ithobaal had been followed by Baal, but  after Baal two judges (suffetes) took for a certain period the place of the monarch. We hear of, internal commotions-natural enough in a country: and city upon which calamity after calamity had fallen in, so short a time 1 and the existence of two parties in the, commonwealth that looked respectively to Chaldoea and to Egypt could not but foster those internal dissensions., In 538, while Eiromus stood at the head of the Tyrian or Phoenician affairs, Cyrus captured Babylon, and thus, became master also of Phoenicia, which had reverted to; this power. At that time Sidon, being made the royal; residence, again resumed the hegemony.

7. During the Persian domination the Tyrians were subject in, name to the Persian king and may have given him tribute. With the rest of Phoenicia, they had submitted to the Persians without striking a blow; perhaps through hatred of the Chaldees, perhaps solely from prudential motives. But their connection with the Persian king was not slavish. Thus, when Cambyses ordered them to join in an expedition against Carthage, they refused compliance, on account of their solemn engagements and parental relation to that colony; and Cambyses did not deem it right to use force towards them (Herod. 3, 19). Afterwards they fought with Persia against Greece, and furnished vessels of war in the expedition of Xerxes against Greece (ibid. 12, 98); and Mapên, the son of Sirom the Tyrian, is mentioned among those who, next to the commanders, were the most renowned in the fleet. It is worthy of notice that at this time Tyre seems to have been, inferior in power to Sidon. These two cities were less than twenty English miles distant from each other; and it is easy to conceive that in the course of centuries their relative importance might fluctuate, as would be very possible in modern times with two neighboring cities, such, for example, as Liverpool and Manchester. It is possible, also, that Tyre may have been seriously weakened by its long struggle against Nebuchadnezzar. Under the Persian dominion, Tyre and Sidon supplied cedarwood again to the Jews for the building of the second Temple and this wood was sent by sea to Joppa, and thence to Jerusalem, as had been the case with the materials for the first Temple in the time of Solomon (Ezr 3:7).

Under the Persians, likewise, Tyre was visited by a historian, from whom we might have derived valuable information respecting its condition (Herod. 2, 44). But the information actually supplied by him is scanty as the motive of his voyage seems to have been solely to visit the celebrated Temple of Melkarth (the Phoenician.  Hercules), which was situated in the island, and' was highly venerated. He gives no details as to the city, and merely specifies two columns which he observed in the temple, one of gold and the other of emerald; or, rather, as is reasonably conjectured by Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, of green glass (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 2, 81,82). Under the successive Persian rulers Phoenicia was allowed to0 retain many of its national institutions, and even a certain amount of independence, in return for which it paid a comparatively small tax and placed its again powerful fleet at the disposal of the conquerors, who entirely lacked that most vital element of naval power. Together, with Philistia and Cyprus, it was incorporated under Darius Hystaspis in the fifth nomos, or circle, of the empire; and up to the time of Xerxes the relations between the conquerors and the conquered were of a perfectly friendly nature. But when this king, during his Greek invasion, had managed to destroy the highly prized Phoenician fleet almost completely, and to this calamity added galling measures and humiliations without end, the people became so exasperated that they took part, under Sidon's leadership, in the revolt of Egypt against Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, about the middle of the 4th century, which ended most disastrously for the whole country, and particularly for Sidon, which, wealth and all, was fired by its own inhabitants. Tyre afterwards (350) again resumed the sway, until, after the battle on the Issus, all the Phoenician cities except herself paid their allegiance to the Macedonian warrior.

8. It was in consequence of this contumacy that Tyre was assailed for the third time by a great conqueror; and if some uncertainty hangs over the siege by Nebuchadnezzar, the results of the siege by Alexander were clear and undeniable. It was essential to the success of his military plans that the Phoenician fleet should be at his command, and that he should not be liable through their hostility to have his communications by sea with Greece and Macedonia suddenly cut off; and he accordingly summoned all the Phoenician cities to submit to his rule. All the rest of them, including Aradus, Byblus, and Sidon, complied with his demands, and the seamen of those cities in the Persian fleet brought away their ships to join him. Tyre alone, calculating probably at first on the support of those seamen, refused to admit him within its walls; and then ensued a memorable siege which lasted seven months, and the success of which was the greatest of all the achievements which Alexander up to that time had attempted. At that time Tyre was situated on an island nearly half a mile from the mainland; it was completely surrounded by prodigious walls, the loftiest portion of which on  the side fronting the mainland reached a height not less than one hundred and fifty feet;” and, notwithstanding his persevering efforts, he could not have succeeded in his attempt, if the harbor of Tyre to the north had not been blockaded by the Cyprians, and that to the south by the Phoenicians. Moreover, owing to internal disturbances, Carthage was unable to afford any assistance to its parent state. For seven months Tyre sustained one of the most remarkable sieges ever recorded (B.C. 332). Palbetyrus having been razed to the ground, the island-city was connected by the conqueror with the mainland by means of a mole, which, once destroyed, had to be reconstructed entirely anew. An immense fleet was collected, the ablest engineers of Phoenicia and Cyprus exercised all their skill on the construction of new battering and other machines; while the means of defense on the part of the Tyrians were as cunning as they were successful, and fearfully galling to the besiegers. At last Tyre fell under a furious double attack, and, provoked by their desperate resistance even after the town was already taken, the soldiery fired it and massacred an immense number of the inhabitants. In accordance with the barbarous policy of ancient times, 30,000 of its inhabitants; including slaves, free females, and free children, were sold as slaves (Arrian, 4:24, 9; Diodorus, 17:46). Alexander replaced the population by new colonists, chiefly Carians, and soon again the exceptionally favorable position of the place regained for it part of its ancient prosperity, though its trade is said to have suffered by the vicinity and rivalry of Alexandria.

9. Ptolemy had, after Alexander's death, annexed Phoenicia to his kingdom; but when, in B.C. 315, Antigonus returned from Babylonia, he easily expelled his garrisons from all the Phoenician cities save Tyre, which only surrendered after an eighteen months siege. The boundaries of its territory at that period were: Sarepta to the north, the “Tyrian Ladder” to the south, and Kedes and Baka in Galilee to the east. Under the Macedonian successors of Alexander, it shared the fortunes of the Seleucide, who bestowed on it many privileges; and there are still in existence coins of that epoch with a Phoenician and Greek inscription (Eckhel, Doctr. Nusmmorum Vet. 3, 379, etc.; Gesenius, Mionum. Phoen. p. 262-264, and Tab. 34).

10. Beyond this nothing particular is known of Tyre from this time forth to the time of the civil wars of Rome-with which empire Phoenicia had been  incorporated together with Syria by Pompey-when Cassius divided Syria into small provinces and sold them separately. Tyre for a short period thus became a principality again with a king of her own. Under the Romans it thus at first continued to enjoy a kind of freedom; for Josephus mentions that when Cleopatra pressed Antony to include Tyre and Sidon in a gift of Phoenician and Jewish territory which he made to her, he steadily refused, knowing them to have been “free cities from their ancestors” (Ant. 15:4, 1). Subsequently, however, on the arrival of Augustus in the East (A.D. 20), he is said to have deprived the two cities of their liberties for seditious conduct (ἐδουλώσατο, Dion Cassius, 64, 7). Still the prosperity of Tyre in the time of Augustus was undeniably great. Strabo gives an account of it at that period (16, 2, 23), and speaks of the great wealth, which it derived from the dyes of the celebrated Tyrian: purple, which, as is well-known were extracted from shell-fish found on the coast, belonging to a species of the gelius Murex.

In the days of Ezekiel, the Tyrians had imported purple from the Peloponnesus; but they had since learned to extract the dye for themselves; and they had the advantage of having shell-fish on their coast better adapted for this purpose even than those on the Lacedaemonian coast (Pausaniasn 3, 21, 6); Strabo adds that the great number of dyeing- works rendered the city unpleasant as a place of residence. He further speaks of the houses as consisting of many stories even of more than in the houses at Rome-which is precisely what might be expected in a prosperous fortified city of limited area, in which ground-rent would be high. Pliny the Elder gives additional information respecting the city, for in describing it he says that the circumference of the city proper (i.e. the city on the peninsula) was twenty-two stadia, while that of the whole city, including Palaetyrus, was nineteen Roman miles (Fist. Nat. 5, 17). The accounts of Strabo and Pliny have a peculiar interest in this respect, that they tended to convey an idea of what the city must have been when visited' by Christ (Mat 15:21; Mar 7:24). It was perhaps more populous than Jerusalem; and if so, it was undoubtedly the largest city which he is known to have visited. It was not much more than thirty miles distant from Nazareth, where Christ mainly lived as a carpenter's son during the greater part of his life (Mat 2:23; Mat 4:12-13; Mat 4:18; Mar 6:3). We may readily conceive that he may often have gone to Tyre while yet unknown to the world; and whatever uncertainty there may be as to the extent to which the Greek language was likely to be spoken at Nazareth, at Tyre and in its neighborhood there must have been excellent opportunities for conversation in that language, with which he seems to have been  acquainted (Mar 7:26). At an early period a Christian community was formed there (Act 21:3; Act 21:7). It was early the seat of a Christian bishopric, and Cassius, bishop of Tyre, is named as having been present at the Council of Caesarea towards the close of the 2nd century (Reland Palestina, p. 1054).

For a long time Tyre retained her manufactures and trade, though a mere shadow of what these once had been. Chiefly with regard to her dyeing produce Hadrian granted Tyre the title of metropolis, and it formed the principal naval station on the Tyrian coast. Once again it was fired in A.D. 193, when it took part with Septimius Severus against Pescennius Niger in their contest for the crown, and Severus gratefully bestowed upon the place, which he peopled with his third legion, the title of colony and the Jus Italicum. Such was its elastic vitality that at the time of Constantine it again equaled all the Eastern cities in wealth and commercial prosperity. Jerome, in the 4th century, calls it the noblest and most beautiful city of Phoenicia, and expresses his astonishment at the apparent nonfulfilment of the prophecy which threatened its eternal desolation (“Nec edificaberis ultra videtur facere qusestionem, quomodo non sit aedificata? quam hodie cernimus Phocenices nobilissimam et pulcherriimam civitatem”).

11. In the 7th century took place the extraordinary Arabian revolution under Mohammed which has given a new religion to so many millions of mankind. In the years A.D. 633-638, all Syria and Palestine, from the Dead Sea to Antioch, were conquered by the caliph Omar. This conquest was so complete that in both those countries the language of Mohammed has almost totally supplanted the language of Christ. In Syria there are only three villages where Syriac (or Aramaic) is the vernacular language. In Palestine it is not the language of a single native; and in Jerusalem, to a stranger who understands what is involved in this momentous revolution, it is one of the most suggestive of all sounds to hear the muezzin daily call Mohammedans to prayers in the Arabic language of Mohammed within the sacred precincts where once stood the Temple in which Christ worshipped in Hebrew or in Aramaic. (As to the Syriac language, see Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, 2, 551.) But even this conquest did not cause the overthrow of Tyre. The most essential conditions on which peace was granted to Tyre, as to other Syrian cities, were the payment of a poll- tax, the obligation to give board and lodging for three days to every Moslem traveler, the wearing a peculiar dress, the admission of Moslems into the churches, the doing away with all crosses and all sounds of bells  the avoiding of all insulting expressions towards the Mohammedan religion, and the prohibition to ride on horseback or to build new churches (see Well, Gesch. der Chalifen, 1, 81-82).

Some of these conditions were humiliating and nearly heart-breaking; but if submitted to, the lives and private property of the inhabitants remained untouched.: Notwithstanding the establishment of an imperial dyeing manufactory at Constantinople, Tyre yet retained her ancient celebrity for her purple, which was imported into Lombardy at the time of Charlemagne. Under the caliphs it enjoyed the benefits of a mild and enlightened dominion, and during the crusades was much admired both for its natural beauty and its fine edifices and its generally prosperous aspect. It again had at that time to sustain a long siege, but finally surrendered (1124), and was made an archbishopric, bestowed four years afterwards upon William of Tyre, the chronicler of the crusades. In August, 1192, it was fixed as the northern boundary of the Christian ‘territories in Palestine, and continued to flourish, chiefly through the Venetian trade, as a commercial city until the conquest of Syria by Selim I in 1516, from which time forth its decline, further aided by the discovery of the New World and the route to Asia by the Cape of Good Hope, has been rapid and complete.

IV. Present Condition. — In the first half of the 14th century, Tyre was visited by Sir John Maundeville, who says, speaking of Tyre, which is now called Sûr, here was once a great and goodly city of the Christians; but the Saracens have destroyed it in great part, and they guard that haven carefully “for fear of the Christians” (Wright, Early Travels in Palestine, p. 141). About 1610-11 it was visited by Sandys, who said of it, “But this once famous Tyre is now no other than a heap of ruins; yet have they a reverent aspect, and do instruct the pensive beholder with their exemplary frailty. It hath two harbors, that on the north side the fairest and best throughout all the Levant (which the cursors enter at their pleasure); the other choked with the decays of the city” (Purchas, Pilgrims, 2. 1393). Towards the close of the same century, in 1697, Maundrell says of it, “On the north side it has an old Turkish castle, besides which there is nothing here but a mere Babel of broken walls, pillars, vaults, etc., there being not so much as an entire house left. Its present inhabitants are only a few poor wretches that harbor in vaults and subsist upon fishing” (see Harris, Voyages and Travels, 2, 846). Lastly, without quoting at length Dr.  Richard Pococke, who in 1737-40 stated (see vol. 10 of Pinkerton, Voyages and Travels, p. 470) that, except some janissaries, there were few other inhabitants in the city than two or three Christian families, the words of Hasselquist, the Swedish naturalist, may be recorded, as they mark the lowest point of depression which Tyre seems to have reached.

He was there in May, 1751, and he thus speaks of his visit: “We followed the seashore… and came to Tyre, now called Zur, where we lay all night. None of these cities, which formerly were famous, are so totally ruined as this except Troy. Zur now scarcely can be called a miserable village, though it was formerly Tyre, the queen of the sea. Here are about ten inhabitants, Turks and Christians, who live by fishing (Voyages and Travels in the Levant [Lond. 1766]). A slight change for the better began soon after Volney states that in 1766 the Metawileh took possession of the place, and built a wall round it twenty feet high, which existed when he visited Tyre nearly twenty years afterwards. At that time Volney estimated the population at fifty or: sixty poor families. Since the beginning of the present century there has been a partial revival of prosperity. But it has been visited at different times during the last thirty years by Biblical scholars, such as Robinson, Stanley (Sinai and Pal. p. 270), and Renan (Letter in the Moniteur, July 11, 1861), who all concur in the account of its general aspect of desolation. Mr. Porter, who resided several years at Damascus, and had means of obtaining correct information, stated in 1858 that “the modern town, or rather village, contains from 3000 to 4000 inhabitants, about one half being Metawileh; and the other Christians” (Handbook, p. 391). They are living among the broken ruins of its former magnificence, eking out a scanty livelihood upon insignificant exports of tobacco, cotton, wool, and wood. The place as it now stands was founded under the old name Sur in 1766, and suffered very considerably during the earthquake in 1837. The remains of an ancient cathedral church probably enclose the bones of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa and of Origen. About one and a half mile distant from Tyre is the so-called Tomb of Hiram, an immense sarcophagus of limestone, popularly supposed to contain the corpse of that king. SEE HIRAM.

The present city lies only upon the eastern part of the island, on the junction of the island and isthmus. The houses are mostly mere hovels, one story high, with flat roofs; and the streets are narrow, crooked, and filthy. Yet the numerous palm-trees and pride of India trees interspersed among the houses and gardens throw over the plain an Oriental charm. One of the  best accounts of its present appearance is given by Dr. Robinson, who spent a Sabbath there in 1838 (Bibl. Res. 3, 395): “I continued my walk,” says he, “along the shore of the peninsula, part of which is now unoccupied except as ‘a place to spread nets upon,' musing upon the pride and fall of ancient Tyre. Here was the little isle, once covered by her palaces and surrounded by her fleets; but, alas! thy riches and thy fame, thy merchandise, thy mariners and thy pilots, thy calkers, and the occupiers of thy merchandise that were in thee-where are they? Tyre has indeed become like ‘the top of a rock.' The sole tokens of her more ancient splendor columns of red and gray granite, sometimes forty or fifty heaped together, or marble pillars-lie broken and strewed beneath the waves in the midst of the sea; and the hovels that now nestle upon a portion of her site present no contradiction of the dread decree, ‘Thou shalt be built no more.'

The downfall and permanent desolation of Tyre is one of the most memorable accomplishments of prophecy which the annals of the world exhibit. The sins which sealed its ruin were, in the words of the sacred writers, these: “Because that Tyrus hath said against Jerusalem, Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people; she is turned unto me; I shall be replenished, now she is laid waste” (Eze 26:2). “Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a god, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas” (Eze 28:2). “The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians, that ye might remove them far from their border” (Joe 3:6).

V. Literature. — See, in addition to the works cited above, Cellarii Notit. 2, 381 sq.; Hengstenberg, De Rebus Syriorum (Berol. 1832); Rhyner, De Tyro (Basil. 1715); Camem, De Nave Tyria (Viteb. 1714); Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.; Poulan de Bossay, Rechierches sur Tyre (Paris, 1864); Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 260 sq.; Gesenius, Comment. zu Jesa. 1, 707 sq.; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 2, 229; Badeker, Palestine, p. 426 sq.; Ridgaway, The Lord's Land, p. 604 sq.

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

             The archeology of Es-Smir is minutely examined in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 1;72 sq.; comp. Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Soc.," July 1881, page 178 sq.

## Tyre, Council Of[[@Headword:Tyre, Council Of]]

             The Arians, through Eusebius of Nicomedia, obtained the convocation of this council from the emperor Constantine, A.D. 335, under pretext of thereby healing the divisions which existed among the bishops; but their real intention was to oppress Athanasius. The bishops who were summoned to attend were selected by the Eusebian party, and came from  Egypt, Libya, Asia; and most of the eastern provinces. The most noted were Marius of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicea, Ursaces of Singedunum, and Yalens of Mursia; in all about sixty Arian bishops attended. There were also a few bishops present who were not of the Eusebian faction, as Maximus of Jerusalem, Marcellus of Ancyra, Alexander of Thessalonica, etc. Constantine sent the count Dionysius to keep order, who, as the event showed, was completely devoted to the Eusebian cause, and by his violence destroyed all liberty of debate.

Atlhanasius, compelled by the order of the emperor, came to the council, attended by forty-nine Egyptian bishops, among whom were Potamon and Paphnutius. No accusation was brought against Athanasius on account of his faith; but he was arraigned for having killed a Meletian bishop named Arsenius, and for having forcibly broken into a church while Ischyrus, a pretended priest, was celebrating; and for having overturned the altar and broken the sacred chalice. He was made to stand as a criminal while Eusebius and the others sat as his judges, against which treatment Potamon of Heraclea made a vehement protest, heaping reproaches upon Eusebins. Prom the very first the Egyptian bishops protested against the proceedings; but their objections were not heeded. Sozomen says that Athanasius appeared frequently before the council, and defended himself admirably, listening quietly to all the calumnious accusations brought against him, and replying with patience and wonderful sagacity.

However, his enemies, not contented with the charges which they had already brought against him, dared to impeach his purity, and introduced into the council a debauched woman, whom they had bribed to assert that she had been ravished-by him. The utter falsehood of the charge was, however, triumphantly proved; for Athanasius having deputed one of his priests, named Thimoteus, to reply for him, the woman, who was ignorant even of the person of the holy bishop, mistaking Thimoteus for him, declared that he was the man who had offered violence to her at such a time and place. Neither were his accusers more successful in their endeavor to fix upon him the murder of Arsenius, who, in the midst of their false statements, appeared before the council alive. Foiled in both these infamous attempts, the Arians were filled with fury, and endeavored to offer violence to him; in which, however, they were prevented by the officers of Constantine. Nothing now remained but the charge of having broken tile chalice, and there being no proof ready, and the clergy of the country where the offence was said to have taken place having solemnly sworn to the falsehood of the charge, a  deputation was sent to make inquiry on: the spot (in the Mareotis), composed of the most decided of his enemies. In the meantime, Athanasius, seeing that his condemnation, by fair means or foul, was resolved, withdrew from Tyre. The deputies, upon their return, declared that they had found the charge correct; and upon this statement, sentence of deposition was pronounced, on the plea of his having been convicted of a part of the accusation brought against him. More than fifty bishops protested against the acts of this assembly. See Malmsi, Concil. 2, 435. SEE ATHANASIUS.

## Tyrian[[@Headword:Tyrian]]

             (Τω῏/ριος), a native or inhabitant of the city of Tyre (Ecclesiastes 46:18). The corresponding Heb. word (צֹרַי, Tsori) is rendered by the indirect phrase of Tyre in the A. V. (1Ki 7:14; 1Ch 22:4; 2Ch 2:14; Ezra 3, 7; Neh 13:16), and so likewise the Greek (1 Esdr. 5, 55; 2Ma 4:10; Act 12:20).

## Tyrimmas[[@Headword:Tyrimmas]]

             in Greek mythology, was a friend of Ulysses, with whom the latter lived while on his journey from Troy to Epirus to consult the oracle about the war. Tyrimmas had a beautiful daughter, Erippe, whom Ulysses loved, and by whom he begot a son, Euryalus.

## Tyrius[[@Headword:Tyrius]]

             (i.e. the Tyrian), in Greek mythology, was; an epithet of Hercules, as adored in Cyprus.

## Tyrones Dei[[@Headword:Tyrones Dei]]

             (new soldiers of God), a name given in the early Church, to catechumens, by Tertullian (De Panitent. c. 6) and Augustine (De Fide ad Catechumen. 2, 1), because they were just entering upon that; state which made them soldiers of God and candidates of eternal life. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 11, ch 1, § 1.

## Tyropceon[[@Headword:Tyropceon]]

             (Τυροποιῶν, of the cheese-makers), the name of a valley (φάραξ) in Jerusalem, mentioned only by Josephus, who says that the city “was built,  one quarter facing another, upon two hills, separated by an intervening valley, at which over against each other the houses terminated.” Again, “The valley of the Tyropoeon, which, I have said, divided the hill of the upper town from that of the lower, extended as far as Siloamar, a fountain whose waters are sweet and copious” (War, 5, 4, 1). He also tells us that the “other hill called Akra, which sustained the lower city,” lay opposite to Mount Moriah, from which it was separated by “another broad valley;” and, further, that the whole city, situated on these two hills, “lay over against the Temple in the manner of a theatre” (Ant. 15:11, 5). Notwithstanding this repeated and seemingly definite notice, the position of the valley is still a matter of dispute. Dr. Robinson, in accordance with his theory of the site of Akra (q.v.), and of the topography of ancient Jerusalem in general, maintains that it is the small valley on the north of Zion; and the English engineers have determined that this chasm, although now inconsiderable, was formerly much deeper, being filled up with the rubbish of ages. Most archaeologists, however, have regarded the “Valley of the Cheese mongers” as identical with, the conspicuous and important one leading from the Damascus gate to the Pool of Siloam, which in all ages has been the principal drain of the internal waters of the city (Thomson, Land handbook, 2, 470; Pierotti). Jerusalem Restored, 1, 19). SEE JERUSALEM.

## Tyrrhenus[[@Headword:Tyrrhenus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a son of Hercules and Omphale, or a son of Telephus and Hiera, and a brother of Tarchon; or a son of Atys and Callithea, and brother of Lydus. He is said to have introduced the use of the great sea-shell as a trumpet. He colonized that part of Italy named after him at the time of his flight from Maeonia because of starvation.

## Tyrrhus[[@Headword:Tyrrhus]]

             in ancient Italian mythology, was a chief shepherd of Latinus, king of Italy. He was the owner of a beautiful tame deer which Silvia nursed, bathed, and ornamented with flowers. The Fury Alecto, sent from Tartarus chased this deer, so that it came within reach of Ascanius, who wounded it, whereupon it fled towards home. The angry shepherd and his sons, and invisibly the Furies also, assembled the neighboring inhabitants, and this was popularly assigned as the original cause of the war which Jeneas was obliged to carry on with the Latinians in Italy.

## Tyrus[[@Headword:Tyrus]]

             (Τύρος), the Greek form of the name of two places in Palestine.

1. The well-known city of TYRE SEE TYRE (q.v.), as the name is usually Anglicized, but “Tyrus” in the A. V. in certain passages (Jer 25:22; Jer 27:3; Jer 47:4; Eze 26:2-4; Eze 26:7; Eze 26:15; Eze 27:2-3; Eze 27:8; Eze 27:32; Eze 28:2; Eze 28:12; Eze 29:18; Hos 9:13; Amo 1:9-10; Zec 9:2-3; 2Es 1:11 Jdt 2:28; 1Ma 5:15; 2Ma 4:18; 2Ma 4:32; 2Ma 4:44; 2Ma 4:49). 2. A place described by Josephus as lying “between Arabia and Judaea, beyond the Jordan, not far from the country of Heshbon,” where Hyrcanus built a strong castle, of a sumptuous character, as the center of his power in that region (Anf. 12:4, 11). It has been identified in modern times with the magnificent ruins Airak el-Emir, four hours from Hesban, which Tristram minutely describes as corresponding to the statements of the Jewish historian (Land of Israel, p. 529).

## Tyrus, Ladder Of[[@Headword:Tyrus, Ladder Of]]

             SEE LADDER OF TYRE.

## Tyson, Michael[[@Headword:Tyson, Michael]]

             a learned English divine, was born in the, parish of All-Saints, Stamford, Nov. 19, 1740. He was educated at Benedict College, Cambridge, where he received his degrees; that of A.B. in 1764, A.M. in 1767, and B.A. in 1775. After taking his bachelor's degree, he was elected a fellow of his college. In 1766 he traveled with Mr. Gough (afterwards the celebrated antiquarian), and, after his return in the following year, was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and in 1769 a fellow of the Royal Society. In 1770 lie was ordained deacon at Whitehall Chapel; and in 1773 received the officially of the archdeaconry of Huntingdon from his father. He was, at the same time, bursar of the college, and succeeded, to the cure of St. Benedict's Church, Cambridge. In 1776 he became Whitehall preacher, and in the same year was presented by the college to the rectory of Lambourne, near Ongar, Essex. He died May 3,1780. Mr. Tyson wrote an ode On the Birth of the Prince of Wales, and another, An Ode to Peace. He was also an excellent draughtsman and painter.

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

             a Flemish painter, was born at Antwerp in 1625; and, after the death of Rubens and Vandyck, was considered one of the ablest painters of his time. He was made director of the Academy at Antwerp in 1661. “His compositions are copious and ingenious, his design more correct than is usual with painters of his country, his coloring strong, clear, and harmonious.' He died, according to best authorities, in 1692. Among his works most worthy of notice are, The Martyrdom of St. Benedict, Church of the Capuchins, Brussels: —The Crucifixion at the Church of the Barefooted Carmelites: — The Assumption of the Virgin, Church of St. James, Antwerp. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts, s.v.

## Tzschirner, Heinrich Gottlieb[[@Headword:Tzschirner, Heinrich Gottlieb]]

             a German theologian and-orator, was born Nov. 14,1778, at Mitweida, in Saxony. He graduated at Leipsic, and in February, 1800, became an adjunct to the philosophical faculty at Witteliberg. His lectures were principally concerned with empirical psychology, and yielded fruit in thie works Leben .u Ende merkw. Selbstnmrder nebst Abhandl. lib. d. Selbstmord (1805): — Ueber d. moral. Indifferentismus: and VerwanSatschaft d. Tugenden und Laster. He was also associated with Manchart in the publication of the Neues Repert. f. empir. Psychologie. In 1801 the sickness of his father called him away from the university, and he became first assistant, and, after the decease of his father, deacon at Mitweida. At that time he began a history of apologetics, but published only one volume (Leips. 1805). In the same year he was received into the theological faculty at Wittenberg, and in 1809 he removed to Leipsic, where he remained until his death, with a temporary interruption occasioned by the war of deliverance from French domination, in which he served as chaplain and gained the decoration of the green cross (1813). The literary fruitage of his campaign is contained in the volume Ueber den Krieg, etc. (Leips. 1815). He died Feb. 17, 1823, regretted by the whole community of Leipsic.

Tzschirner's theological tendency was that known in his day as aestheticism, whose aim was the reconciliation of rationalism and supernaturalism. He regarded Christianity as being in its nature a religion of reason, though introduced by a supernatural revelation. See Briefi, veranl. durch Reinhards Gestdndnisse (Leips. 1811), and Briefe einzes  Deutschen an Chateaubriand, etc., published by Krug. His Dogmatik (published by Hase, Leips. 1829) is non-committal, and contents itself with merely stating the differences of the two great opposing schools of thought in Protestant theology (see Rohr, Krit. Prediger-Bibliothek, 10:1). He was rather a historian than a systematic theologian, and-disposed to hide himself behind his work. He added the two final volumes to Schröckh's Church History since the Reformation; but his principal work, according to his own judgment, is his Fall des Heidenthums, published by Niedner (Leips. 1829).

The period following the Napoleonic wars and beginning with the jubilee of the great Reformation (1817), developed Tzschirner into a foremost defender of Protestantism and popular freedom. Enthusiastically inspired by the study of the great past of the Evangelical Church, he yet refused to confine himself to the letter of Luther's authority, but insisted upon the exercise of the Protestant principle of intellectual liberty. In view of the fact that timid statesmen endeavored to repress the enthusiasm of the nation consequent on the defeat of Napoleon, and that Romanists and would-be perverts to Romanism charged upon Protestantism the originating and development of every revolutionary tendency and excess, he devoted his brilliant diction and incisive thought to the demonstration that Protestantism tends to mature the intelligence and fix the principles of peoples; and that it therefore tends to peace and quietness, and is more favorable to any legitimate form of settled government than Romanism. Numerous works, some of which became famous and were translated into foreign languages, were the result .of this effort-e.g., Katholic us. Potes ismu s . Prtes smus s dem Standpunkte der Politik (1822). He also wrote in behalf of oppressed Protestants in France, Sardinia, and Hungary (1824), and of the liberties of Greece (1821). — His Protestant contemporaries, for their part, gave him many tokens of their appreciation of his labors in their behalf, among them the king of Denmark, who in 1826 conferred on him the Order of Danebrog.

Tzschirner had taken Reinhard for his model as a pulpit orator. His sermons are occasionally models of pulpit eloquence. They were carefully elaborated and strictly memorized, sometimes pervaded with a poetic spirit and great freshness, and characterized by the frequent use of matter drawn from Church history. His personality, voice, and manner in the pulpit gave him great power over his audiences, despite difficulties he experienced with his respiratory organs. Five volumes and several separately published  Sermons by Tzschirner are extant. His views respecting the effect of rationalistic principles upon. the preacher are contained in the article Dass die Verschiedenheit d. Dogmen Systeme kein Hi-zde-niss des Zweckes d. Kische sei, in Magazin fui christl. Pediger, 1823. His theory of homiletics sets forth that homiletics “is the art of edifying by means of speech which: harmonizes with the forms of beauty and excites into activity all the faculties if the soul, subject to the purpose of promoting piety and virtue, for which the Church exists” (see Rohl, sup. 2, 2, p. 243, art. Tzschirner als Homiletiker”).

Literature. — Krug, Tzschiriners Denkmal, etc. (Leips. 1823); H. G. Tzschirner, etc. (2nd ed. ibid. 1828); Goldhorn, Dr. H. G. Tzschirner, etc. (1828); Rohr, Krit. Prediger-Bibl. 1, 1, 126; Tittman, femoria Tzchirneri (Lips. 1829), and many others. See also Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v., where an extended list of Tzschirner's numerous works is given.