

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Tan- Tamar

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

Tan

SEE DRAGON.

Ta'nach

(⁶²⁵Joshua 21:25). *SEE TAANACH.*

Tanaim

SEE SCRIBES, JEWISH.

Tanchelm

(TANCHELIN, TANQUELIN), a fanatic who lived in the 11th century, and was identified with the opposition current in that age against the ecclesiasticism then prevailing. We are told that he despised the Church and the clergy, from the pope downward, and claimed that the true Church inhered in him and his followers; that the priestly *station* has no influence upon the sacrament of the eucharist, worth and sanctity being the only efficient qualifications of the minister. He declared himself to be possessed of the Holy Ghost, and even to be God, as Christ is God; and he affianced himself with the Virgin Mary, whose image he presented to the vision of the assembled multitude, demanding sponsalia, which were readily contributed. Water in which he had bathed was distributed for drinking purposes, with the assurance that its use formed a sacred and powerful sacrament to the good of the body as well as the soul. Tanchelm's followers were chiefly drawn from the lower classes of society, and were mostly women. His operations were carried on along the coast of the Netherlands, and particularly in Utrecht, where disturbances were occasioned which called forth the successful interference of archbishop Frederick of Cologne. Tanchelm then removed to Bruges and Antwerp, where he caused still greater tumults than at Utrecht, and was killed on shipboard by a priest in A.D. 1124 or-1125. His sect continued to exist somewhat longer, but was ultimately scattered or reclaimed to the Church. See Hahn, *Gesch. d. Ketzer in Mittelalter* (Stuttg. 1845), 1, 459 sq.; Okken, *Diss. de Priva Rel. Christ. Med. Evo inter Nederlandos*, etc. (Groning. 1846), p. 43 sq.; *Ep. Traj. Eccl. ad Fridericum, Archiepiscopum Colon.*, in Tengnagel, *Coll. Vet. Monum. contra Schismaticos* (Ingolst. 1612), p. 368 sq.; Du Plessis d'Argentre, *Coll. Jud. de Novis Erroribus*, etc. (Paris, 1728), 1, 11 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Tanchelmians

SEE TANCHELM.

Tanchum

(OF JERUSALEM) BEN-JOSEF, also called “*R. Tanchum Jerushalmi*” of *Haleb*, flourished about A.D. 1265-80. The first who made Tanchum’s name known to the learned world was the famous scholar Schnurrer, who in 1791 published ch. 1-12 of Tanchum’s Arabic commentary on Judges: *R. Tanchumi Hierosolymitani ad Libros V. T. Commentarii Arabici Specimen una cum Annotationibus ad aliquot Loca Libri Judicum* (Tübingen, 1791). Since that time his exegetical works have been brought to light, though nothing of his life is known except that he must have lived shortly after the devastation of Palestine by the Mongolians, A.D. 1260. He wrote a commentary in Arabic on the whole Old Test., entitled **ʿaybl a batk**, i.e. *The Book of Exposition*, of which the following are still extant in MS. at the Bodleian Library: *a.* the commentary on the earlier prophets, i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings (Cod. Pocock 314); *b.* commentaries on Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the minor prophets (Cod. Pocock 344); *c.* commentaries on the five Megilloth (i.e. Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther) and Daniel (Cod. Pocock 320); *d.* **twrfphl a j rçl a batk**, i.e. *The Haphtaroth*, or *Lessons from the Prophets*, translated into Arabic (Cod. Hunt. 607). These commentaries are preceded by elaborate introductions treating on the general import of Holy Writ. Besides the commentary on Lamentations, **ʿaybl a batk ʿm twnyq rps j rç**, which has been edited by W. Cureton, *Tanchumi Hierosolymitani Comm. Arabicus in Lamentationes e Codice unico Bodleiano Literis Hebraicis exarato. Descripsit Characteres Arabico et edidit* (Lond. 1843), the following portions have been published: 1. Commentary on *Joshua*, edited by Haarbrücker, in the *Wissenschctliche Blatter aus der Veitel-Heine-Ephraim’schen Lehranstalt* (Berlin, 1862); 2. on *Judges*, in part by Schnurrer, ch. 1-12, and ch. 13-21 by Haarbrucker (Halle, 1847); 3. on *Samuel* and *Kings*, by Haarbrücker (Leipsic, 1844); 4. on *Habakkuk*, with a French translation by Dr. Munk (Paris, 1843, in Cahen’s Bible, vol. 13). “R. Tanchum’s contributions to Biblical exegesis,” says Dr. Ginsburg, “are very important to its history. His commentaries are based upon the literal and grammatical meaning of the text. He frequently avails himself of the labors of Hai Gaon, Danash ibn-Librat, Ibn-Chajug,

Ibn-Ganach, Ibn-Ezra, Maimonides, etc.; rejects the traditional interpretations (comp. comm. on ^{<07137>}Judges 12:7; 20:28); transposes sundry portions of the sacred narratives, so as to point out their chronological order (comp. ^{<07180>}Judges 18:1; 20:28), and, like Maimonides, distinguishes different degrees and kinds of prophecy (comp. ^{<07634>}Judges 6:34; 13:1; 20:28).” He also wrote an *Arabic Lexicon* to the Mishna, entitled **ypakl a dçrml a**, i.e. *A Sufficient Guide*, treating on the relation of the language of the Mishna and of Maimonides *ald ha-Chazaka*. There are four different MSS. of this work in the Bodleian Library, viz. Cod. Pocock 297, written by Saadia ben-Jacob in 1388; Cod. Hunt. 129, by Saadia ben-David in 1451; Cod. Hunt. 621, by Solomo ben-David ben-Binjamin in 1393; and Cod. Pocock 215. 216, 229, written in 1449. He also wrote a Grammar of the Old Test. Hebrew, quoted by Tanchum himself, but which has not yet come to light. See De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 145 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 2, 56 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* col. 2666-2669; Ewald, *Beitrdge zur Gesch. d. dltesten Aisleguig u. Spracherklirung des A. Test.* (Stuttgart, 1844), 1, 151 sq.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Leipsic, 1873), 7:144 sq.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, p. 44; Keil, *Introd. to the Old Test.* 2, 384 sq.; Bleek, *Eiznleitugn in das Alte Test.* p. 106; Goldziher, *Studien über Tanchuns Jeruschalmi* (Leipsic, 1870), Geiger, *Judische Zeitschrift*, 1862, p. 193; 1871, p. 199; Gratz, *Monatsschrift*, 1870, p. 239, 285; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 2, 1306. (B. P.)

Tanchuma ben-Abba

who flourished A.D. 380, is the reputed author of the celebrated commentary on the Pentateuch called **amwj nt çrdm**, for which see the art. **SEE MIDRASH**. The latest edition is that published by E. Perlmutter (Stettin, 1864). See First, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 409; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* col. 2669; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 4:458, 558; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 1159 sq.; 3, 1166 sq.; 4:1035; Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortrdge* (Berlin, 1832), p. 226-238; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 307; id. *Annales Hebraeo-typographici*, p. 24. (B. P.)

Tancred, Christopher

an English benefactor, was the son of Sir Richard Tancred, and died unmarried in 1754, leaving his house and estate at Whixley for the maintenance of twelve decayed gentlemen who had borne arms in the

service of their country. He also founded four medial exhibitions at Caius College; four in divinity at Christ's College, Cambridge; and four law studentships at Lincoln's Inn.

Tancred of Bologna

was a most celebrated canonist of the 13th century (who must not be confounded with another Tancred of Corneto; comp. De Savigny, *Gesch. d. rom. Rechts im Mittelalter* [2d ed.], 5, 135, and p. 115, 116). His preceptors were Azo in Roman and Laurentius in canon law. In 1210 he was himself a teacher (*decretorum magister*) at Bologna, and entrusted with the management of important affairs by both the pope and the city. He belonged to the Chapter of Bologna, and in 1226 was made archdeacon by Hoiorius III, which position then included among its duties the supervision of promotions in the university. The year of his decease is not known, but it must have been prior to 1236 as the archdeaconate is then found to be in other hands (see Sarti, *De Claris Archigynynasii Bononiens.*

Professoribus, pars 2, fol. 28, 29, 36, 37, 181). His literary remains include a *Summa de Matrimonio*, written between 1210 and 1213; first published, with numerous interpolations, by Simon Schard (Cologne, 1563), and again, in revised form, by Wunderlich (Göttingen, 1841): — an *OrdoJudiciarius (Ordinariustancredi)*, written about 1214, and afterwards revised in 1225. 1234, and often by unknown scholars. It was formerly believed that this work originated in about 1227, but the earlier date is now accepted. An edition of the work in its original form was issued by Bergmann (ibid. 1842). Tancred's lectures at Bologna were, among other matters, upon the collections of decretals received into the curriculum of Bologna after the close of Gratian's collection, and resulted in *Apparatus*, or commentaries, on the first three compilations. He had no part, however, in the preparation of the fifth ancient compilation. In addition to the above, there is extant of Tancred's works a manuscript list of bishoprics throughout the Church, arranged in the order of provinces (De Savigny, *ut sup.* p. 117, 118). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tailred of Sicily

the son of Eudes, a Norman baron, and of Emma, the sister of Robert Guiscard, was one of the celebrated heroes of the first Crusade, and was born after the middle of the 11th century. Some chroniclers profess to detail the events of his early life, describing him as the most accomplished

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

Tan'humeth

[some *Tanhu'meth*] (Heb. *Tanchu'meth*, תַּחְמִי מַתְיָהוּ; *consolation*; Sept. **Θαναμάθ** or **Θαναεμέθ** 'v.r. **Θανεμάθ**, etc.; Vulg. *Thanehumeth*) the father (Fürst says *mother*, as the name is fem.) of Seraiah, in the time of Gedaliah (²²⁵²2 Kings 25:23, where he appears as a Netophathite by the clerical omission of another name, as is evident from the parallel passage, ²⁴¹⁸Jeremiah 40:8). B.C. ante 582.

Ta'nis

(**Τάνις**, the Greek form (Judith 1, 10) of the Egyptian city *Zoan* (q.v.).

Tankerfield, George

an English martyr, was a native of York, and followed the occupation of a cook. Seeing the great cruelty shown by the papists under queen Mary, he began to doubt their doctrines and to abhor them. After study, reflection, and prayer, he abjured popery, whereupon he was arrested and taken to Newgate, in February, 1555. Being summoned before bishop Bonner, he declared his convictions concerning auricular confession, the mass, etc. He was sentenced to death, and was burned at the stake Aug. 26. See Milner's Fox, *Hist. of Christ. Martyrdom*, 2, 770.

Tanner

(**Βυρσεύς**, Hebraized in the Talmud as **ysrwb**, also **yqsrwb**), the occupation of Simon of Joppa (~~406~~ Acts 9:43; 10:6, 32). This trade, on account of the bad smell connected with it (comp. Schol. on Aristoph. *Eq.* 44; Petron. *Sat.* 11), was despised among the Jews (*Kethuboth*, 7:10; *Megillah*, 3, 2; see Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.* i, 447; Wettstein, *N.T.* 2, 516). Those who followed it were called by the Greeks **βυρσοδρέψαι**, in Latin *coriarii*, *subo7tarii* (Guter, *Inscript.* p. 1548, No. 8). They usually had their work-place outside the cities (Artemid. 1, 51; Mishna, *Baba Batihra*, 2, 9), or on streams or the sea (~~406~~ Acts 10:6). See Walch, *Dissert. in Act. Apost.* 2, 101 sq. — Winer. **SEE MECHANIC**. The ancient Egyptians used the bark of various trees for tanning (Wilkinson, 2. 106). **SEE LEATHER**. The tanneries of Joppa are now on the shore south of the cit(Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 281). Several circumstances, however, confirm the tradition of the present "house of Simon" there (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 269). **SEE SIMON**.

Tanner

the name of several theological scholars and writers.

1. ADAM, born at Innsbruck in 1572, a Jesuit, lectured on theology at Ingolstadt and Vienna, was made chancellor of the University of Prague, and died March 25, 1632, at Unken. He wrote, *Bericht uber die Disputation zu Regensburg*, 1601 (Munich, 1602): — *Theologia Scholastica* (4 vols.): — *Anatomia Confessionis Augustance*: — *Apologia*

pro Societate Jesu (Vienna, 1618): *Disputationes Theologie in Summam Thomae* : — *Astrologia Sacra* (Ingolstadt, 1621).

2. CONRAD, born at Schwyz Dec. 28, 1752, was made abbot of Einsiedeln in 1808, and died April 7, 1825. He wrote. *Die Bildung des Geistlichen durch Geistesübungen* (Augsburg, 1807, 2 vols.; 6th ed. 1847): — *Berachtungen zur sittlichen Aufklärung im 19ten Jahrhundert* (ibid. 1804): — *Betrachtungen uaf die Feste des Herrn und der Heiligen* (ibid. 1829 sq.).

3. MATTHIAS, born at Pilsen in 1630, a Jesuit, was professor of philosophy and theology, and was sent to Rome in 1675 as procurator of his order. He died about 1705. He wrote, *Cruentum Christi Sacriticium Incruenio Missae Sacrificio explicatum* (Prague, 1669): — *Contra Omnes impie Agentes in Locis Sacris* [Latin and Bohemian] : — *Societas Jesusque ad Sanguinis et Vitae Profusionem Militans* [a glorification of the Jesuitic mission] (ibid. 1675; in German, 1683); similar. is *Societas Jesu Apostolorum Imitatrix sive Gesta Praeclara et Virtutes*, etc. [Latin and German] (ibid. 1694 and 1701): *Historia Montis Oliveti in Moravia ad Strambergam Siti* [Bohemian] (ibid. 1666). (B. P.)

4. THOMAS, an English divine and antiquary, was born at Market Lavington, Wiltshire, in 1674. He entered Queens College, Oxford in 1689; was admitted clerk in 1690; graduated in 1693; entered holy orders at Christmas, 1694; became chaplain of All-Souls' College in January following; fellow of the same in 1697; and chancellor of Norfolk and rector of Thorpe, near Norwich, in 1706. He was installed prebendary of Ely Sept. 10, 1713; archdeacon of Norfolk Dec. 7, 1721; canon of Christ Church Feb. 3, 1723; prolocutor of the House of Convocation in 1727; and was consecrated bishop of St. Asaph Jan. 23, 1732. He died at Christ Church, Oxford, Dec. 14, 1735. After his death appeared, *Notitia Monastica, or an Account of all the Abbeys, Priories, etc., formerly in England and Wales*, etc., with additions by the Rev. John Tanner (Lond. 1744, fol.; Camb. 1787, fol.) : *Bibliotheca Britannico Hiberaica, sive de Scriptoribus, qui in Anglia, etc.* (Lond. 1748, fol.; 250 copies).

See *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Wetzter u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.; *Regensburger Conversations-Lexikon*, s.v.; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Littérateur*, 1, 124; 2, 46, 797; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer.*

Authors, s.v. On Adam Tanner, see also Werner, Gesch. der kathol. Theol. seit demn trident. Concil. (Munich, 1866), p. 7,17, 25.

Tanquelmians

SEE TANCHELMIAN.

Taoists, Taoism

SEE LAO-TZU.

Tapers, Early Use of

Picture for Tapers

It became customary at an early period to burn tapers in churches on various occasions. This was done during the reading of the gospel, and is partly excused by Jeromte. He says to Vigilantius, "We do not light candles in open day, therefore you slander us without reason." He confesses, however, that some untaught laymen and simple religious women, "of whom we may certainly say that they have a zeal of God without knowledge," do such a thing in honor of martyrs; but he asks, What is the harm? And then he refers to a custom prevalent in the East: "In all churches of the East they light tapers, without any respect to the relics of martyrs, when the gospel is to be read, even when the sun shines brightly; which is done, not for the sake of giving light, but as an expression of joy. Hence the virgins in the Gospel had their lamps lighted; and the apostles were warned to let their loins be girded about, and their lights burning.' Hence it is said, of John also, 'He was a burning and a shining light.' Also under the figure of a material light is represented that light of which we read in the Psalter, Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." But the superstition spread, and during the ceremony of baptism tapers were placed in the hands of the baptized, if adults; if they were infants, in the hands of the sponsors. These tapers were said to be emblematical of the illuminating power of the sacrament. Also at the eucharist we find the same custom. Tapers were also used at marriages; and in funeral processions carried before and behind the coffin. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict. s.v.*

The altar tapers were used in those candlesticks which are placed on or about the altar; ordinarily those which were lighted during the office of the Christian sacrifice. Custom in the West expects that at least two be lighted,

even at low celebrations; at high celebrations, in the Latin Church, as also in some English churches, six tapers are ordinarily lighted. They symbolize (1) the fact that our Savior, “God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God,” is the true Light of the world. They are also (2) symbols of joy and gladness on the part of the faithful that Christ is born into the world (a) naturally, (b) sacramentally, i.e. in the eucharistic mystery. A seventh taper is added if the bishop of the diocese celebrates a solemn pontifical mass; even twelve or twenty-one are sometimes used.

Ta’phath

(Heb. *Taphath*’, תפֿף; *ornament*; Sept. Τεφάθ v.r. Ταφατά; Vulg. *Tapheth*), Solomon’s daughter, and wife of Abihadab, his commissariat in the district of Dor (^{<1041>}1 Kings 4:11). B.C. cir. 1000.

Taph’nes

(Ταφνάς), a Graecized form (Judith 1, 9) of the Egyptian city TAPANHEH *SEE TAPANHEH* (q.v.).

Ta’phon

(ἡ Τεφώ); Josephus, Τοχόα or Τοχόαν; Vulg. *Thopo*; Syr. *Tefos*), one of the cities in Judmae fortified by Bacchides (1 Macc. 9:50). It is probably the BETH-TAPPUAIA *SEE BETH-TAPPUAIA* (q.v.) of the Old Test., which lay near Hebron. The form given by Josephus suggests *Tekoa*, but Grimm (*Exeg. Handbuch*) has pointed out that his equivalent for that name is Θεκωέ; and there is, besides, too much unanimity among the versions to allow of its being accepted.

Tappan, Benjamin, D.D.

a Congregational minister, the son of the Rev. David Tappan, professor of divinity in Harvard College, and grandson of Benjamin Tappan, pastor in Manchester, Mass., was born at West Newbury, Mass., Nov. 7, 1788. He graduated at Harvard College in 1805, spent some time teaching at Woburn and Salem, and in 1809 became tutor at Bowdoin College, Me., which position he held for two years. In 1811 he was ordained over the Church in Augusta, Me., and continued pastor until he assumed the secretaryship of the Maine Missionary Society in 1849. His death took place Dec. 22, 1863. His ministry was eminently useful, and few men occupy a more prominent place in the history of Congregationalism in

Maine. He was vice-president of the board of Bowdoin College until his death, secretary of the Maine Missionary Society from 1849 to 1863, and trustee of Bangor Theological Seminary from 1825, of which he was a most liberal and steadfast friend, and a professorship in which he declined in 1829. Dr. Tappan was an immense worker, was noted for his hospitality and generosity, and his Christian character was one of beauty and strength. He was an effective preacher, and had a remarkable gift in prayer. Dr. Tappan was one of the pioneers in the temperance reform, preaching a sermon on the subject in 1813. Waterville College (now Colby University) conferred upon him the degree of D.D. in 1836, and Bowdoin in 1845. See *Cong. Quarterly* art. by his son Benjamin), 1865, p. 131-159.

Tappan, David, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born at Manchester, Mass., in 1753, graduated at Harvard College in 1771, and was ordained in April, 1774, pastor at Newbury, Mass., where he remained until inaugurated professor of divinity at Harvard College, Dec. 26, 1792, which position he retained until his death, Aug. 27, 1803. He published, *Two Friendly Letters to Philalethes* (1785): — *An Address to the Students of Andover Academy* (1791): — *An Address to Andover Students* (1794): — and a large number of occasional *Sermons*; After his death were published *Lectures on Jewish Antiquities* (1807): — *Sermons on Important Subjects* (1807). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 97.

Tappan, William Bingham

an American divine, was born at Beverly, Mass., in 1794, entered the service of the American Sunday-school Union in 1826, and continued this connection until his death, at West Needham, Mass., in 1849. He published, among other poetical works, *Poetry of the Heart* (Worcester, 1845, 12mo). — *Sacred and Miscellaneous Poems* (Boston, 1846, 16mo): — *Poetry of Life* (ibid. 1847, 16mo): — *The Sunday-school and other Poems* (ibid. 1848, 16mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tap'puah

[some *Tappu'ah*] (Heb. *Tappu'ach*, j WPTi [in ^{<188>}1 Chronicles 2:43, j P]i; an *apple*, as often; Sept. *Τάφου, Ταφούτ, Θαφέθ, Θαφφού*, etc., and

twice [^{<0653>}Joshua 15:34; 17:8] omits; Vulg. *Taphucu*), the name of a man and also of two places in Palestine. **SEE APPLE.**

1. Second named of the four sons of Hebron of the lineage of Caleb (1 Chronicles 2, 43); not to be confounded with either of the following (see Keil, *ad loc.*). B.C. ante 1618.
2. A town in the lowland district of Judah, mentioned between Engannim and Enam (^{<0653>}Joshua 15:34), in the group situated in the N.W. corner (see Keil, *ad loc.*); differs from the Beth tappuah (q.v.) of ver. 53, but probably the same with the royal city of the Canaanites (^{<0627>}Joshua 12:17), conquered by the Israelites (see Keil, *ad loc.*). It is perhaps the present *Beita tab*, an important place on a conspicuous hill, about half-way from Jerusalem to Beit-Jebrin. It contains about 600 or 700 inhabitants, is built of stone, and has a ruined tower or castle (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 13). This is apparently the place meant by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 102) by “the village *Beth-Tapa*, five English miles N.W. [ten N.E.] of Beit-Jibrin.”
3. A town in the tribe of Ephraim, near the border of Manasseh, in which latter the adjacent territory (“land of Tappuah”) lay (^{<0668>}Joshua 16:8; 17:8); probably containing a fine spring, and hence called (ver. 7) EN-TAPPUAR **SEE EN-TAPPUAR** (q.v.). It is no doubt, as suggested by Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 351), although this is disputed by Keil (*Comment. ad loc.*), the same as the present ‘*Atuf*, a deserted village about four hours N.E. by E. of Nablis, with traces of antiquity and ancient wells of excellent water. Schwarz also states that “at the present day the Arabs call the country between Nablds and the Jordan *Balad-tapuach*, as probably the town of this name was formerly in it” (*Palest.* p. 89). **SEE TRIBE.**

Ta’rah

(Heb. *Te’rach*, j rīl, [in pause *Tdrach*, j rīf], *wandering* or *delay*; Sept. Ταράθ v.r. Θαράθ; Vulg. *Thaire*), a station of the Israelites in the desert, situated between Tahath and Mithcah (^{<0637>}Numbers 33:27); perhaps in the great Wady el-Jerafeh, opposite Mount Hor. **SEE EXODE.**

Tar’alah

[some *Tara’lah*] (Heb. *Taratlah*’, hl aḥṭi *reeling*; Sept. Θαραλά v.r. Θαραηλά; Vulg. *Thairem*), a town in the western section of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Irpeel and Zelah (^{<0637>}Joshua 18:27).

Schwarz suggests (*Palest.* p. 128) that it “is perhaps the village’ *Thaniel=Thariel*, in the neighborhood of Lod,” probably meaning *Neby Daniyal*, two miles south of Lud; but the name has little resemblance, and the territory of Benjamin did not reach so far west. It is possibly represented by the modern village *Beit-Tirza*, in Wady Ahmed, just north of Beit-Jala, with a well adjacent and several ruined sites in the vicinity.

Tarasius

patriarch of Constantinople, was a zealous and active supporter of image-worship in the time of the empress Irene. *SEE ICONOCLASM*. He first held the secular position of secretary of state, but was chosen, though a layman, to fill the patriarchal office by both the court and the people (A.D. 784). His election gave great offence to Rome, but he was eventually recognized by Hadrian I on the ground of his avowed intention to restore the worship of images in the Greek Church. A synod to promote the unifying of the Church of Constantinople with other churches, which he had suggested as a condition of his acceptance of the patriarchate, met in 785, but was compelled by a mob to adjourn to Nicea, where it reconvened in 787. In this body the papal legates were accorded the first place and the patriarch of Constantinople the second, and the latter heartily endorsed the new creed, which determined that worship, in the exercises of kissing, bowing the knee, illuminations, and burning of incense, should be rendered to the images of the human person of Christ and of Mary, the angels, apostles, prophets, and all saints; but not such worship as is due to the Divine Being only (Τὴν τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν-οὐ μὴν τὴν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θεῷ φύσει). All laws directed against the worship of images were anathematized. In his own person, Tarasius was also especially active in the work of converting the opponents of image-worship. In the matrimonial affairs of Constantine, the son of Irene, Tarasius played an unworthy part. He protested at first against the rejection of queen Maria and the substitution for her of Theodota, but soon gave way to the wishes of the court, and thereby came into collision with the monks, who regarded the emperor as excommunicated. Tarasius died in 806, and ranks among the saints of both the Greek and the Romish Church. His literary remains consist of letters and homilies (see. Walch, *Entwufener vollst. Hist. d. Ketzereien, Spaltungen u. Religionsstreitigkeiten* [Leips. 1782], 10:419-511). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Ta'rea

[some *Tare'a*] (Heb. *Tare'd*, [rəʔ] by interchange of gutturals for *Tahrea*; Sept. Θαρπέ v.r. Θαρράχ; Vulg. *Tharaa*), son of Micah in the lineage of king Saul (^{<1385>}1 Chronicles 8:35); elsewhere (9, 41) called TAHREA *SEE TAHREA* (q.v.).

Tares

Picture for Tares

(ζιζάνια; Vulg. *zizania*). There can be little doubt that the ζιζάνια of the parable (^{<1385>}Matthew 13:25) denote the weed called “darnel” (*Lolium temulentum*), a widely distributed grass, and the only species of the order that has deleterious properties. The word used by the evangelist is an Oriental, and not a Greek, term (the native Greek word seems to be αἶρα, Dioscor. 2, 91). It is the Arabic *zawân*, the Syriac *zizàna*, and the *zoni* (ῥυνῶ) of the Talmud (Mishna, 1, 109; see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s.v.). The derivation of the Arabic word from *zân*, “nausea,” is well suited to the character of the plant, the grains of which produce vomiting and purging, convulsions, and even death. Volhey (*Trav.* 2, 306) experienced the ill effects of eating its seeds; and “the whole of the inmates of the Sheffield work house were attacked some years ago with symptoms supposed to be produced by their oatmeal having been accidentally adulterated with lolium” (*Engl. Cyclop* s.v. “Lolium”). The darnel before it comes into ear is very similar in appearance to wheat; hence the command that the *zizania* should be left to the harvest, lest while men plucked up the tares “they should root up also the wheat with them.” Prof. Stanley, however (*Sinai and Palest.* p. 426), speaks of women and children picking out from the wheat in the cornfields of Samaria the tall green stalks, still called by the Arabs *zuwan*. “These stalks,” he continues, “if sown designedly throughout the fields, would be inseparable from the wheat, from which, even when growing naturally and by chance, they are at first sight hardly distinguishable.” See also Thomson (*Land and Book*, 2, 111): “The grain is just in the proper stage to illustrate the parable. In those parts where the grain has *headed out*, the tares have done the same, and then a child cannot mistake them for wheat or barley; but where both are less developed, the closest scrutiny will often fail to detect them. Even the farmers, who in this country generally *weed* their fields, do not attempt to separate the one from the other.” The grain-growers in Palestine believe that the *zawân* is merely

a legenerate wheat; that in wet seasons the wheat turns to tares. Dr. Thomson asserts that this is their fixed opinion. It is curious to observe the retention of the fallacy through many ages. "Wheat and *zunin*," says Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.* on ~~4135~~ Matthew 13:25), quoting from the Talmud, "are not seeds of different kinds." See also Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* s.v. *זנב*): "Zizania, species tritici degeneris, sic dicti, quod scortando cum bono tritico, in pejorem naturam degenerat." The Roman writers (comp. "Infelix lolium," Virgil, *Georg.* 1, 154) appear to have entertained a similar opinion with respect to some of the cereals. Thus Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 18:17), borrowing probably from Theophrastus, asserts that "barley will degenerate into the oat." The notion that the *zizania* of the parable are merely diseased or (egenerate wheat has been defended by Brederod (see his letter to Schultetus in *Exercit. Evang.* 2, 65), and strangely adopted by Trench, who (*Notes on the Parables*, p. 91, 4th ed.) regards the distinction of these two plants to be "a falsely assumed fact." If the *zizania* of the parable denote the darnel, and there cannot be any reasonable doubt about it, the plants are certainly distinct, and the *L. temulentum* has as much right to specific distinction as any other kind of grass. On the route from Beirut to Akka (1852), Dr. Robinson describes fields of wheat "of the most luxuriant growth, finer than which I had not before seen in this or any other country. Among these splendid fields of grain are still found the *tares* spoken of in the New Test. As described to me, they are not to be distinguished from the wheat until the ear appears. The seed resembles wheat in form, but is smaller and black. In Beirut, poultry are fed upon this seed, and it is kept for sale for that purpose. When not separated from the wheat, bread made from the flour often causes dizziness to those who eat of it" (*Bibl. Res.* 3, 55). The bearded darnel has the bad reputation of yielding the only deleterious grain among all the countless grasses. We are not aware that any injurious quality has been detected in the seeds of its own congeners, *Lolium arvense*, *L. perenne*, the rye-grasses so familiar to British husbandry; but if mixed with bread, *L. temulentum* occasions giddiness, nausea, difficulty of articulation, and other symptoms ranging from intoxication to paralysis, and instances are on record where mortification of the extremities, or even death, has ensued (see Burnett, *Plantce Utiliores*, vol. 3). Hence the French have named it *icraie*, or "tipsy-grass," a word from which the English have dropped the first syllable, and bestowed it on those unoffending "ray" or 'rye grasses," by which the darnel is represented in our hay-fields. Thus understood, "how well do these 'tares' represent those who make a false profession; who

appear among God's people; who draw near with their mouth, and honor God with their lips, but their heart is far from him (^{<23913>}Isaiah 29:13; ^{<4058>}Matthew 15:8; ^{<4076>}Mark 7:6) ! Both grow together, and at first may seem alike. Man cannot accurately distinguish between the true and the false; but at the great harvest-day the Lord will separate them. He will gather the wheat into his garner, while the tares shall be consumed" (Balfour, *Bot. and Religio* p. 251). See Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, ad loc.; Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 130; Calcott [Lady], *Script. Herbal*, p. 475 sq.; Tristram, *Na Ht. s. of the Bible*, p. 486; Bochelius, *De Zizaniis in Eccles. Dei Disseminatis* (Arg. 1661).

Target

([^]wdyKp̄kiddn, ^{<0976>}1 Samuel 17:6, a *spear*, as usually rendered; h̄lxǣ tsinnâh, ^{<1106>}1 Kings 10:16; ^{<4495>}2 Chronicles 9:15; 14:8, a large *shield*, as usually rendered). **SEE SHIELD.**

Targum

([^]wGr̄T̄i, i.e. *translation, interpretation*) is the name given to a *Chaldee version* or paraphrase of the Old Test., of which there are several extant.

I. Origin of the Targums. — The origin of the Chaldee paraphrase may be traced back to the time of Ezra. After the exile it became the practice to read the law in public to the people, with the addition of an *oral* paraphrase in the Chaldee dialect. Thus we read in ^{<608>}Nehemiah 8:8, [^]cr̄wpm̄ [^]pyhl̄ ah̄ trwtb̄ rpsb̄ warqyw̄ l̄ kç̄ [^]mw̄çw̄, which expression the Talmud, Bab. *Megillah*, fol. 3, col. 1, explains [^]wgr̄t̄ wz̄ [^]cr̄wpm̄, i.e. "to explain means Targum." This ecclesiastical usage, rendered necessary by the change of language consequent on the captivity, was undoubtedly continued in aftertimes. It rose in importance, especially when the synagogues and public. schools began to flourish, the chief subject of occupation in which was the exposition of the Thorah. The office of the interpreter ([^]m̄grwtm̄, [^]m̄grwt̄, [^]arwmā, less frequently [^]çrd̄, comp. Zunz, *Die gottesd. Vortrage*, p. 332) thus became one of the most important, and the canon of the Talmud, that as the law was given by a mediator, so it can be read and expounded only by a mediator, became paramount (Jerus. *Megillah*, fol. 74). The Talmud contains, even in its oldest portions, precise injunctions concerning the manner of conducting these expository prelections. Thus, "Neither the reader nor the interpreter

is to raise his voice one above the other;” “They have to wait for each other until each have finished his verse;”

“The methurgeman is not to lean against a pillar or a beam, but to stand with fear and with reverence;” “He is not to use a written Targum, but he is to deliver his translation *viva voce*;” “No more than one verse in the Pentateuch and three in the prophets shall be read or translated at a time ;” “That there should be not more than one reader and one interpreter for the law; while for the prophets one reader and one interpreter, or two interpreters, are allowed” (Mishna, *Megillah*, 4:5, 10; *Sopherim*, 11:1). Again (*Megillah*, *ibid.*, and *Tosiphta*, c. 3), certain passages liable to give offence to the multitude are specified, which may be read in the synagogue and translated; others which may be read but not translated; others, again, which may neither be read nor translated. To the first class belong the *account of the creation*— a subject not to be discussed publicly on account of its most vital bearing upon the relation between the Creator, and the Cosmos, and the nature of both; the deed of Lot and his two daughters (^{<0198>}Genesis 19:31); of Judah and Tamar (ch. 38); the first account of the making of the golden calf (Exodus 32); all the curses in the law; the deed of Amunon and Tamar (2 Samuel 13); of Absalom with his father’s concubines (^{<0162>}2 Samuel 16:22); the story of the woman of Gibeah (Judges 19). These are to be read and translated, or *ymgrtmw yadqn*. To be read but not translated, *ymgrtm alw yarqn*, are the deed of Reuben with his father’s concubine (^{<0252>}Genesis 25:22); the latter portion of the story of the golden calf (Exodus 32); and the deed of David and Bathsheba (^{<0112>}2 Samuel 11:12).

At what time these paraphrases were written down we cannot state; but it must certainly have been at an early period. Bearing in mind that the Hellenistic Jews had for a long time been in possession of the law translated into their language, and that in the 2nd century not only had the Jews themselves issued Greek versions in opposition to the Alexandrian version, which were received with decided approbation even by the Talmudists, as the repeated and honorable mention of Aquila in the Talmud proves, but that also the Syrians had been prompted to translate the Holy Scriptures, it would indeed be strange had not the Jews familiar with the Aramsean dialect also followed the practice at that time universally prevalent, and sought to profit by it. We have, in point of fact, certain traces of written Targums extant at least in the time of Christ. For even the

Mishna seems ‘to imply this in *Yadacim*, 4:5, where the subject treated is the language and style of character to be used in writing the Targums. Further, the Talmud, *Shabbaih*, fol. 115, col. 1, mentions a written Targum on Job of the middle of the 1st century (in the time of Gamaliel I), which incurred the disapprobation of Gamaliel. Zunz here justly remarks, “Since it is not likely that a beginning should have been made with Job, a still higher antiquity as very probably belonging to the first renderings of the law may be assumed” (*loc. cit.* p. 62). Gritz, in his *Monatsschrift*, 1877, p. 84, believes that this Targum of Job, mentioned four times in the Talmud, can only refer to a Greek translation of that book, and Derenbourg, in his *Essai sur l’ Histoire et la Geographie de la Palestine*, p. 242, accounts for the action of Gamaliel, because it was written *avec des caracteres non-hebraïques*. But as Delitzsch, in *Ioorne lebr. et Talmud.* (*Zeitschrift für die luth. Theologieu. Kirche* [Leips. 1878], p. 211), remarks, “**µwgrt btk** means ‘in Targum,’ i.e. written in the Aramaean and refers not to the characters with which, but to the language in which, it was written. Gamaliel acted according to old principle, **ktwkl yaçr hta ya hp l [bç µyrbd**, i.e. all that belongs to oral tradition was not to appear in written form. This principle included also the Targum, but it was not strictly observed, and, like the Mishna, so, also, Targums were clandestinely circulated in single copies. That this was the case we see from the fact that Gamaliel of Jabneh, the grandson of Gamaliel I or elder, having been found reading the Targum on Job, was reminded of the procedure of his grandfather, who had the copy of the Job Targum, which was brought to him while standing on the mountain of the Temple, immured in order to prevent its further use. Dr. Frariki, in *Die. Zusdtze in der Sept. zu Hiob* (in Grlitz, *Monatsschrift*,. 1872, p. 313), says, “There is no doubt that the additions in the Sept. were made according to an old Aramaean Targum,” and in corroboration of his statement he quotes *Tosiphtha Shabbath*, c. 14; *Shabbath*, fol. 115, col. 1; *Jerus. Shabbath*, 16, 1; *Sopherin*, v, 1.5. We are thus obliged to assume an early origin for the Targums, a fact which will be corroborated further on, in spite of the many objections raised, the chief of which, adduced by Eichhorn, being the silence of the Christian fathers, of whom none, not even Epiphanius or Jerome, mention the subject. But this silence is of little weight, because the fathers generally were ignorant of Hebrew and of Hebrew literature. Nor was any importance attached to them in comparison with Greek translations. Besides, in truth, the assertion in question is not even

supported by the facts of the case; for Ephraem Syrus, e.g., made use of the Targums (comp. Lengerke, *De Ephraemi S. Arte Hermeneut.* p. 14 sq.; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 1, 66).

II. *The Targum of Onkelos.* — There is a Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch which has always been highly valued by the Jews.

1. *Authorship.* — In regard to the author, the notices of him are meagre and uncertain. We now approach one of the most mooted questions as to the identity of Onkelos with Akilas or Aquila; but before solving it we must hear the different witnesses. The first mention of Onkelos is found in the *Tosipohtha*, a work drawn up shortly after the Mishna. From this we learn:

a. That Onkelos the Proselyte (רְגֵחַ שְׂוֵל קְנָא) was so serious in his adherence to the newly adopted (Jewish) faith that he threw his share of his paternal inheritance into the Dead Sea, לִמְהַרְבֵּי מַיִם וְקִיּוּן יְהוָה (Tos. *Demci'*, 6:9).

b. At the funeral of Gamaliel the elder he burned more than seventy mince worth of spices in his honor (Tos. *Shabbath*, 100. 8; the same story is repeated with variations *Semchoth* 100. 8, and Talm. *Aboda Zarah*, fol. 11, col. 1).

c. He is finally mentioned, by way of corroboration to different Halachas, in connection with Gamaliel in three more places, viz. *Chagigah*, 3, 1; *Mikvaoth*, 6:1; *Kelim*, 3, 2,2. In the Babylonian. Talmud, Onkelos is mentioned in the following passages:

(1.) *Gittin*, fol. 56, col. 2; fol. 57, col. 1, where we read, “onkelos the Proselyte, the son of Kalonikos (Callinicus or Cleonicus?), the son of Titus’s sister, who, intending to become a convert, conjured up the ghosts of Titus, Balaam, and Jesus [the latter name is omitted in later editions, for which, as in the copy before us, is substituted לִאֲרָצָה [צָרָה, but not in Bomberg’s and the Cracow editions], in order to ask them what nation was considered the first in the other world. Their answer that Israel was the favored one decided him.”

(2.) *Aboda Zarah*, fol. 11, col. I, here called the son of Kalonymos (Cleonymos?); and we also read in this place that the emperor sent three Roman cohorts to capture him, and that he converted them all.

(3.) *Baba Bathra*, fol. 99, coil. 1, where Onkelos the Proselyte is quoted as an authority on the question of the form of the cherubim (comp. ^{<480>}2 Chronicles 3:10).

(4.) *Megillah*, fol. 3, col 1, where we read, “II Jeremiah, or, according to others, It. Chia bar-Abba, said the ‘Targum, on the Pentateuch was made by the proselyte Onkelos; from the mouth of R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshna; the Targum on the prophets was made by Jonathan ben-Uziel from the month of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.... But have we not been taught that the Targum existed from the time of Ezra?... Only it was forgotten and Ollelos restored it. In the *Miidrash Tanichuma*, section ! ! in (^{<480>}Genesis 28:20), we read, “Onkelos the Proselyte asked an old man whether that was all the love God bore towards a proselyte, that he promised to give him bread and a garment? The old man replied that this was all for which the patriarch Jacob prayed.” In the book of, *Zohar*, section *twm yrj a* (^{<480>}Leviticus 18:4), Onkelos is represented as a disciple of Hillel and Shammai. Finally a MS. in the library of the Leipsic Senate (B. H.) relates that Onkelos, the nephew of the wicked Titus ([*çrh swfyf l ç wdkn*), asked the emperor’s advice as to what merchandise he thought it was profitable to trade in. Titus told him that that should be bought which was cheap in the market, since it was sure to rise in price. Onkelos went to Jerusalem and studied the law under R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua, and his face became wan (*twbwh [wynp wyhw*). When he returned to Titus, one of the courtiers observed the pallor of his countenance, and said to Titus, “Onkelos appears to have studied the law.” Interrogated by Titus, he admitted the fact, adding that he had done it by his advice. No nation had ever been so exalted, and none was now held cheaper among the nations than Israel; “therefore,” he said, “I concluded that in the end none would be of higher price” (comp. Anger, *De Onkelo*, pt. 2 [Lips. 1846], p. 12, where the whole passage in the original is copied). In all these passages the name of Onkelos is given. But there are many passages in which the version of Akilas (*sl yq [µgrt*) is mentioned, and the notices concerning Akilas bear considerable likeness to those of Onkelos. Akilas is mentioned in *Siphra* (^{<480>}Leviticus 25:7), and in Jerus. Talmud, *Demai*, 27 d, as having been born in Pontus; that, after having embraced the Jewish faith, he threw his paternal inheritance into an asphalt lake (Jerus. *Demaz*, 25 d); that he translated the *Torah* before R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua, who praised him (*wtwa wsl yqw*) and said to him, “Thou art fairer than the sons

of men” (μδα γνβμ τυρρρ); or, according to the other accounts, before R. Akiba (comp. Jerus. *Kiddushin*, 1, 11, etc.; Jerus. *Megillah*, 1, 9; Babyl. *Megillah*, fol. 3, col. 1). We learn, further, that he lived in the time of Hadrian (*Chag.* 2, 1), that he was the son of the emperor’s sister (*Tanchun*, ed. Prague, fol. 34, col. 2), that he became a convert against the emperor’s will (*ibid.* and *Shemoth Rabbah*, fol. 146 c), and that he consulted Eliezer and Jehoshua about his conversion (*Bereshith Rabba*, fol. 78 d; comp. *Midrash Coheleth*, fol. 102 b).

That Akilas is no other than Aquila (Ἀκύλας), the well-known Greek translator of the Old Test., we need hardly add. He was a native of Pontus (Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 3,24; Jerome, *De Vir. Ill. c.* 54; Philbstr. *De Icer.* § 90). He lived under Hadrian (Epiph. *De Pond. et Mens.* § 12). He is called the πενθερίδες (*Chronicles Alex.* πενθερός) of the emperor (*ibid.* § 14), becomes a convert to Judaism (§ 15), whence he is called the Proselyte (Iren. *loc. cit.*; Jerome to ^{<2484>}Jeremiah 8:14, etc.), and receives instructions from Akiba (Jerome, *loc. cit.*). He translated the Old Test., and his version was considered of the highest import and authority among the Jews, especially those unacquainted with the Hebrew language (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* *loc. cit.*; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, 15:23; Philostr. *De Her.* § 90; Justin, *Novell.* 146). Thirteen *distinct* quotations from this version are preserved in the Talmud and Midrash; and we may classify the whole as follows:

Greek Quotations. ^{<0170>}Genesis 17:1, in *Beresh. Rab.* 51 b; ^{<0230>}Leviticus 23:40, Jers. *Sukkah*, 3, 5, fol. 53 d (comp. *Iaj. Rab.* 200 d); Isaiah 3, 20, Jers. *Shabb.* 6, 4, fol. 8 b; ^{<3160>}Ezekiel 16:10, *Mid. Thren.* 58, 100; ^{<3235>}Ezekiel 23:43, *Vaj. Rab.* 203 d; Psalm 48, 15 (Masor. text 47, according to the Sept.), Jers. *Meg.* 2, 3, fol. 73 b; ^{<0820>}Proverbs 18:21, *Vaj. Rab.* fol. 203 b; ^{<0006>}Esther 1:6, *Midr. Esth.* 120 d; Daniel 5, 5, Jers. *Yoma*, 3, 8, fol. 41 a.

Hebrew Quotations (retranslated from the Greek). — ^{<0820>}Leviticus 19:20, Jerus. *Kid.* 1, 1, fol. 59 a; ^{<0813>}Daniel 8:13, *Beresh. Rab.* 24 c.

Chaldee Quotations. — ^{<0151>}Proverbs 25:11, *Beresh. Rab.* 104 b; Isaiah 5, 6, *Midr. Coh.* 113 c, d.

All these quotations are treated at length by Anger, *De Onkelo*, 1, 13, sq., and the variations adduced there show how carefully they have to be

perused, and the more so since we have as yet no critical edition of the Talmud.

The identity of Akilas and Aquila having been ascertained, it was also argued that, according to the parallel accounts of Onkelos and Aquila, Onkelos and Aquila must be one and the same person, since it was unlikely that the circumstances and facts narrated could have belonged to two different individuals. But who will warrant that the statements are correct? There are chronological differences which cannot be reconciled, unless we have recourse to such means as the Jewish historian Dr. Gratz, who renders qzh g8 8r (i.e. R. Gamaliel I, or elder) “Gamaliel II.” Is it not surprising that on one and the same page Onkelos is once spoken of as “Onkelos the Proselyte,” and “Onkelos the son of Kalonymos became a convert” (*Aboda Zarah*, fol. 11, col. 1)? It has also been stated that Onkelos was neither the author of the Targum nor a historical person, but that *Targum Onkelos* means simply a version made *after the manner of Akils*, the Greek translator. Aquila’s translation was a special favorite with the Jews, because it was both literal and accurate. Being highly valued, it was considered a model or type after which the new Chaldee one was named, in commendation, perhaps, of its like excellences. This view is very ingenious, but it is hardly probable. Now the question arises, how is it ‘that there is only a version of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, while Aquila translated the whole Old Test.? If Onkelos’s Targum was really made after the manner of Aquila, how is it that the latter is so slavishly literal, translating even the ta , sign of the accusative, or, as Jerome states (*De Opt. Genesis Interpret.*), “Non solum verba sed et etymologias verborum transferre conatus est... Quod Hebrsei non solum habent ἄρθρα sed et πρόρθρα, ille κακοζήλως et syllabas interpretetur et litteras, dictatque $\sigma \grave{\upsilon} \nu \tau\omicron\nu \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\delta\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma \grave{\upsilon} \nu \tau\eta\nu \gamma\eta\nu$ quod Graeca et Latina lingua non recipit,” while Onkelos is freer, adding sometimes here and there a word or phrase for the better understanding?

That the Targum Onkelos cannot mean a Targum after the manner of Aquila is also evident from the fact that while Aquila made a recension of the then existing Sept., nothing of the kind can be said of Onkelos. The latter wrote for the people in a language which it understood better than the original Hebrew; the former wrote for polemical purposes, to counterbalance the arguments of the Christians, who made use of the Alexandrian version against the Jews. That the author of the Chaldee

paraphrase was not a proselyte, but a native Jew, is sufficiently proved from the excellence and accuracy of his work; for without having been bred up from his birth in the Jewish religion and learning, and long exercised in all the rites and doctrines thereof, and being also thoroughly skilled in both the Hebrew and Chaldee languages, as far as a native Jew could be, he could scarcely be thought thoroughly adequate to that work which he performed. The representing of Onkelos as having been a proselyte seems to have proceeded from the error of taking him to have been the same with Aquila of Pontus, who was indeed a Jewish proselyte. A comparison of both versions must show the superiority of Onkelos's over that of Aquila. The latter, on account of his literal adherence to the original, makes his version often nonsensical and unintelligible, and less useful than the former, as the following will show:

GENESIS.

<0016>Genesis 2:6. dyaw—Aq. ἐπιφλυγμός; Onk. Ann[y.

7. tmçn-Aq. ἀναπνοή; Onk. atmçn.

<0016>Genesis 6:4. μυι γρηh-Aq. ἐπιπίπτοντες; Onk. ayrwbq.

16. rhwx—Aq. μεσημβρινόν; Olk. rwhyn.

<0016>Genesis 8:1. wbçyw—Aq. καὶ ἐστάλησαν; Onk. wj nw

<0128>Genesis 12:8. qt[yw-Aq. μετῆρε Onk. ql tsaw.

<0152>Genesis 15:2. qçm ^bw-Aq. υἱὸς τοῦ ποτίσοντος; Onk. rbwε
asnrp.

<0182>Genesis 18:12. hbrqb—Aq. κατ' αὐτῆς; Onk. ah[mb.

ytwl b-Aq. κατατριβῆναι; Onk. tybysd.

<0212>Genesis 22:2. hyrwmh ra-Aq. τὴν γῆν τὴν καταφανῆ; Onk.
anj l wp a[ral .

13. bsb—Aq. ἐν συχνῶ; Onk. anl Aab.

<0233>Genesis 26:33. [bç rab-Aq. Φρέαρ πλησμονῆς; Onk. rab [bç.

^{<0318>}Genesis 30:8. ytl trn myhl a yl wtrn-Aq. συνέστρεψέν με ὁ Θεός; Onk. wtw[b 8j l bq.

11. dgb (Keri dg ab)-Aq. ἤλθεν ἡ ζῶσις; Onk. dg ata.

^{<0325>}Genesis 32:25. qbayw-Aq. ἐκυλίετο; Onk. λδτάς.

^{<0342>}Genesis 34:21. myml ς-Aq. -πηρτισμένοι; Onk. ^yml ς.

^{<0356>}Genesis 35:16. ra trbk-Aq. καθ ὄδον τῆς γῆς; Onk. a[ra bwrk.

^{<0364>}Genesis 36:24. mymyh ta—Aq. τοὺς Ἰαμεῖν; Onk. ty ayrbg.

^{<0377>}Genesis 37:27. [xb hm-Aq. τὶ πλεονέκτημα; Onk. hm anl yhhtn ^wmm.

^{<0388>}Genesis 38:18. l ytrw-Aq. στρεπτόν; Onk. apycyc.

^{<0404>}Genesis 42:4. ^wsa—Aq. σύμπτωμα; Onk. atwm.

EXODUS.

^{<0009>}Exodus 1:9. μwx[w—Aq. ὄστοῖνον (id. ^{<0006>}Deuteronomy 9:1); Onk. ^yprqt.

11. twnksm yr[-Aq. πόλεις σκηνωμάτων; Onk. arxwa tyb ywrq.

13. rpb-Aq. ἐν τρυφήματι; Onk. wyqrb.

^{<0042>}Exodus 4:12. ytwrwhw-Aq. φωτίσω σε (id. ver. 15; 24:12 always φωτίζειν, taken from rwa); Onk. hypl a (id. ver. 15; 24:12).

^{<0082>}Exodus 8:12. bwr[h-Aq. παμμυῖαν; Onk. ^ybwry[. 14:27. wntyal -Aq. εἰς ἀρχαῖον αὐτοῦ; Onk. hyrqwtl .

^{<0158>}Exodus 15:8. wmr[n—Aq. ἐσωρεύθη; Onk. amykj .

^{<0246>}Exodus 24:6. twngab-Aq. ἐν προθύμασιν; Onk. ayqrzmb.

^{<0288>}Exodus 28:8. ynς-Aq. διάφορον (id. 35:22, 35); Onk. yrwhz.

^{<0246>}Exodus 29:6. rzn-Aq. τὸ πέταλον; Onk. al yl k.

36. tafj w myrwk l [-Aq. ἐξίλασμοῦ περὶ ἁμαρτίας; Onk. ykdtw ayrwk l [.

<0302>Exodus 30:12. rpwk—Aq. ἐξίλασμα; Onk. ἤqrdr.

35. h[wp yk awh [wgp—Aq. ἀποπετασμένος αὐτὸς ὅτι; Onk. awh l yfb. Aq. ἀπεπέτασεν αὐτόν; Onk. hynyl fbayra.

<0304>Exodus 34:24. μym[ρ ςwl ς—Aq. τρεῖς καθόδους; Onk. ἤynmz tl t.

LEVITICUS.

<0301>Leviticus 3:1. μym l ς-Aq. εἰρηνικῶς; Onk. avdyq tskn.

<0306>Leviticus 13:6. hçpt hçp-Aq. ἐπιδόση ἐπίδομα; Onk. āyswt apswa.

<0307>Leviticus 17:7. μyγ[ςl -Aq. τοῖς τριχιούσιν (id. <0321>Isaiah 13:21); Onk. ἤdyςl .

<0308>Leviticus 25:33. l agy rçaw-Aq. ὅς ἂν ἐγγίζων ἔστιν; Onk. qwrpy ydw.

<0309>Leviticus 27:2. ayl py—Aq. θαναμαστώση; Onk. çrpy.

NUMBERS.

<0407>Numbers 1:47. hfml -Aq. εἰς ῥάβδον; Onk. afbçl .

<0408>Numbers 11:8. ἤmçh dçl —Aq. τοῦ μαστοῦ ἐλαίου; Onk. aj çmb çyl d.

<0412>Numbers 23:12. hgsph—Aq. λαξευτήν; Onk. atmr.

DEUTERONOMY

<0504>Deuteronomy 1:40. μkl wnp—Aq. νεύσατε αὐτοῖς; Onk. wnpta ἤwkl .

<15219>Deuteronomy 22:9. $\mu\gamma\alpha\lambda\ \kappa$ —Aq. ἀνομοιόμενος; Onk. $\hat{y}byry[\]$.
 $znf[\ \zeta$ —Aq. ἀντιδιακείμενον; Onk. $aznf[\ \zeta$.

<15215>Deuteronomy 23:15. $\text{יְהִי לְךָ יְקָוָה תְּלִי וְ$ —Aq. τοῦ δοῦναι τοὺς
ἐχθρούς σου εἰς πρόσωπόν σου; Onk. $rsmml\ w\ \text{hdq}\ bbd\ yl\ [b$.

<15201>Deuteronomy 28:20. $hmwhmh\ \text{taw}\ hramh\ \text{ta}$ —Aq. σπανή καὶ
φαγέδαινα; Onk. $tyw\ \text{atryam}\ ty\ ay\zeta\omega\zeta$.

It has been urged that while Akilas's version is always cited in the Talmud by the name of its author, $sl\ yq[\ \mu\omega\gamma\text{r}t$, the Targum of Onkelos is never quoted with his name, but introduced with $\hat{n}ym\gamma\text{r}tm\ dk$, "as we translate," or $\hat{d}d\ \mu\omega\gamma\text{r}t$, "our Targum," or $wm\omega\gamma\text{r}tk$, "as the Targum has it;" but this only shows the high esteem in which Onkelos's Targum stood. And as to the quotations of Aquila, almost all which are cited are on the prophets and Hagiographa, while Onkelos's Targum is only on the law; and a close examination of the sources themselves shows that what is said there has reference only to the Greek version, which is fully expressed in the praise of R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua when saying $\mu\delta\alpha\ ynbm\ \text{typppy}$, "Thou art fairer than the sons of men," thereby alluding to <010327>Genesis 9:27, where it is said that Japheth (i.e. the Greek language) should one day dwell in the tents of Shem (i.e. Israel) (*Megillah*, 1, 11, 71 b and c; *Bereshith Rabba*, 40 b).

There is another very important point, which has been overlooked by all favoring the identity of Akilas with Onkelos, and thus putting the origin of the Targum of Onkelos at a late date, viz. the use of the *mentra* = λόγος by Onkelos; and this peculiarity of the Targum shows that its origin belongs to the time of Philo and the New Test. period. It is not unlikely that, in this respect, Onkelos was followed by the other Targumists, and that his intention was to reconcile Alexandrian with Palestinian theology. John's doctrine of the Logos would be without any foundation or point of departure if we could not suppose that at the time of Jesus a similar doctrine concerning the Word of God, as it can be deduced from the Targum, was known among the Palestinian Jews. That later Judaism has put aside this important moment of older theology must be explained from its opposition to Christianity.

In the Targum of Onkelos we find not the least indication that it was made after the destruction of Jerusalem; we find neither the least trace of hostility to the Romans nor of opposition to Christianity. The Temple is regarded as still standing, the festive days are still celebrated, the Jews are still a nation which never ceases to resist its enemies. This may be seen from the prophetic passages, as Genesis 49; Numbers 24; Deuteronomy 33; the explanation of which, as given by Onkelos, could have hardly originated after A.D. 70. Onkelos uses for Argob (Deuteronomy 3, 4, 14; so also Jonathan, ^{<10413>}1 Kings 4:13) the name Trachona (**anwkrf**)=Trachonitis (Luke 3, 1); Josephus writes **Τραχωνίτις**, sometimes **ὁ Τράχων** (*Ant.* 15:10, 1 and 3; 18:4, 6; 20:7, 1). The Peshito of the Pentateuch did not follow this explanation (Luke 3, 1, **anwkrfd arta**), probably because the division of Palestine at the time of Jesus did not exist in the Syrian translator's days, or it was unintelligible to him (among the rabbins **anwkrf** is used in the sense of "palace," **ʿyfl p** [Buxtorf, *Lex.* p. 913 sq.]). All this indicates, or rather confirms, the supposition that this Targum belongs to the time of Jesus. There is a similar indication in Onkelos's rendering of Bashan by **ʿntm** (Syr. **ʿyntm**), Batansea (see Gesenius, *Comm. zu Jes.* 2, 13); **trnk μy**, by Gennesaret, **rswnyg**. This reminds one of the language of the New Test.; so also **anwmm** (Mammon), "the injustice with the Mammon" (**ʿw hNwmmb ʿyçyb**; it is said, in ^{<1013>}Genesis 13:13, of the Sodomites). When Paul speaks of that "spiritual rock" that followed the children of Israel in the wilderness (^{<1013>}1 Corinthians 10:3), he undoubtedly refers to the tradition preserved by Onkelos (also by Pseudo Jonathan), "The well which the princes digged, the chiefs of the people cut it, the scribes with their staves; it was given to them in the wilderness. And from [the time] that it was given to them it descended with them to the rivers, and from the rivers it went up with them to the height, and from the height to the vale which is in the field of Moab" (^{<10218>}Numbers 21:18 sq.). Hence the expression of the apostle, "spiritual, following rock." The Syriac retains the proper names of the Hebrew text. After what has been said, we believe the Targum of Onkelos originated *about the time of Philo-an* opinion which is also held by Zunz (*Gottesd. Vortrige*, p. 62). This being true, Onkelos and Akilas (or Aquila) *are not one and the same person-a* view also expressed by Frankel (*Zudem Targum dera Propheten* [Breslau, 1872.] p. 6); and the Talmudic notices concerning Onkelos, the disciple of Gamaliel I (or elder), the teacher of the apostle Paul, are corroborated by our argument, minus the notice that

Onkelos was a proselyte, as we have already stated above. For with the identity of Onkelos with Akilas (or Aquila), it is hardly conceivable that a man like Aquila, who, from a Christian, became a Jew, and such a zealous one that he prepared another Greek version for polemical purposes against the Christians, should have spent so much money at the death of Gamaliel I, whose liberal and friendly attitude towards Christianity was known, and who is even said to have become a Christian, as a tombstone covering his remains in a church at Pisa indicates:

“Hoc in sarcophago requiescunt corpora sacra Sanctorumn... Sainctus Gamaliel. Gamaliel divi Patuli didascalus olim, Doctor et excellens Israelita fuit, Concilii mnagui fideique per omnia cultor.” We now come to the work itself.

2. Style, etc. — The language of Onkelos greatly approaches the Biblical Chaldee, i.e. it has still much of Hebrew coloring, though in a less degree than the other. It also avoids many Aramaisms (such as the contraction of nouns), which at a later period became prevalent, and comprises a comparatively small number of Greek words, and of Latin words none whatever. Of Greek words we mention, ^{<0285>}Exodus 28:25, **al rb** = βήρυλλος; ver. 11, **ā l g** = γλυφή; ^{<0287>}Genesis 28:17, **fwydh** = ιδιώτης; ^{<0113>}Leviticus 11:30, **atfl j** = κωλώτης; ^{<0289>}Exodus 28:19, **aygrf** = θρακίας (Pliny, 37:68); 39:11, **anydkrk** = καρηδόνιοι; ^{<0111>}Deuteronomy 20:20, **mwkrk** = χαράκωμα; ^{<0231>}Exodus 28:20, **mwrk** = χρώμα; ^{<0158>}Numbers 15:38, ^{<0212>}Deuteronomy 22:12, **adpswrk** = κράσπεδον; ^{<0234>}Exodus 30:34, **tçk** = κίσσιος; ^{<0178>}Genesis 37:28, **mwfl** = λήδον; ^{<0246>}Exodus 24:16, **asrp** = φάρσος; 26:6, **arwpr** = πόρπη; ^{<0164>}Genesis 6:14, **swrdq** = κέδρος; ^{<0239>}Exodus 28:19, **yrkñq** = κέγχρος (Pliny, 37:14). There are, besides, some obscure expressions which were partly unintelligible to the Talmudists, as **anwgsμ** for **ç j t**, etc., in ^{<0253>}Exodus 35:23; 28:4, **axmrm** for **bçt**; ver. 17, **^qry** for **hdfp**; ver. 18, **yrykñq** for **μçl**; ^{<0221>}Leviticus 22:20, **hyny[b ^yl yj** for **l l bt wyny[b**, etc.

The translation of Onkelos is, on the whole, very simple and exact. It is obvious from the character of the work that the author was in possession of a rich exegetical tradition; hence we never find him omitting any passage of the original. His elucidations of difficult and obscure passages and

expressions, perhaps less satisfactory, are commonly those most accredited by internal evidence, and in this particular he is worthy of a more careful regard and assent than have usually fallen to his lot. ^{<0015>}Genesis 3:15 he translates *rykd yhy awh hyl rfnyht taw ^ymdql m hyl tb[d hm l apwsl*, i.e. “he shall remember thee what thou hast done to him from the beginning, and thou shalt watch him unto the end;” ^{<0017>}Genesis 4:7 he translates *bfyf ma al h μwyl dbw[bfyf al μaw l qntcy dbw[8kw hm a[rptal dyt[dw ryfn bfj anyd*, “.shall not pardon be given to thee if thou doest well; but if thou doest not well, thy sin shall be preserved till the day of judgment, when it will be exacted of thee,” etc. Here *taç* is taken from *açn*, in the sense of *tollere peccata*. i.e. “taking-away of sin,” and not in the sense of “lifting-up of the countenance.” Onkelos did not understand the meaning of the verse, but- (says Winer) “sensum hujus loci prudentissimos etiam interpretes mirifice vexavit.” ^{<0018>}Genesis 6:3, Onkelos, like the Sept., Syr., Saad., and many recent commentators, gives *arçb ^wnad l ydb ^ydh açyb ard μyqty al* (*μyç = μy rçab*), i.e. “this evil generation shall not stand before me forever, because they are flesh;” ^{<0144>}Genesis 14:14, *yhwml w[ty zyrzw*, i.e. “he armed his young men,” but ^{<0152>}Genesis 15:2, *qçmA^b = asnrpA^b*, “governor,” is contrary to the true sense of the words; ^{<0216>}Genesis 20:16, he did not rightly understand *tj bwnw*, for he translates *tj kwta trmad hm l k l [w* “and with respect to all she said she was reproved;” ^{<0255>}Genesis 24:55, *ya μymy rwc[*, which the Sept. correctly translates *ἡμέρας ὡσεὶ δέκα*, Vulg. *salter decem dies*, Onkelos, in accordance with all Jewish interpreters, explains by *^d[^yj ry arç[wa ^d[b*, i.e. “a season of times, or ten months;” ^{<0263>}Genesis 24:63, *j yçl* is translated by *hal xl*, “to pray;” ^{<0272>}Genesis 27:42, *μj ntm* is translated, by way of explanation, *l fqml l ^mk*, “plotteth against thee, to kill thee.” The difficult *rba*, in ^{<0443>}Genesis 41:43, is explained by *akl ml aba*, “a father to the king,” and *hn[p tnpç* by *hyl ^yl g ^yrymf d arbg*, the man to whom mysteries are revealed.” The *μkç l yttñ j a*, in ^{<0482>}Genesis 48:22, is correctly given by *l tybhy dj ql wj*, “and I give thee one part;” and *μymk zj p*, in ^{<0494>}Genesis 49:4, by *pa μdql tl za*, “thou hast been carried away by thine anger.”

Explanatory additions, which evidently belong to Onkelos, are found in ^{<008>}Genesis 6:3 ([~]wbwt y ma, “if they may be converted,” at the end of the verse); ^{<005>}Genesis 9:5 (yhwj ad amd ty dwçyd, “who sheddeth the blood of his brother”); ^{<012>}Genesis 14:22 (where yl xb, “in prayer,” is added to ydy ytwmyrh); ^{<032>}Genesis 43:32 (where we have ^yl ka yarb[hyl ^yl j d yarxmd ary[byra, “because the Hebrews eat the animals ‘which are sacred to the Egyptians’”) (comp. Winer, *De Onkeloso*, p. 41). Larger additions and deviations from the original text are found mostly in the poetical parts of the Pentateuch (Genesis 49, Numbers 24; Deuteronomy 32 and 33). In the multiplicity of words, which is here employed, the original text almost disappears. Thus ^{<041>}Genesis 49:11, 12, which is referred to the Messiah (the parallel being ^{<047>}Numbers 24:17), is rendered, “Israel shall dwell in the circuit of his city; the people shall build his temple; and there shall be the righteous in his circuit, and the makers of the law in his doctrine; the best purple shall be his clothing; his covering shall be silk dyed with purple and with various colors. His mountains shall be redder in their vineyards; his hills shall drop wine: his fields shall be white with his grain and with flocks of sheep.”

In passages relative to the Divine Being, we perceive the effect of a doctrinal bias in certain deviations from the Hebrew text. Anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions are avoided, lest human attributes should be assigned to the Deity. Thus, [~]pyhl a and hwhy are rendered yyd armym, “the Word of God ;” or yyd arqy, “the splendor of God;” or yyd atnkç, “the Shechinah of God.” Akin to this peculiarity is the avoidance of [~]pyhl a, when it is applied to men or idols, and the employment of br , aynyd, ^w[f, ^l j d. In cases where divine qualities or ornaments appear to be assigned to men, Onkelos modifies and smoothes the meaning, and substitutes a different idea. Thus, ^ybhbrk ^whtw, i.e. ye shall be as princes,” is substituted for [~]ptyyj yhl ak, in ^{<005>}Genesis 3:5; or wnmmdj ak hyh µdah ^h, in ver. 22, is translated by aml [b ydyj y hwh µda hynm, “behold Adam is the only one in the world of himself.”

Onkelos shows an apparent desire to present the great men of his nation in as favorable a light as possible (comp. ^{<012>}Genesis 16:12; 25:27; 45, 27). Difficult words are not infrequently retained, as in Genesis 2, 12; ^{<017>}Exodus 12:7; ^{<030>}Leviticus 13:30; and ^{<022>}Deuteronomy 22:12. Names

of peoples, cities, and mountains are given as they were common in his time. Thus, in ^{ⲀⲐⲐⲐⲐ}Genesis 8:4, instead of *fr̄ra yr̄h*, he has *wdr̄q yr̄wf*, as in Syr. and Arab.; *y[n̄ç ra*, in 10:10, becomes: *l bb a[ra*; *pyr̄wtpk*, in ver. 14, becomes *yaqf̄wpq*; *μyl a[m̄çy*, in 37:25, becomes *yabr̄*, etc. (see Winer, *op. cit.* p. 39). In perusing Onkelos as a source of emending the Hebrew text, great caution is necessary, and the more so because we have not as yet a critical edition of this Targum. The only safe rule in emending the Hebrew text is when the same variety of readings which the Chaldee presents is found in several Hebrew MSS. Thus, e.g., in ^{ⲀⲐⲐⲐⲐ}Exodus 9:7, we read in the Hebrew *l ar̄çy hn̄qmm*, but in the Chaldee *l ar̄çy ynbd ary[bm*. The original reading was probably *l ar̄çy ynbd hn̄qmm*, which is found in several MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi, and in most of the ancient versions. The Targum of Onkelos has always been held in high regard among the Jews, who also composed a Masorah upon it. Such a Masorah has lately been published, from a very ancient codex, by Dr. Berliner, *Die Massorah zum Targum Onkelos, enthaltend Massorah Magna und Massorah Parva* (Leips. 1877).

3. Manuscripts of Onkelos are extant in great numbers. Oxford has five, London (British Museum) two, Vienna six, Augsburg one, Nuremberg two, Altdorf one, Carlsruhe three, Stuttgart two, Erfurt three, Dresden one, Leipsic one, Jena one, Dessau one, Helmstadt two, Berlin four, Breslau one, Brieg one, Ratisbon one, Hamburg seven, Copenhagen two, Upsala one, Amsterdam one, Paris eight, Molsheim one, Venice six, Turin two, Milan four, Leghorn one, Sienna one, Geneva one, Florence five, Bologna two, Padua one, Trieste two, Parma about forty, Rome eighteen, more or less complete, etc., containing Onkelos. For a full description of these MSS, see Winer, *De Onkeloso*, p. 13 sq.

4. Editions. — The Targum of Onkelos was first published with Rashi's commentary on the Pentateuch (Bologna, 1482, fol.). It was subsequently reprinted quite frequently, and may be found in the Rabbinic and Polyglot Bibles. Buxtorf was the first to add the vowel-points to the Targum. As yet, we have no critical edition of this Targum. Dr. Berliner purposes to publish a new and critical edition according to that of Sabioneta (1557). This Targum has been translated into Latin by Alphonso de Zamora in the Complutensian Polyglot, by Paul Fagius, and by John Mercier (1568). That

of Fagius is the best. It was rendered into English by Etheridge (Lond. 1862-65).

5. Literature. — Jes. Berlin (Pik), **amygr t ynym**, or glosses and comments upon the Targum of Onkelos (Breslau, 1827); Luzzato, **rg bhwa**, *Philoxenus, sire de Onkeloosi Chaldaica Pentateuchi Versione Dissertatio*, etc. (Vienna, 1830), distributes the deviations from the Hebrew into thirty-two classes, and endeavors to emend the text from MSS., although the genius of the version is not well described in it (the writer of the art. “Targum” in Smith’s *Dict. of the Bible*, besides a great deal of useless ballast, thought it necessary to copy Luzzato); Berkowitz, **rya hfw** , on the hermeneutics of Onkelos (Wilna, 1843); id. **twl mç twpyl j** (ibid. 1874); Levy, in Geiger’s *Zeitschrift*, 1844, 5, 175-198; Fürst, *Literaturblatt*, 1845, p. 337 sq., 354; Smith, *Diatribes de Chald. Paraphrastis eorumque Versionum* (Oxf. 1662); Winer, *De Onkeloso ejusque Paraphrasi Chaldaica* (Lips. 1820); Maybaum, *Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos*, etc. (Breslau, 1870); Geiger, *Jidische Zeitschrift*, 1871, p. 85-104; **hnytn rgl** , or a commentary on Onkelos by Dr. Adler in the edition of the Pentateuch with ten commentaries (Wilna, 1874); and the literature given in the art. **ONKELOS** *SEE ONKELOS* in this *Cyclopaedia*.

III. Jonathan ben-Uzziel on the Prophets, i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, stands next in time and importance to Onkelos.

1. Authorship and Sources — As to Jonathan himself, we read in the Talmud—

(1.) “Eighty disciples had Hillel the elder, thirty of whom were worthy that the Shechinah [Divine Majesty] should rest upon them, as it did upon Moses our Lord; peace be upon him. Thirty of them were worthy that the sun should stand still at their bidding, as it did at that of Joshua ben-Nun. Twenty were of intermediate worth. The greatest of them all was Jonathan ben-Uzziel, the least R. Jochanall ben-Zachai; and it was said of R. Jochanan ben-Zachai that he left not [uninvestigated] the Bible, the Mishna, the Gemara, the Halachahs, the Haggadahs, the subtleties of the law, and the subtleties of the Sopherim . . . the easy things and the difficult things [from the most awful divine mysteries to the common popular proverbs].... If this is said of the least of them, what is to be said of the

greatest, i.e. Jonathan ben-Uzziel?" (*Baba Bathra*, 134 a; *comp. Sukkah*, 28 a).

(2.) A second passage, referring more especially to our present subject, reads as follows: "The Targum of Onkelos was made by Onkelos the Proselyte from the mouth of R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua, and that of the prophets by Jonathan ben-Uzziel from the mouth of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. And in that hour was the land of Israel shaken three hundred parasangs. And a voice was heard, saying, 'Who is this who has revealed my secrets unto the sons of man?' Up rose Jonathan ben-Uzziel and said, 'It is I who have revealed thy secrets to the sons of man.... But it is known and revealed before thee that not 'for my honor have I done it, nor for the honor of my father's house, but for thine honor, that the disputes may cease in Israel.'... And he further desired to reveal the Targum to the Hagiographa, when a voice was heard, 'Enough.' And why? Because the day of the Messiah is revealed therein" (*Megillah*, 3 a).

There is some exaggeration in 'this description of Jonathan's paraphrase, but it only shows the high esteem in which it stood. Fabulous as the whole may appear, yet there is no doubt as to the high antiquity of this paraphrase. Many doubts were raised as to the authorship of this Targum. Some, who would not deny the existence of Jonathan, hesitate to believe that he had any share in the Targum commonly ascribed to him. 'It has also been suggested by Luzzato and Geiger that *Jonathan* is the same with the Greek *Theodotion*, and that the Babylonians gave this name to the paraphrase-especially as they were acquainted with that of Jonathan ben-Uzziel-to indicate that the Targum was *after the manner of Theodotion*, like the reputed origin of the name *Onkelos* in connection with the Greek *Akilas* or *Aguila*." But this more ingenious than true suggestion has no support, and needs no refutation. It has also been suggested by most of the modern critics that because this Targum is never once quoted as the Targum of Jonathan, but is invariably introduced with the formula $\tilde{a}swy \ 8r \ \mu gr \ tmdk$, "as R. Joseph interprets," that not Jonathan, but R. Joseph, is the author of this Targum; and this supposition is based upon the fact that the Talmud relates that this R. Joseph, in his latter years, occupied himself chiefly with the Targum when he had become blind. This relation of the Talmud, and perhaps the fact that Jonathan's Targum, which was called, by way of abbreviation, $y8 \ 8t$, i.e. $\hat{t}nw y \ \mu wgrt$, made Joseph the author of this Targum, since $y8 \ 8t$ may also mean $\tilde{a}swy \ \mu wgrt$, or

something else, and the real Targum is now quoted under Joseph's name. That Jonathan's Targum was really extant before the time of R. Joseph we see from *Megillah*, 3 a, where on ^{<3812>}Zechariah 12:12 R. Joseph remarks, "Without the Targum to this passage, we could not understand it;" but when the writer, of the art. "Targum" in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible* remarks, Twice even it is quoted in Joseph's name, and with the addition, Without the Targum to this verse (due to him), we could not understand it,' he only betrays his carelessness as to the Talmudic sentence. After all, we do not see why we should not rely upon the Talmudic notice concerning Jonathan equally as much as upon that concerning R. Joseph. The language concerning the former, we admit, is a little hyperbolic, but this does not exclude the truth of the matter. Besides, there is nothing to militate against Jonathan having written a Targum on the prophets; and even the expression that this Targum was made "from the mouth of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi" is not so absurd as the writer of the art. "Targum" in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia* would suppose, for if it means anything, it means this, that the explanation of Jonathan contains the transmitted-exposition in the spirit of Hillel, and, as Zunz remarks (*Gottesd. Vortrage*, p. 332), "Jonathan's Targum on the prophets, as a result of studies which were instrumental in forming fixed national opinions, proves that a considerable time before it was customary to explain the contents of the prophetic books, by means of Targumical prelections or otherwise, to the public. Nay, he commends the teachers for-even in evil times teaching the law in the synagogues at the head of the congregations" (Targ. on ^{<008>}Judges 5:2, 9). From the New Test. we know that Moses and the prophets were read in the synagogues, and, deducting all hyperbolic language, there is no reason for doubting the high antiquity of this Targum. The text is rendered, in the same manner as by Onkelos, free from all one-sided and polemical considerations, which the Jews since the 2d century followed. Many passages are referred to the Messiah; even such as do not rightly belong to him, so that no polemical tendency against Christians appears in the version. The following is a list of them: 1 Samuel 2, 10; ^{<023>}2 Samuel 23:3; ^{<103>}1 Kings 4:33; ^{<204>}Isaiah 4:2; 9:6; 10:27; 11:1, 6; 15:2; 16, 1-5; 28:5; 42, 1; 43, 10; 45, 1; 52, 13; 53, 10; ^{<235>}Jeremiah 23:5; 30:21; 33:13, 15; ^{<305>}Hosea 3:5; 14:8; ^{<308>}Micah 4:8; 5, 2, 18; ^{<308>}Zechariah 3:8; 4:7; 6:12; 10:4.

2. Character, etc. — In the historical books the exegesis is simple and tolerably literal. A few words are added occasionally, which have no

representatives in the original, but they are not many. The interpretation is good, giving the sense fully and fairly; but in the prophetic books the text is more freely handled, for, as Zunz justly remarks (op. cit. p. 63), “The prophetic writings, not containing anything of the nature of legal enactment, admitted of a greater latitude in handling the text. This became even unavoidable because of the more obscure language and the predictions concerning Israel’s future by which they are characterized. Even in the case of the historical books, Jonathan often acts the part of an expositor. In the case of the prophets themselves, this course of exposition—in reality becoming a Haggadah—is pursued almost uninterruptedly.” “This pervading, often misunderstood, characteristic,” says Havernick, “constitutes the chief proof, confirmed also by external evidence, of the *oneness* of the authorship of this Targum; for not only do parallel passages (such as Isaiah 36-39; comp. ^{<1283>}2 Kings 18:13 sq.; Isaiah 2, 24; Micah 5, 1-3) literally harmonize, but he is also in the habit of furnishing, particularly the poetical portions of the historical books (Judges 5; 1 Samuel 2; 2 Samuel 23), with profuse additions. These additions often very much resemble each other (comp. ^{<1058>}Judges 5:8 with ^{<2304>}Isaiah 10:4, ^{<1204>}2 Samuel 23:4 with ^{<2316>}Isaiah 30:26).”

Another peculiarity of this Targum are the Jewish dogmatical opinions of that day with which the work is interwoven, and the theological representations, in introducing which a special preference was given to the book of Daniel. Examples of this are the interpreting of the phrase “stars of God” by “people of God” (^{<2443>}Isaiah 14:13; comp. ^{<2780>}Daniel 8:10; 2 Macc. 9:10); the application of the passage in ^{<2711>}Daniel 12:1 to that in ^{<2302>}Isaiah 4:2. In ^{<2302>}Isaiah 10:32 the author introduces a legend framed in imitation of the narrative in Daniel 3, which is repeated by later Targumists (comp. Targ. Jesus; ^{<1128>}Genesis 11:28; 16, 5; ^{<1483>}2 Chronicles 28:3); in ^{<2214>}Isaiah 22:14 and 65, 35 he has interwoven the doctrine concerning the *second death* (comp. Revelation 2, 11), which the wicked should die in the next world or kingdom of the Messiah; and in ^{<2313>}Isaiah 30:33 he mentions *Gehenna*. In various places the notices respecting the Messiah’s offices, character, and conduct, the effects of his advent and personal influence, harmonize with those of the New-Test. writers (comp. ^{<2301>}Isaiah 42:1 sq.; ^{<1027>}Matthew 12:17 sq.); but from this the Sept. differs, and at other times the N.T. writers differ from this Targum. Isaiah 53 it recognizes as referring to the Messiah, and assumes a suffering and expiatory Messiah. Its author nevertheless here, as well as elsewhere (Micah 5, 1), indulges in

many perversions. He seems to have entertained-in germ, at least-the idea, which became further developed in the Talmud, of a Messiah submitting to obscurity for the sake of the sins of the people, and then appearing in glory (comp. ³⁹⁰⁸Micah 4:8 with ³⁸⁰⁸Zechariah 3:8; 4:7). There is little doubt that the text has received several interpolations. To this head Zunz (*op. cit.* p. 63, 282) refers all that is hostile to Rome, e.g. ¹²⁹⁶Exodus 39:16; ⁹⁰¹⁵1 Samuel 2:5; ²³⁴⁹Isaiah 34:9. So, too, *Armillus*, in ²³¹¹⁴Isaiah 11:14. To these may be added perhaps *Germania*, from Gomer, in ²⁵⁸⁶Ezekiel 38:6, the superstitious legend inserted in ²³⁰²Isaiah 10:32 relative to the army and camp of Sennacherib; and the peculiar story about Sisera (⁹⁰¹⁸Judges 5:8). Even Rashi speaks of interpolations in the text of Jonathan (²⁵⁷⁹Ezekiel 47:19); and Wolf says (*Bibl. Heb.* 2, 1165), “Quæ vero, vel quod ad voces et barbaras, vel ad res metate ejus inferiores, aut futilia nonnulla, quamvis pauca triplicis hujus generis exstent, ibi occurrunt, ea merito falsarii cujusdam ingenio adscribuntur.” The printed text of the Antwerp Polyglot confirms this supposition of interpolations, since several of them are wanting there. So long as we have no critical edition of this Targum, we must be careful to draw the inference, as did Morinus and Voss, in favor of a very late origin of the Targum; for a perusal of the recently published edition of this Targum by Lagarde, from the Codex Reuchlin, and its comparison with our present editions, will only show the corrupt state in which the text at present is.

The style of Jonathan is, upon the whole, the same as that of Onkelos. Eichhorn and Berthold asserted that this Targum teems with “exotic words.” Yet, notwithstanding their assertion, we believe that Carpzov (*Crit. Sacra*, p. 461) is correct when he says, “Cujus nitor sermonis Chaldai et dictionis laudatur puritas, ad Onkelosum proxime accedens et purum deflectens a puro tersoque Chaldaismo Biblico.” The text lying at the basis of the Targum is the Masoretic one; yet it differs from the Masoretic text in various places, where it appears to follow preferable readings. But the freedom which the translator took makes it difficult to tell in every case what particular form of the text lay before him. Hence great caution must be used in applying the Targum to critical purposes, and the more so as we have not as yet a critical edition.

We subjoin from the art. “Targum” in Smith’s *Dict. of the Bible* the following specimens of this Targum from different books:

Picture for Targum 1

3. Literature. — For the editions, translations, and oldbr literature, see Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 2, 106 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 2, 1166; Le Long (ed. Masch), II, 1, 39 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Handbuch*, 3, 9 sq.; Frankel, *Zu dem Targum der Propheten* (Breslau, 1872); Lagarde, *Prophetæ Chaldaice. Efide Codicis Reuchliniani* (Lips. 1872 sq.); Bacher, *Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum*, in the *Zeit schrift d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft* 1874, 28:1 sq.; 1875, 29:157 sq., 319 sq. **SEE JONATHAN BENUZZIEL.**

IV. *The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerushalmi on the Pentateuch.*

— The greater simplicity which characterized the older Targums soon ceased to satisfy the progressively degenerating taste of the Jews, especially after the Talmud began to assume a written form. Hence Targums marked by greater laxity soon began to be written which embraced more the opinions peculiar to the age, and furnished the text with richer traditional addenda. Of these latitudinarian Targums we possess two on the Pentateuch—the one known by the name of Pseudo-Jonathan, inasmuch as writers of a later period ascribe it to the author of the Targum on the Prophets; and the commonly so-called Targum Hierosolymitanum or Jerushalmi.

1. Pseudo Jonathan. This paraphrase is falsely ascribed to Jonathan ben-Uzziel. It extends from the first verse of Genesis to the last of Deuteronomy. The way in which it came to be regarded as his is supposed to have been the mistake of a copyist, who made out of **y8 8t**, i.e. *Targum Jerushalmi*. **^tnwy8t**, *Targum Jonathan*. Proof is not needed at the present day to show that the Jonathan of the prophets is not the Jonathan of the Pentateuch, for he could have little to do with a Targum which speaks of Constantinople (^{<0219>}Numbers 24:19, 24), describes very plainly the breaking-up of the West-Roman empire (ver. 19-24), mentions the Turks (^{<0102>}Genesis 10:2), and even Mohammed's two wives, Chadija and Fatima (^{<0221>}Genesis 21:21), and which not only exhibits the fullest acquaintance with the edited body of the Babylonian Talmud, by quoting entire passages from it, but adopts its peculiar phraseology: not to mention the complete disparity between the style, language, and general manner of the Jonathanic Targum on the Prophets, and those of this one on the Pentateuch, strikingly palpable at first sight. This was recognized by early investigators (Morinus, Pfeiffer, Walton, etc.), who soon overthrew the old belief in

Jonathan ben-Uzziel's authorship, as upheld by Menahem Rekanati, Asariah de Rossi, Gedaljah, Galatin, Fagius, etc. The work of the Pseudo-Jonathan is not a version. It is rather a paraphrase, though by no means exclusively so. Neither is it a Haggadic commentary. Version and paraphrase are interwoven throughout, the author seldom confining himself to simple explanation, but proceeding to large Midrashim. Halachah and Haggadah are richly imbedded in the work, the latter especially. His legends are rich and copious. His Haggadah is not historical; it is ethical, religious, metaphysical, lyrical, and parabolic. It has been well observed that he is only the interpreter of the ideas prevailing in his time—the narrator of traditions, religious and national, not their inventor, because most of them are found in preceding literature, or, as Zunz states it, “almost all his explanations and embellishments coinciding with the Haggadah we find occurring in the other Haggadic writings; the few which are peculiar to him he has not devised, any more than Jonathan has devised his interpretation of the prophets. In both the culture of the age and the potency of traditional ideas are manifest” (*Gottesd. Vortrage*, p. 72). To these embellishments belongs the manner in which events and characters are dressed out hyperbolically in Jonathan's Midrashim; not only the Biblical heroes, as was natural, but even the enemies of the Jewish nation. Thus Og carries on his head a piece of rock sufficient to bury all the camp of Israel beneath its weight (⁰²¹³⁵Numbers 21:35). A mountain possessed of divine virtues is suspended in the air over the children of Israel (⁰²⁹¹⁷Exodus 19:17), etc. Many examples are given by Zunz (*op. cit.* p 72, note b) to show, against Winer and Petermann, that all these stories were not invented by Pseudo-Jonathan, but borrowed from traditional usage. The ethical Haggadah is perhaps the best part of the work, for here the exegete becomes didactic. Thus we are told in Genesis 40 that Joseph suffered two additional years of imprisonment because he built on man's rather than God's help, a view also espoused by Rashi. The region of the supernatural is treated very freely by Jonathan. His angelology is marvelous. He has the names of many angels outside the circle of the Bible, as Samael, Gabriel, Uriel, Saglugael, etc. We find rhetorical or poetical digressions in ⁰²²¹⁴Genesis 22:14 (the prayer of Abraham on Mount Moriah), ⁰⁵⁴¹⁶Deuteronomy 34:6 (the hymn on Moses death); ⁰⁴⁴⁰⁴Genesis 49:4; ⁰²¹³⁴Numbers 21:34; ⁰⁵²⁷⁰Deuteronomy 32:50 (parables). Like Onkelos and others, he avoids anthropomorphic ideas, and is averse to ascribe superhuman attributes to heathen gods. The Halachah is also brought within the circle of his paraphrase, and its results employed in the

exposition. This part of Jonathan's version has of late been treated by Dr. S. Gronemann, in his *Die jonthanische Pentateuch-Uebersetzung in ihrem Verhalltniss zur Jalacha* (Leipsic, 1879).

The language of this Targum shows it to be of Palestinian origin, as it is in what is called the Jerusalem dialect, like that of the Jerusalem Talmud, but with many peculiarities. It is far from being pure, because the Syriac had deeply affected it. Foreign elements enter into it largely, such as ^{<0507>}Genesis 50:7, *swnyyqwa* = ὠκεανός (2, 6; ^{<0306>}Numbers 34:6); ver. 9, *atkwd* = δοχεῖον, or δοχή; ver. 20, *rywa* = ἀήρ; 2, 12, *yl rwb* = βήρυλλος, Syr. *al wrb*; 3, 4, *rwl yd* = delator; 4:6, *ynwqya* = εἰκόνες; 6:2, *sqp*, from πείκω, or πείζω, or πέκω; ver. 9, *asyng* = γένεσις, γέννησις, γένος; Syr. *sng* and *asng*, etc.; comp. Petermann. *De Duabus Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus' Chaldaicis*, particula 1, p. 66 sq., where a collection of these foreign words is given. The names of Constantinople and Lombardy, and even of two of Mohammed's wives, which occur in this paraphrase, besides the many foreign words, prove the Targum to have originated in the second half of the 7th century. That Jonathan had Onkelos before him, a very slight comparison of both will show. Many places attach themselves almost verbally to Onkelos, as ^{<0201>}Genesis 20:1-15. Indeed, one object which the Pseudo-Jonathan had in view was to give a criticism upon Onkelos. He corrects and alters him more or less. Where Onkelos paraphrases, Jonathan enlargest paraphrase. The same attention to the work of his predecessor is shown in his Halachic as in his Haggadic interpretation; as also in the avoidance of anthropomorphisms and anthropomorphisms. Sometimes the divergences from Onkelos are slight, sometimes important and they are often superior to Onkelos, but sometimes the reverse. As his object was different, his production presents a great contrast on the whole, because he intended to interpret, not to translate. Besides, this divergence from Onkelos must be accounted for in another way: he did not base his work *primarily* on the latter, but upon another paraphrase; or, in other words, he worked upon Onkelos indirectly in the first instance because his whole production rests on the basis of the Jerushalmi, or Jerusalem, Targum. But, before proceeding with our observation on the Pseudo-Jonathan, let us speak of

2. The Jerushalmi, or Jerusalem, Targum — The Jerusalem Targum, written in the same dialect substantially as that of the Pseudo-Jonathan, and interpreting single verses, often single words only, is extant in the

following proportions: a third on Genesis, a fourth on Deuteronomy, a fifth on Numbers, three twentieths on Exodus, and about one fourteenth on Leviticus. Judging from the rounded and complete form in which the different parts are given, we may infer that it is now in its primitive state. If so, it cannot be a fragmentary recension of Jonathan. Yet their similarity is striking. The Haggadah of the one regularly appears in the other, and has usually a more concise form in the Jerusalem Targum. Indeed, there is often a verbal agreement, or nearly so, between them, so that one might at first be inclined to assume their original identity, if not that they are fundamentally the same work — the Jerusalem Targum containing variations from the other, or being a fragmentary recension of it. The latter opinion is held by Zunz. But against this there are many arguments, especially the fact that the work is complete and rounded off in many parts. And though the similarity of the Jonathan and Jerusalem Targums is considerable, there is so much divergence as to prove diversity of authorship. Thus Jerushalmi knows very little of angels: Michael is the only one ever occurring. In Jonathan, on the other hand, angelology flourishes with great vigor: to the Biblical Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, are added the Angel of Death, Samael, Sagnugael, Shachassai, Usiel; seventy angels descend with God to see the building of the Babylonian tower; nine hundred millions of punishing angels go through Egypt during the night of the Exode, etc. Jerushalmi makes use but rarely of Halachah and Haggadah, while Jonathan sees the text as it were only through the medium of Haggadah: to him the chief end. Hence Jonathan has many Midrashim not found in Jerushalmi, while he does not omit a single one contained in the latter. There are no direct historical dates in Jerushalmi, but many are found in Jonathan; and since all other signs indicate that but a short space of time intervenes between the two, the late origin of either' is to a great extent made manifest by these dates. The most striking difference between them, however, and the one, which is most characteristic of either, is this, that while Jerushalmi adheres more closely to the language of the Mishna, Jonathan has greater affinity to that of the Gemara. It is also perceptible that the reverence of Onkelos for the name of God, shown in substituting the *Memra*, or something intermediate, is not so excessive in Jonathan as' in the Jerusalem Targum. If such be the diversity of Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum, they are not one work fundamentally; nor is the one a recension, now in fragments, of the other. But how is their resemblance to be explained? Only by the fact that both have relation to Onkelos. The author of the Jerusalem Targum worked upon that of Onkelos, his object

being to correct it according to certain principles, and to insert in it a selection of Haggadahs current among the people. Pseudo-Jonathan afterwards resumed the same office, and completed what his predecessor had begun. The Jerusalem Targum formed the basis of Jonathan, and its own basis was that of Onkelos, Jonathan used both his predecessors paraphrases, the author of the Jerusalem Targum that of Onkelos alone. There is no doubt that the small glossarial passages of the Jerusalem Targum are intended as a critical commentary upon Onkelos, and from his standpoint the author proceeds freely in using his predecessor. Thus he rejects his acceptations of words, and gives closer acceptations for his freer ones. In many places where Onkelos's scrupulosity about removing anthropomorphisms from the text had obscured the sense, the Jerusalem Targum restores the original meaning by some addition or change. Thus in ^{<0006>}Genesis 6:6, where Onkelos omits the name Jehovah and paraphrases, the Jerusalem Targum comes near the original text. Sometimes, where Onkelos Aramaizes a Hebrew word, the Jerusalem Targum substitutes a genuine Aramaean one, as in ^{<0022>}Genesis 8:22, where the *afyḡi* of Onkelos is displaced for *abr*. So in ^{<0342>}Genesis 34:12, where Onkelos has *wn;Tmll* *yr*, the Jerusalem Targum puts *aTb* *tk* *wi*. *Vice versa*, the Jerusalem Targum often prefers a Hebrew word to Onkelos's Aramaean one, perhaps because the latter was better known in Palestine, as in ^{<0224>}Genesis 22:24. There is, indeed, no uniformity between Onkelos and Jerusalem in the use of Aramaean words, while consistent divergences may be readily traced. After all that has been said there can be no doubt that the general object of the author of the Jerusalem Targum was to correct and explain Onkelos, adapting it to a later time and different country by enriching it with the Haggadic lore which had accumulated, so that its deficiencies might be removed. From being a version, he wished to supplement it in various parts, so that it should be a paraphrase there. That he has made many mistakes, and departed in not a few cases from Onkelos for the worse, we need not remark, nor enumerate his errors, since Peterman has collated them (*op. cit.* p. 60 sq.). It is this fragmentary Jerusalem Targum to which Jonathan had regard in the first instance. He uses the larger paraphrases and Haggadic parts of it, as well as the smaller variations from Onkelos, but always with discretion. More commonly the Haggadah of the Jerusalem Targum is simplified and abridged. Nor does Jonathan follow Onkelos implicitly, but often diverges. If he does not adhere consistently to the Jerusalem Targum, we need not expect to see

him copying ‘Onkelos.’ Thus in ^{<01071E>}Genesis 7:11; 22:24, he leaves Onkelos for the Jerusalem Targum. It should also be observed that Jonathan relies upon Onkelos much more than the Jerusalem Targum, which is freer and more independent. Thus the former follows Onkelos, and the latter departs from him in ^{<011ED>}Genesis 11:30; 12:6, 15; 13:6; 14:5, 21; 16:7, 15; 19:31; 20:18, etc. The interval of time between the Jerusalem Targum and Jonathan cannot be determined exactly, but it must have been a century. From these observations it will no longer be uncertain “whether the Targum of Jerusalem hath been a continued Targum, or only the notes of some learned Jew upon the margins of the Pentateuch, or an abridgment of Onkelos” (Alix, *Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church*, etc., p. 88). All the guesses are incorrect. The only objection to this hypothesis is the statement of Zunz that because many citations made by older authors from the two Targums in question are now missing, an older and complete Jerusalem Targum must have existed, which is now lost. But when we consider the probable chances of passages being lost in the course of transcription, and of others being interpolated, as also the fact of variations in the editions, it need not be assumed, in the face of internal evidence, that they are *very* different now from what they were at first. Many of the passages cited by authors and now wanting, which Zunz has brought together, need a great deal of sifting and correction, as has been ably shown by Seligsohn in Frankel’s *Monatsschrift*, 1857, p. 113. The view of the relation now given between Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum, and Pseudo-Jonathan was briefly advocated by Frankel (*op. cit.* 1846, p. 111 sq.) with ability and success. His view has again been taken up by Seligsohn and Traub, and satisfactorily established by them in a prize-essay, published in Frankel’s *Monatsschrift*, 1857.

3. Editions and Commentaries. The Pseudo- Jonathan Targum was first published at Venice in 1591; then at Hanau, 1618; Amsterdam, 1640; Prague, 1646; Amsterdam, 1671 and 1703; Berlin, 1705; Wilna, 1852; Vienna, 1859, etc. — all these, as well as the *editio princeps*, having Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targum. It is also in the London Polyglot, vol. 4. together with a Latin translation made by Antony Chevalier. It was translated into English by Etheridge (Lond. 1862-65). The Jerusalem Targum was first printed by Bomberg (Venice, 1518) in his Rabbinical Bible, and reprinted in the subsequent Rabbinical Bibles issued by him and in the great Polyglots. Since its publication by Walton in 1657, it has also appeared at Wilna (1852), Vienna (1859), and Warsaw (1875). Francis

Taylor made a Latin version of this Targum (Lond. 1649); but the more correct one is that of Antony Chevalier above noticed.

A commentary was written upon the Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerusalem Targums by David ben-Jacob Zebrecyn (Prague, 1609), entitled ןַטְנֻי ןַמְגֵרְתִּי [ךְּרֵיפּ יַמִּל ךְּרֵי ןַמְגֵרְתְּו; by Mordecai ben-Naphtali Hirsch (Amsterdam, 1671), entitled ןַיַּמְשׁ תְּרִפָּק, but ךְּרֵיפּ יַמִּל ךְּרֵי ןַטְנֻי ןַמְגֵרְתִּי [is given in the Pentateuch edition published at Wilna in 1859.

R. Pheibel benDavid (Hanau, 1614), author of תְּוִל מְהַדְּבֵב, did not compose, as the writer of the art. "Targum" in Kitto states, a commentary on Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerushalmi, but an elucidation of difficult words found in Jonathan's Targum.

We subjoin the following specimens from Genesis and Deuteronomy, selected at random:

Picture for Targum 2

4. *Literature.* Winer, *De Jonathanis in Pentateuchum Paraphrasi Chaldaica* (Erlangen, 1823); Petermann, *De Duabus Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus Chaldaicis*, pt. 1; *De Indole Paraphraseos quas Jonathanis esse dicitur* (Berlin. 1829); Bar, *Geist des Jeruschalnz* (*PseudoJonathan*), in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1851-52, p. 235-242; Seligsohn and Traub, *Ueber den Geist der Uebersetzung des Jonathan ben-Usiel zum Pentateuch und die. Abfassung des in den Editionen dieser Uebersetzung beigedruckten Targum Jeruschalmi*, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1857, p. 96-114, 138-149; Geiger, *Das Jerusalemische Targum zzum Pentateuch*, in the *Urschrift u. Uebersetzung der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 457-480; Seligsohn, *De Duabus Hierosolymitanis Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus* (*ibid.* 1858); Gronemann, *Die Jonathan'sche Pentateuch-Uebersetzung*, etc. (Leips. 1879).

V. *Targums on the Hagiographa.* — These Targums are generally divided into three groups, viz.: *a.* Job, Psalms, Proverbs; *b.* The five Megilloth; *c.* Daniel, Chronicles, and Ezra. Tradition ascribes to R. Joseph the Blind the authorship of this Targum, but this is contradicted by writers even of the 13th century (see Zunz, *op. cit.* p. 65).

1. *The Targum on the Book of Job.* — A feature of this Targum is its Haggadical character.: As early as the middle of the 1st century a

paraphrase on the book of Job is: mentioned. Its difficulty, but more especially its adaptation to allegorizing fancies, presented a peculiar temptation to Chaldee expositors. In many places we find a double Targum. After one interpretation, which is always free in character, another still more paraphrastic is annexed with the introductory, **a8 8t**, i.e. **rj a μwgrt**, *another Targum* (comp. ^{<K817>}Job 18:7, 8, 18). The extraneous insertions are very numerous, uncertain, fabulous, and incorrect. Thus at 2, 1 we read, “And the three friends of Job heard of all the evil that had come upon him when they had seen the trees of his garden burned up, and the bread of his food changed into living flesh, and the wine of his drink into blood; and they came each one from his place, and for this service they were delivered from the place appointed them in Gehenna.” In ^{<K815>}Job 1:15 the words of the original **abç l [l ptw** are rendered **äyktb t l pnw dgrmz tkl mm tyl yl**, “and the queen of Samarcand (?) suddenly rushed in.” If Samarcand be really mentioned, the date is late. The language is intermixed with Greek and Latin words in the same degree as the Palestinian Targumim and Midrashim. Thus the word **yl gna**, **ἄγγελος** (angel), is used in ^{<K815>}Job 15:15; 20:27; 35:10. Bacher also finds in this Targum the Latin word *delator*, and comes to the conclusion that the author lived in Palestine, under Roman dominion, in the 4th or 5th century, while the writer of the art. “Targum” in Kitto states that “the work is a growth belonging to various times and writers, of which the beginning and end cannot be precisely determined.”

With regard to the Masoretic text, the Targum of Job agrees sometimes with the Sept. (as ^{<K812>}Job 19:29: **yb**, Targ. **hyb**, Sept. **ἐν αὐτῷ**; ^{<K821>}Job 22:21: **ttawbt**, Targ. **ttl l [**, Sept. **καρπός σου**; ^{<K812>}Job 31:32: **j r'ial**, Targ. **aynskal**, Sept. **ξένος**, both **j r'ea**), or with the Peshito (comp. ^{<K818>}Job 3:8; 6:16; 7:4; 9:7; 16:10; 26:10; 33:28). Often the reading of the Targum has to be explained from an interchange of letters, thus:

r and **d**— ^{<K824>}Job 24:24; **wmr**, Tar. **wmd** (**wkwrwa**).

A “ ^{<K815>}Job 5:5; **l a**, “ **l j** (**˘yswml wp**).

^{<K818>}Job 30:3; **hawç**, “ **hj wç** (**aj wç**).

^{<K817>}Job 28:7; **hya**, “ **hyj** (**hwj**).

A and m ^{<18704>}Job 7:4; ddmw, Tar. ddaŵ (tyddnŵ).

j “ m ^{<18702>}Job 30:12; hj rp, “ j rp (ʿwhynb).

h “ t ^{<18702>}Job 17:2; μtwrmhbwμ “ twrmθbw
(ʿwhygwrypbw).

y “ w — ^{<18702>}Job 19:28; yb, “ wb (hyb).

y “ w — ^{<18707>}Job 28:7; hya, “ hwj (hwj).

^{<18722>}Job 22:29; μyny[, “ μynw[(anj rws).

^{<18760>}Job 36:10; ʿwa, “ ʿya(aml ʿymdd).

n “ ç — ^{<18709>}Job 7:9; ʿn[, “ ʿç[(qspd amkyh (annt

^{<18760>}Job 36:20; āaçt, “ āant (rygt).

In two cases the variation is to be accounted for by hearing amiss, viz.

^{<18722>}Job 29:22, where, instead of āft, bfyt (rpçt), and ^{<18723>}Job 39:23, where, for hnr̄t, hm̄rt (ydçt) is read. The number is greater where the vowel-points differ from those of the Masorah. Variations of this kind may amount to about thirty.

The Targum on Job was published by John Terentius (Franek. 1663) [the text being that of Buxtorf, and the Latin translation that of Arias Montanus], with notes, consisting of various readings and explanations of Chaldee words. The Latin version of Alphonso de Zamora was published with notes by John Mercier (ibid. 1663), and Victorius Scialai translated it into Latin (Rome, 1618). This Targum has been treated by Bacher, in Gratz's *Monatsschrift*, 1871, p. 208-223, and by Weiss, *De Libri Jobi Paraphrasi Chaldaica* (Vratisl. 1873).

2. The Targum on the Psalms. — This Targum is not so Haggadic or diffuse as that of Job. Sometimes it follows the original with a tolerable degree of closeness, as in 1, 3, 5, 6:etc. In more cases, however, it indulges in prolix digressions, absurd fables, and commonplace remarks. Two or three different versions of the same text occasionally follow one another without remark, though the introductory notice a8 8t, i.e. μwḡrt rj a, sometimes precedes (comp. ^{<18700>}Psalms 110:1). The additions to the text are

often inappropriate, the sense distorted, the titles wrongly paraphrased, and fables are abundant. Thus in ex, 1 the paraphrase has, “The Lord said in his word that he would appoint me lord of all Israel; but he said to me again, Wait for Saul, who is of the tribe of Benjamin, till he die, because he does not agree in the kingdom with an associate; and afterwards I will make thine enemies thy footstool,” to which is subjoined **a8 8t**, thus, “The Lord said in his word that he would give me the dominion because I was intent upon the doctrine of the law of his right hand wait till I make thine enemy the footstool of thy feet.” Deviations from the Masoretic text are numerous. On the whole, the linguistic character of this Targum corresponds with that on Job, and resembles that of the Jerusalem Targum. It abounds in Greek words; thus, besides the **ἄγγελοι**, occurring also in Job, we meet with **δῶρον**, 20:4; **πέλαγος**, 46:3; **κύρνος**, 53:1, and 97:10; **νήσος**, 72:10; **πλατεῖα**, 58:12; **κύριος**, 73:13; **ὄχλος**, 89:7; **συνέδριον**, 57:32; **χάλκωμα**, 18:34, etc. According to Bacher, *Das Targum zu den Psalmen*, in Gratz’s *Monatsschrift*, 1872, p. 408416; 463-473, the author of this Targum is the same as that of Job. Davidson, in Kitto’s *Cyclop. s.v.* “Targum,” thinks that, “like the Targum on Job, this one is an accumulation of expositions extending over centuries.” The Targum on the Psalms was printed in Justiniani’s Polyglot Psalter (Genoa, 1516), and in the Hexaglot edition of the Psalter, published at Rostock, 1643. It is also printed in the latest Rabbinical Bible (Warsaw. 1875). The Antwerp and following Polyglots (1572, 1645, 1657) contain the Latin version of Arias Montanus. From the Codex Reuchlin, it was published by Lagarde in his *Hagiographa Chaldaice* (Leips. 1873), and republished by Nestle in his *Psalterium Tetraglottum* (Tüb. 1877-79).

3. The Targum on Proverbs. — This Targum is not Haggadic, and adheres more closely to the original text. Its remarkable agreement with the Syriac version has often been noticed an agreement which extends even to the choice and position of words, comp. 1, 1-6, 8, 10, 12, 13; 2, 9, 10, 13-15; 3, 2-9; 4:1-3, 26; 5, 1, 2, 4, 5; 8:27; 10:3-5; 26:1; 27:2, 5, 6, 8; 29:5, 6; 31:31. Dathe, in his *De Ratione Consensus Versionis Chaldaicae et Syriacae Proverbiorum Solononis* (Lips. 1764), was the first who gave special attention to this fact, and came to the conclusion that the Chaldee interpreter was dependent on the Syriac. He endeavors to prove his position by many pertinent arguments, such as that the Syriac explains Aramaean departures from the Hebrew most naturally, and that many Syriacisms in words, forms, and orthography appear in the version which

are otherwise unknown to Chaldee, or at least are very rare. Eichhorn and Volck take the same view. Havernick denies the use of the one by the other, endeavoring to account for their similarity by the cognate dialects in which both are written, the identity of country in which they had their origin, and their literality. Davidson, in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, is inclined to believe that, the Targum having been made in Syria, the Syriac as well as the Hebrew was consulted, or rather the Greek through the medium of the Syriac. While the Hebrew was the basis, the Syriac was freely used. Different entirely is the opinion of Maybaum, who takes the opposite ground to that of Dathe, Eichhorn, and others. He believes that the Syriac interpreter was dependent on the Chaldee. The statements in the art. *SEE SYRIAC VERSION, ITS RELATION TO THE SEPTUAGINT AND CHALDEE*, in this *Cyclopaedia*, confirm this view. The greatest obstacle in all these disquisitions is the want of a critical text, and Maybaum, who compared the different readings together with an ancient codex preserved at Breslau, has come to the conclusion that Dathe's evidence is based upon corrupt readings. As to the original language of this Targum, Dathe (*op. cit.* p. 125) expresses it as his opinion that it was originally written in Syriac, the Chaldaisms which we find at present having been interpolated by Jews: "Nempe Judaei utebantur versionibus Syriacis, quas legere atque intelligere ob summam utriusque linguae consensionem paterant. Sed mutabant eas passim, partim ad suse dialecti proprietatem, partim ad lectionem textus Hebraei inter eos receptam." His hypothesis is based upon the fact that the Chaldee in 18:22 agrees with the Hebrew **bwf axm hça axm**, and while the other versions read **hbwf** after **hça**, the Chaldee agrees with the Hebrew. But it is evident that because the word is wanting in one MS., this inference cannot be drawn concerning all others. The fact in the matter is, that only in Walton's edition does the Chaldee agree with the Hebrew text; while others, as Dathe himself admits, have the word **hbwf**. And, after all, how is it that the Chaldee so often deviates from the Masoretic text? Whence is it that so many Chaldaisms are found even in those codices which, in the passage quoted above, do not agree with the Masoretic text? The answer is that, as the Chaldaisms in our Targum are as original as the Syriacisms, we have here evidently to do with a mixed dialect; and from the analysis given on the linguistic peculiarities, Maybaum comes to the conclusion *that the language of the Targum on Proverbs is Syro-Chaldaic, and the original language of the author.* The relation of the Chaldee to the Syriac version having already been treated at some

length in the art. *SEE SYRIAC VERSION, ITS RELATION TO THE SEPTUAGINT AND CHALDEE*, we can only refer to it. If the hypothesis of Maybaum, which we have adopted, be true, viz. that the Syriac depended upon the Chaldee, not *vice versa* for even Davidson admits that “a uniform dependence of the Aramaean upon the Syriac cannot be sustained” the Targum on Proverbs must have existed at a very early period; at any rate, Davidson acknowledges that the Targum on Proverbs is older than those on Job and Psalms, in this respect following Zunz. This being so, we do not err in assuming that the Targum on Proverbs belongs to the 2d or 3d century. It is generally found in the Polyglot and Rabbinical Bibles. It was translated into Latin by Alphonso de Zamora and John Mercier. See, besides Dathe’s treatise, already mentioned, Maybaum, *Ueber die Sprache des Targum zu den Sprüchen und dessen Verhältniss zum Syrer*, in Merx’s *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Forschung des Alten Testaments*, 2, 66 sq.

4. *The Targum on the Five Megilloth*, i.e. on Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and the Lamentations, is, according to Zunz, a Midrashic paraphrase, exceedingly loose and free in character, containing legends, fables, allusions to Jewish history, and many fanciful additions. The whole bears the impress of a date considerably posterior to the Talmudic time, and is written in an intermediate dialect between, the West Aramaean of Job, Psalms, and Proverbs, and the East Aramaean of the Babylonian Talmud. The least Haggadic is Ruth, the most rhapsodical that of Song of Solomon. Delitzsch (*Gesch. d. jüd. Poesie*, p. 135) thinks that “the Targums on the five Megilloth are the most beautiful national works of art, through which there runs the golden thread of Scripture, and which are held together only by the unity of the idea.” Whether these Targums are the work of one or different persons cannot be well decided. The former is the opinion of Zunz, Volck, and Deutsch, the latter that of Davidson.

(1.) *The Targum on Ruth* was published separately with a Latin translation and scholia by John Mercier (Paris, 1564), and the following specimen will give a fair idea of the same: ^{<ARABIC>}Ruth 2:10, 11,” Why have I found pity in thine eyes to know me, and I of a strange people, of the daughters of Moab, and of a people who are not clean to enter into the Church of the Lord? And Boaz answered and said to her, In telling it has been told me by the saying of the wise men, that when the ‘Lord decreed, he did not decree respecting women, but men; and it was said to me in prophecy that kings

and prophets are about to spring from thee on account of the good thou hast done," etc.

(2.) The *paraphrase on Lamentations* is more Midrashic than that on Ruth, but of the same type, being copiously interwoven with pieces of history, allegory, fables, reflections, etc.

(3.) The *paraphrase on Ecclesiastes* is more Midrashic than the former, the author having given a free rein to his imagination and made copious insertions. The following verses will best illustrate the character of this paraphrase. In 1, 2, we read:

“When Solomon the king of Israel foresaw, by the spirit of prophecy, that the kingdom of Rehoboam his son would be divided with Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and that Jerusalem and the holy temple would be destroyed, and that the people of Israel would be led into captivity, he said, by the Divine Word, Vanity of vanities is this world; vanity of vanities is all which I and my father, David, have labored for, all of it is vanity... (ver. 12,13). When king Solomon was sitting upon the throne of his kingdom, his heart became very proud of his riches, and he transgressed the Word of God, and he gathered many horses and chariots and riders, and he amassed much gold and silver, and he married from foreign nations, whereupon the anger of the Lord was kindled against him; and he sent to him Ashmoda, the king of the daemons, who drove him from the throne of his kingdom, and took away the ring from his hand, in order that he should roam and wander about in the world to reprove it; and he went about in the provincial towns and the cities of the land of Israel, weeping and lamenting, and saying, I am Coheleth, whose name was formerly called Solomon, who was king over Israel in Jerusalem: and I gave my heart to ask instruction of God at the time when he appeared unto me in Gibeon, to try me, and to ask me what I desire of him; and I asked nothing of him except wisdom, to know the difference between good and evil, and knowledge of whatsoever was done under the sun in this world, and I saw all the works of the wicked children of men—a sad business which God gave to the children of men to be afflicted by it.” As this Targum has been translated into English by Ginsburg, in his *Commentary on, Ecclesiastes* (London, 1861), the reader, by perusing the same, will be enabled to judge for himself better than by any extracts.

(4.) The *Targum on Song of Solomon* is the most Haggadic of all, and hardly deserves the name of a paraphrase, because the words of the

original are: completely covered by extravagant and inflated expressions (*nugae atque frivolitates*)” which refer to another subject. “The paraphrast has indulged in the greatest license, and allowed his imagination to run riot in a multiplicity of ways.” He has composed a panegyric on his people, describing prophetically the history of the Jewish nation, beginning with their exode from Egypt, and detailing their doings and sufferings down to the coming of the Messiah and the building of the third Temple. Thus, according to this allegory, 1:3 relates Jehovah’s fame which went abroad in consequence of the wonders he wrought when bringing the Israelites out of Egypt; ver. 12 describes the departure of Moses to receive the two tables of stone, and how the Israelites in the meantime’ made the golden calf; ver. 14 particularizes the pardon of that sin and the erection of the tabernacle; 3:6-11 refers to the passage of the Israelites, under the leadership of Joshua, over the Jordan, their attacking and conquering the Canaanites, and the building of Solomon’s Temple; 5:2 describes the Babylonian captivity; 6:2 represents the deliverance of Israel through Cyrus, and the building of the second Temple; ver. 7, etc., names the battles of the Maccabees; 7:11,12 represents the present dispersion of the Jews, and their future anxiety to learn the time of their restoration; 8:5, etc., describes the resurrection of the dead, the final ingathering of Israel, the building of the third Temple, etc.

The very first verse of this Targum reads thus: “The songs and praises which Solomon the prophet, king of Israel, sang by the spirit of prophecy, before God, the Lord of the whole world. Ten songs were sung in this world, but this song is the most celebrated of them all. The *first* song Adam sang when his sins were forgiven him, and when the Sabbath-day came and protected him he opened his mouth and said, ‘A song for lie Sabbath-day,’ etc. (Psalm 92). The *second* song Moses and the children of Israel sang when the Lord of the world divided the Red Sea for them. They all opened their mouths and sang as one man the song as it is written, ‘Then sang Moses and the children of Israel’ (^{Exodus} Exodus 15:1). The *third* song the children of Israel sang when the well of water was given to them, as it is written, ‘Then sang Israel’ (^{Numbers} Numbers 21:17). The *fourth* song Moses the prophet sang when his time came to depart front- this world, in which he reproved the people of the house of Israel, as it is written, ‘Give ear, O heavens, and I will speak’ (^{Deuteronomy} Deuteronomy 32:1). The *fifth* song Joshua the son of Nun sang when he waged ‘war in Gibeon, and the sun and moon stood still for him thirty-six hours; and when they left off singing

their song, he himself opened his mouth and sang this song, as it is written, 'Then sang Joshua before the Lord' (⁽¹⁸⁰²⁾Joshua 10:12). The *sixth* song Barak and Deborah sang in the day when the Lord delivered Sisera and his army into the hands of the children of Israel, as it is written, 'Then sang Deborah, etc. (⁽¹⁷⁵¹⁾Judges 5:11). The *seventh* song Hannah sang when a son was given her by the Lord, as it is written, 'And Hannah prayed prophetically and said' (⁽¹⁷¹¹⁾1 Samuel 2:1, and the Targum, *ad loc.*). The *eighth* song David the son of Israel sang for all the wonders which the Lord did for him. He opened his mouth and sang a hymn, as it is written, 'And David sang in prophecy before the Lord' (⁽¹⁷²¹⁾2 Samuel 22:1, and the Targum, *ad loc.*). The *ninth* song Solomon the king of Israel sang by the Holy Spirit before God, the Lord of the whole world. And the *tenth* song the children of the captivity shall sing when they shall be delivered from their captivity, as it is written and declared by Isaiah the prophet, 'This song shall be unto you for joy, as in the night in which the feast of the Passover is celebrated; and gladness of heart as when the people go to appear before the Lord three times in the year, with all kinds of music, and with the sound of the timbrel, to go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to worship before the Lord the mighty one of Israel' (⁽²³¹⁹⁾Isaiah 30:29)." From this specimen it will be seen how far the learned Broughton was correct in saying that the paraphrase "is worth our-study, both for delight and profit." This Targum is found in the Rabbinical Bibles; it has been translated into Latin, and is also accessible to English readers in the translation of Gill, at the end of his *Commentary on the Song of Solomon* (Lond. 1751), p. 535 sq.

(5.) *The Targum, or rather Targums, on Esther*; The book of Esther, enjoying, both through its story like form and the early injunction of its being read or heard by every one on the Feast of Purim, a great circulation and popularity, has been targumized many times. One translation of concise form, and adhering closely to the text, occurs in the Antwerp Polyglot (vol. 3); it was issued enlarged with glosses by Tailer in *Targum Prius et Posterius in Esther*, studiis F. Taileri (Lond. 1655), and forms the *Targum Prius* which is contained in the London Polyglot. Much more prolix, and amplifying still more the legends of this Targum (comp. 1:2, 11; 2:5, 7; 3:1; 5:14, etc.) is the *Targum Posterius* in Tailer, it being "a collection of Eastern romances, broken up and arranged to the single verses; of gorgeous hues and extravagant imagination, such as are to be met with in the *Adsharib* or *Chamis*, or any Eastern collection of legends and tales." Its

final redaction probably belongs to the 11th century. This is the view of Dr. Munk, the latest editor of this second Targum, one of the tales of which runs as follows:

“One day when the king (Solomon) was again full of wine, he commanded that all wild animals, the fowls of the air, and the creeping animals of the earth, as well as the devils, daemons, and spirits, be brought to him, that they might dance before him, and behold, with all the kings who were with him, his glory. The royal scribe called them by their name, and they all congregated before the king, with the exception of the wild cock. At this the king angrily commanded that he should be sought for, and when found, should be brought in, intending to kill him. Then said the wild cock to the king, My lord king, trive heed and hear my words! For three months I weighed in my mind, and flew about in the whole world ill search of a town which does not obey thee. I saw then a city in the East, of the name of *Kitor*, in which are many people, and a woman governs them all; she is called queen of Sheba. If it please thee, my lord king, I shall go to that city, bind their kings in chains, and their rulers with iron fetters, and bring them hither. As it pleased the king, writers were called who wrote letters and bound them to the wings of the wild cock. He came to the queen, who, observing the letter tied to the wing, loosened it and read the following contents: From me, king Solomon, greeting to thee and to thy princes! Thou knowest well that God has made me king over the beasts of the field, over the birds of heaven, over daemons, spirits, and goblins. The kings from all regions of the earth approach me with homage: wilt thou do this, thou shalt have great honor; if not, I will send upon thee kings, legions, and horsemen. The kings are the beasts of the field; the horsemen the birds of heaven, the hosts, daemons and spirits; the goblins are ‘the legions who shall strangle you in your beds. When the queen had read this, she rent her garments and called for the elders and lords, saying, Know ye what king Solomon has sent to me? They answered, We neither know nor esteem him. The queen, however, trusting them not, called for sailors and sent presents to the king, and after three years she came herself. The king, on hearing of her arrival, sat in a crystal hall to receive her, which made her fancy that he was, sitting in water; she therefore uncovered her feet to pass through. On seeing his glory, she said; May the Lord thy God be praised who has found pleasure in thee and made thee sit on the throne to exercise mercy and justice.” We have purposely selected this: piece from the first chapter, because it is also found in an abridged form in the Koran (sura

27). With a commentary, the second Targum is found in the Warsaw Rabbinical Bible. A separate edition, with various readings, notes, etc., was published by Munk, *Targum Scheni zom Buche Esther* (Berlin, 1876). It has lately been translated by Cassel, in an appendix to his *Das Buch Esther. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Morgenlandes* (ibid. 1878). It has been treated in an essay by Reiss, *Das Targum Scheni zu dem Buche Esther*, in the *Monatsschrift* edited by Gratz, 1876, p. 161 sq., 276 sq., 398 sq.

5. The Targum on the Books of Chronicles. — This is preserved in three codices. The oldest, bearing the date of 1294, is in the Vatican, known as *Cod. Urbin. I*, and is still awaiting a critical edition or perusal. A second codex, of the year 1343, belonging to the Erfurt Library, was published by Beck (Augsburg, 1680-83, 2 vols.), and edited with a Latin translation and learned annotations. The Erfurt MS. has many chasms, especially in the first fourteen chapters. The third codex, of the year 1347, and belonging to the University of Cambridge, was published by David Wilkins (Amster. 1715). Here the text is complete, so that the *lacuna* in Beck's edition are filled. Like its predecessor, it has also a Latin version, but there are no notes. Great as was Wilkins's ability for editing this Targum, yet it speaks badly for his knowledge that he has put on the title-page R. Joseph as the author (though Beck was of the same opinion), and that he has made him rector of the academy in *Syria*, instead of *Sora* in Babylonia. Wilkins's edition was lately republished from a copy found at Prague by Dr. Rahmer, under the title $\mu\omega\gamma\rho\tau\ ymyh\ yrbd\ I\ \zeta$ (Thorn, 1866), and the deviations from Beck's edition are given in notes. We cannot enter here upon a comparison of the Erfurt codex with that of Cambridge. As to the authorship of this Targum, its ascription to R. Joseph the Blind must be regarded as exploded. Whether it is the work of one author or of more cannot now be decided. Language, style, manner, and Haggadic paraphrase show its Palestinian origin. Zunz remarks that it sometimes transcribes the Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch verbally, as in the genealogical table of the first chapter (comp. ver. 51 with the Jerusalem Targum on ~~1339~~ Genesis 36:39). So, also, in the psalm passages in 1 Chronicles 16 its words often coincide with the Targum on Psalm 105 and 96. The origin of this Targum cannot be put earlier than the 8th century; or, as the most recent writer on this Targum thinks, the older text, as preserved in the Erfurt codex, belongs to the middle of the 8th century, and the later, as preserved in the Cambridge codex, to the beginning of the 9th. Owing to the late origin of this Targum, we must not be surprised at finding the name

of Hungary occurring in it, as well as some other foreign words, besides many fables, especially in the explanation of proper names. For critical purposes both editions must be used—the first, *Paraphrasis Chaldaica Libr. Chronicorum, cura M. F. Beckii*, for the learned notes; the second, *Paraphrasis... auctore R. Josepho, etc.*, for the more correct and complete text. The writer of the art. “Targum” in Smith’s *Dict. of the Bible* states that “the science of exegesis will profit little by it” (this Targum). What we know of the subject induces us to hold an opposite opinion (see Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 1867, p. 349 sq.; but, more especially, Rosenberg, *Das Targum zur Chronik*, in Geiger’s *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1870, p. 72 sq., 135 sq., 263 sq.).

6. The Targum on Daniel. — The existence of this work was first noticed by Munk, who thinks that he found it in a MS. in the Imperial Library at Paris (No. 45 du Fonds de St. Germain-des-Pres). The MS., however, contains only a Persian Targum, giving an apocryphal account of Daniel. According to the learned writer, this **l aynd hxq**, or *History of Daniel*, was taken from a Targum on Daniel in Chaldee. The first words are written in Chaldee, they are then repeated in Persian, and the history continues in the latter language. After several legends known from other Targums, follows a long prophecy of Daniel, from which the book is shown to have been written after the first Crusade. Mohammed and his successors are mentioned, also a king who, coming from Europe (**aymwr za**), will go to Damascus, and kill the Ishmaelitic (Mohammedan) kings and princes; he will break down the minarets (**hranm**), destroy the mosques (**ahdgsm**), and no one will after that dare to pronounce the name of the Profane (**l wsp** = Mohammed). The Jews will also have to suffer great misfortunes (as, indeed, the knightly Crusaders won their spurs by dastardly murdering the helpless masses—men, women, and children in the Ghettos along the Rhine and elsewhere, before they started to deliver the holy tomb). By a sudden transition, the prophet then passes on to the “Messiah son of Joseph,” to Gog and Magog, and to the “true Messiah, the son of David.” Munk rightly concludes that the book must have been composed in the 12th century, when Christian kings reigned for a brief period over Jerusalem (*Notice sur Saadia* [Par. 1838], p. 82). According to the description here given, there can be no doubt that it is the same which Zotenberg published some years ago, in Persian, with a German translation, in Merx’s *Archiv*, 1, 385 sq., and beginning thus: “History of Daniel (peace be upon him). I am Daniel, of the children of Jeconiah, king of the house of

Judah.” Davidson says, “We must express our doubts about such a Chaldee paraphrase on Daniel, in the absence of all proof that the Persian was’ made from the Chaldee; for a few Chaldee words at the beginning are no argument in favor of it. All that Munk communicates i.e. part of a page is insufficient to warrant us in accepting the fact. Yet Steinschneider has referred to ‘a Targum on Daniel,’ simply on the authority of Munk’s notice (*Catalogus Librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*). No Targum upon Daniel is extant, so far as we yet know, and it is very doubtful whether one was ever made. The reason assigned in the Talmud for not rendering the book into Chaldee is that it reveals the precise time of the Messiah’s advent. A good part of the book is already in Chaldee.” To this it may be answered that at the time when Davidson wrote, this Targum was not yet published, otherwise he would have thought differently. Its contents show that the original Chaldee was the basis of it. A number of Hebrew words occur in it, and it closes with quoting ~~HEB~~ Psalm 147:2.

7. There is not any Targum, so far as is known, upon Ezra and Nehemiah. Part of Ezra is already Chaldee, and Nehemiah was counted with it as one book.

8. To the Roman edition of the Sept. of Daniel, published in 1772, a Chaldee version is added of the Apocryphal pieces in Esther. This has been printed by De Rossi, accompanied by a Latin version, remarks, and dissertations (*Specimen Variarum Lectionum Sacri Textus et Chaldaica Estheris Additamenta*, etc. [Tüb. 1783, 8vo]). An edition of the Chaldee Hagiographa was published by Lagarde (Leips. 1873).

VI. *Fragmentary Targums on the Other Books.* — According to Zunz, the Jerusalem Targum-or rather, as it should be called, the Palestinian one-extended to the prophetic books also, and he justifies his opinion by the following particulars, which we give in his order: Abudraham cites a Jerusalem Targum on ~~HEB~~ 1 Samuel 9:13, and Kimchi has preserved several passages from it on Judges (11:1, consisting of 47 words), on Samuel (1:17,18: 106 words), and Kings (1:22, 21: 68 words; 2, 4, 1: 174 words; 4:6: 55 words; ver. 7: 72 words; 13:21: 9 words), under the simple name of *Tosephthah*, i.e. Addition, or Additional Targum. Luzzato has also lately found fragments of the same, under the names “Targum of Palestine,” “Targum of Jerushalmi,” “Another Reading,” etc., in an African codex written A.M. 5247=A.D. 1487, viz., on ~~HEB~~ 1 Samuel 18:19; ~~HEB~~ 2 Samuel 12:12; 1 Kings 5, 9, 11, 13; 10:18, 26; 14:13; on ~~HEB~~ Hosea 1:1;

Obadiah 1:1. On Isaiah (ch. 66), Rashi, Abudraham (²⁵⁴¹Isaiah 54:11), and Farissol (Isaiah 66) quote it, agreeing in part with a fragment of the Targum on this prophet extant in Cod. Urbin. Vatican. No. 1, containing about 190 words, and beginning, "Prophecy of Isaiah, which he prophesied at the end of his prophecy in the days of Manasseh the son of Hezekiah, the king of the tribe of the house of Judah, on the 17th of Tamuz, in the hour when Manasseh set up an idol in the Temple," etc. Isaiah predicts in this his own violent death. Parts of this Targum are also found in Hebrew, in *Pesiktah Rabbathi*, 6 a, and *Yalkut Isaiah* 58 d. A Jerusalem Targum on Jeremiah is mentioned by Kimchi; on Ezekiel by R. Simon, Nathan (Aruch), and likewise by Kimchi, who also speaks of a further additional Targum on Jonathan for this book. A Targum Jerushalmi on Micah is known to Rashi, and of Zechariah a fragment has been published by Bruns (*Repert.* pt. 15:p. 174) from a Reuchlinian M6. (Cod. Kennic. 154), written in 1106. The passage, found as a marginal gloss to ³⁸²⁰Zechariah 12:10, reads as follows:

Targum Jerushalmi. — And I shall pour out upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of prophecy and of prayer for truth. "And after this shall go forth Messiah the Son of Ephraim to wage war against Gog. And Gog will kill him before the city of Jerusalem. They will look up to me and they will ask me wherefore the heathens have killed Messiah the Son of Ephraim. They will then mourn over him as mourn father and mother over an only son, and they will wail over him as one wails over a first-born." A Targum Jerushalmi on the third chapter of Habakkuk, quoted by Rashi, is mentioned by De Rossi (Cod. 265 and 405, both of the 13th century). To these quotations, which led Zunz to draw the inference that the Jerusalem Targum extended to the prophetic books also, a large number of fragments and variations must now be added since the publication of the Reuchlinian codex by Lagarde. These fragments and variations deviate from the common translation, and are introduced by five different designations, as on, *grt*, *rj arps*, *anyrj a ançyl*, *ymgrtmd tyaw*, *çwry*, *alid gyl p*. These additions, as found in the Reuchlinian codex, have been analyzed in a very scholarly manner by Dr. Bacher, in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft*, 1874, 28:1 sq., and they extend to the following books, viz.: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Zechariah. Obadiah, Nahum, Haggai, and Malachi are not included. Zunz, after referring to the conjecture that the Jerusalem Targum

on the prophets embraced nothing more than the Haphtaroth, or lessons, remarks that the idea is untenable, because the expressions of the authors who allude to it go to show that they had seen Targums upon entire books (*Gottesd. Vortrage*, p. 78). This may be so; but the existence of an entire Targum of Palestine on all the prophets is problematical. We have seen above, if the Reuchlinian MS. may be taken as a standard, that on four prophets, viz. Obadiah, Nahum, Haggai, and Malachi, such fragments are not given. Some books may have received such a paraphrase; on others, and those the great majority of the prophetic books, there is reason to doubt its existence. It is more probable that *portions* were treated paraphrastically in the spirit of the later Haggadah—portions selected on no definite principle, but adopted by the fancy or liking of paraphrasts; and we are the more justified in this conclusion when comparing Dr. Bacher's parallels from the Talmud and Midrash with these fragmentary additions. Deutsch, the writer of the art. "Targum" in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, thinks "the Babylonian version the Jonathan Targum though paraphrastic, did not satisfy the apparently more imaginative Palestinian public. 'Thus from heaped-up additions and marginal glosses, the step to a total rewriting of the entire codex in the manner and taste of the later times and the different locality was easy enough.' Be it as it may, this question will always remain, as Dr. Bacher says, "one of the darkest points in the disquisition of the Targum on the prophets."

VII. *Character and Value of the Targums in General.* There is nothing to indicate that the Targums were written at first with vowels. Buxtorf endeavored to correct the punctuation and bring it as near as possible to the standard of that in Daniel and Ezra, for which some censured him, though, we believe, unjustly. It is no reproach to his memory to say that he did not perfect their vocalization. As there is at present no critical text of the Targums, they can only be carefully employed in the criticism of the Hebrew original, although they show the substantial integrity of the Masoretic text. They may be advantageously used in suggesting readings of some importance and value. Perhaps they are more useful in interpretation than the lower criticism. On the whole, Richard Simon's view of the Targums deserves to be noted here. In his *Hist. Crit. Vet. Test.* lib. 2, c. 18, he says, "Omnes iste paraphrases, praeter illam Olkelosi et Jonathanis. non magna mihi utilitatis esse videntur, nee forsan multum e re fecit, illas curiose quaesiisse. Non quanta tamen multis existimatur, illarum utilitas: ex adverso Judei ex illis arma adversus Christianos depromunt, sibi fingentes,

nobis ipsorum superstitiones aniles et absurdas probari, quasi veteribus cersionibus quibus junguntur a nobis aequiparentur. Proeterea videntur Judaici ritus et cerimoniae iis magis quam fides Christiana confirmari: incerta itaque et anceps ex illis ducta contra Judaeos victoria. Quid quod quis nostrae fidei fayentia credimus, pleraque verae sunt allegorise, quas non operosum verbis alio convertere; neque enim religio allegoriis probatur.”

VIII. Literature. — Since we have already mentioned under the different heads the special literature, we will here name the works on the Targumim in general. Here belong—besides the general introductions to the Old Test. of Eichhorn, Havernick, De Wette, Bleek, Kaulen, and Kleinert—Prideaux, *Connection* (ed. Wheeler, Lond. 1865), 2, 443 sq.; Walton, *Prolegomena* (ed. Dathe); Smith, *Diatriba de Chaldaicis Paraphrasibus*; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebraea*, 2, 1135-1191; 4:730-734; Zunz, *Die gotfisd. Tortrdge der Judein* (Berlin, 1832), p. 61-83; Gfrorer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i, 36-59; Fürst, *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1840, Nos. 44-47; id. *Bibl. Jud.* 2, 105-107; 3, 48; Frankel, *Einiges zu den Targum*, in the *Zeitschrift fuib die religiosen Interessen des Judenth.* 1846, p. 110-120; Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, 3, 61 sq., 551 sq.; Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 162-167; Volck, s.v. “Thargumim,” in Herzog’s *Real-Encyklop.* 15:672-683; Deutsch, s.v. “Targum,” in Smith’s *Dict. of the Bible*; Davidson, id. in Kitto’s *Cyclopaedia*; id. *Biblical Criticism*, 1, 224 sq.; Langen, *Das Judenth. in Paldstina*, p. 70-72, 209-218, 268 sq., 418 sq.; Noldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 255-262; Schurer, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leips. 1874), p. 476 sq. The best lexicon on the Targums is that of Levy, *Chalddisches Wörterbuch über die Targumint* (ibid. 1867); the latest Aramrean grammar is that of Lerner, *װַׁלְ ׁׁׁׁׁ ׁׁׁׁׁ ׁׁׁׁׁ* (Warsaw, 1875). **SEE CHALDEE LANGUAGE.** (B. P.)

Tarnoczy, Maximilian Von

a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, was born Oct. 24, 1806, at Schwaz, in Tyrol. Having graduated at the gymnasium at Innsbruck, he entered, in 1824, the clerical seminary at Salzburg, and received the first orders in 1829. He completed his studies at Vienna, and, after having been honored in 1832 with the theological doctorate, he was appointed professor of dogmatics at Salzburg. In 1844 he became a member of the Salzburg chapter, and from that time, being the trusty adviser of the cardinal and

prince archbishop Schwarzenberg, he took an active part in ecclesiastical affairs. When Schwarzenberg received the archbishopric of Prague in 1850, Tarnoczy was appointed his successor at Salzburg, and was consecrated June 1, 1851, for that office. In his new position he labored for twenty-five years, and his labors were acknowledged by Pius IX, who made him a member of the college of cardinals, Dec. 22. 1873. After a long illness, Tarnoczy died at Salzburg, April 4, 1876. See the *fite rarischer Handweiser*, 1876, p. 285. (B. P.)

Tarnov, Johann

a German doctor and professor of theology, was born April 19, 1586, at Grevismuhlen, in Mecklenburg, and died Jan. 22, 1629, at Rostock, where he had lectured since 1614. He wrote: *Declaratio eorum quae ad Dicti Esai. c. 45 5. 8 Sensu Literali Investig. in Exercit. Biblic. allata sunt* (Rostock, 1621): *Exercilt. Biblic. Libri IV in quibus Verus et Genuin. Sensus Locorum Sacrosrum Multorum Inquiritur ac Defenditur* (2d ed. ibid. 1621, and often): — *In Threnos Jerentice Comment.* (Hamburg, 1707): — *In Prophetas Minores Comm.* (Leipsic, 1688, 1706): — *In Prophetam Haggteum Comm.* (Rostock, 1624): — *In Prophetam Malachiam Comm.* (ibid. 1624): — *Comment. in Epistol. Pauli ad Ephes., Philipp., Coloss., et Thessal.* (ibid. 1636). See Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 188, 220, 222, 253; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 411; Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, p. 399, 456. (B. P.)

Tarnov, Paul

a German doctor and professor of theology, uncle of Johann, was born April 29, 1562, at Grevismihlen, and died at Rostock, March 6, 1633. He is the author of, *In Joann. Evang. Commentarius* (Rostock, 1629): — *Libri III de Conjugio* (ibid. 1614): — *De Sacros. Ministerio Libri III* (ibid. 1623). See Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 248, 460, 464; 2, 797. (B. P.)

Tar'pelite

(Chald. only in the plur. emphat. *Tarpelaye'*, **ayēPṭṭi**; Sept.

Ταρφαλαῖοι v.r. **Ταρφαλλαῖοι**; Vulg. *Tharphalcei*), the Aramsean designation of a race of colonists who were planted in the cities of Samaria after the captivity of the northern kingdom of Israel (¹⁵⁴⁹Ezra 4:9). Junius and others have found a kind of resemblance in name to the Tarpelites in

the *Tapyri* (Ταπουροί, Ptolemy, 6:2, 6; Arrian, *Alex.* 3, 8, 7; Τάπυροι, Strabo, 11:511, 515, 520, 523), a tribe of Media who dwelt eastward of Elymais, but the resemblance is scarcely more than apparent. Others, with as little probability, have sought to recognize the Tarpelites in the *Tarpetes* (Ταρπήτες, Strabo, 11:495), a Maeotic race. In the Peshito-Syriac the resemblance is greater, for they are there called *Tarpoye*. First (*Handwb.* s.v.) says in no case can *Taspel*, the country of the Tarpelites, be the Phoenician *Tripolis*; although Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 62) assumes this.

Tarphon, or Tryphon

a Jewish rabbi of the 2d century A.D., belonged to a sacerdotal family. He was a friend and contemporary of rabbi Akiba, and for some time rector of the school at Lydda. He was noted as a bitter enemy of Christianity, and declared that, although the gospels and the other writings of the “Minim,” or Christians, contained the sacred name of the Deity, they ought to be burned; that heathenism was less dangerous than Christianity; that heathens offended from ignorance, while Christians did so with full knowledge; and that he would prefer seeking shelter in a heathen temple rather than in a meeting-place of the Minim (Talm. *Shabbath*, fol. 116, col. 1). This, his animosity against Christianity, induced some, as Lightfoot, Carpzov, and others, to maintain that rabbi Tarphon is the same Trypho who is the interlocutor in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue, an opinion which probably owes its origin to Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* 4:18), but which has little or no probability in its defense. In the *Pirke Aboth*, 2, 20 sq., we have the recorded maxim of this sage: “The day is short, the labor vast; but the laborers are slothful, though the reward is great, and the Master presseth for dispatch. It is not incumbent upon thee to complete the work, and yet thou art not at liberty to be idle about it. If thou hast studied the law much, great reward will be given thee; for faithful is thy employer, who will award to thee the hire of thy labor, and be aware that the award of the righteous will be in the future which is to come.” See Basnage, *Histoire des Juif* (Taylor’s Eng. transl.), p. 524; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Hamburger’s Germ. transl.), p. 321, s.v. “Tryfon;” Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 65; Friedlander, *Patristische und talnmudische Studien* (Vienna, 1878), p. 136 sq., 147; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 449. (B. P.)

Tarquini, Camillo

an Italian Jesuit, was born Sept. 27, 1810, at. Marta, near Montefiascone. He belonged to a noble family and studied at Rome. In 1837 he joined the Society of Jesus. From 1850 he was professor of canon law at the Collegium Romanum, and was one of the editors of the *Civiltà Cattolica*. Besides a number of monographs, he published *Juris Ecclesiastici Publici Institutiones* (Rome, 1862; 3d ed. 1873). He also wrote a grammar and lexicon on the ancient Etruscan language, which he left in manuscript. In 1873 he was made cardinal-deacon, and died Feb. 15, 1874. Tarquini was the first cardinal who, since 1713, was appointed from the members of the Society of Jesus. , See the *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1863, p. 182; 1874, p. 176. (B. P.)

Tarragona, Councils of

These two councils were so called because they were held in the city of that name in Spain. This city (anciently *Taarraco*), capital of the province of the same name, is situated at the mouth of the Francoli, has a population of about 18,000, is the seat of an archbishop, and, besides other schools of learning, has an ecclesiastical seminary.

I. The *first* council of Tarragona was held in 516, during the reign of Theodoric, king of Italy, and guardian of Amalric, king of Spain. Ten bishops were present, and thirteen canons published.

3. Forbids usury among clerks.

4. Forbids bishops, priests, and clerks to judge any cause on Sundays; allows them to do so on other days, provided they do not interfere in criminal cases.

7. Directs that the priest or deacon appointed to any country parish shall remain there during his week (i.e. that the priest shall remain there one week, and then the deacon shall succeed him and keep his week) in order to celebrate divine service with the clerks; and that on *Saturday* all the clergy shall attend in order to begin the Sunday office. It also orders that matins and vespers shall be said daily.

1. Forbids monks to leave their convent in order to perform any clerical function without leave from their superior. See Mauisi, *Coec.* 4:1562.

II. The *second* council was held in 1242, by Peter the archbishop, against the Waldenses in Aragon. Part only of the acts remain. See Mansi, *Cone.* 11:592.

Tar'shish

(Heb. **vyvæʃi**, *Tarshish'*, *subdued* [Gesén.] or *established* [Fürst]; Sept. **θάρσεις** [but **Καρχηδών** in Isaiah 23; **Καρχηδόνιοι** in Ezekiel; **θάλασσα** in Isaiah 2, 16]; Vulg. usually *Tharsis*; A.V. "Tharshish," ^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:22; 22:48; ^{<1370>}1 Chronicles 7:10; once Heb. **hvyvæʃi** *Tarshishah'*, 1 Chronicles 1, 7), the name of three men, of a country, and of a gem.

1. Second-named of the four sons of Javan, the son of Japheth (^{<0104>}Genesis 10:4; ^{<1300>}1 Chronicles 1:7). B.C. post 2514. He may have been the founder of the city noticed below. *SEE ETHNOLOGY.*

2. Sixth-named of the seven sons of Bilhar, the grandson of Benjamin (^{<1370>}1 Chronicles 7:10). B.C. post 1875.

3. Fourth-named of the seven "princes" of Persia in the time of Artaxerxes (^{<1704>}Esther 1:14). B.C. 483. As a Persian name the word stands in relation with *Teresh* (2,221; 6:2), and with *Tirshatha*; all probably from the root *torsh*, *severe* (Gesénus, *Thesaur.* s.v.).

4. A famous port or region the location of which has been much disputed. Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 6, 1) confounds it with *Tarsus* in Cilicia; and in the Sept. version of ^{<2304>}Isaiah 23:1, 10-14, it is rendered **Καρχηδών**, *Carthage*. A similar rendering is found in ^{<2712>}Ezekiel 27:12; 38:13, **Καρχήδονιοι**, *Carthaginians*, an identification urged by *Davis* (*Carthage*, ch. 1). As the Vulg. translates it by "sea" in the passage quoted above, so the Sept. in Isaiah 2, 16 renders it **θαλάσσης**, a translation followed by Saadias and Luther. The Targums adopt the same translation in some places, and Jerome apologizes for the blunder by saying that "the Hebrews thought Tharsis was their original term for sea; the noun in common use among them, *iam*, being a Syriac one." In other places, as ^{<1224>}1 Kings 22:48, and ^{<2400>}Jeremiah 10:9, the Targum gives the peculiar rendering of **aqyrpa**, *Africa*. Most interpreters, however, are agreed that (with the possible exception of the passage in Chronicles) the allusion is to *Tartessus* in Spain. It seems to have been the source of the precious stone called by the same name.

In the great genealogical table (^{<1104>}Genesis 10:4, 5) it is placed among the sons of Javan; “Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim. By these were the islands of the Gentiles divided.” This refers the mind at once to the north-western parts of the Mediterranean. To a similar conclusion does other scriptural language lead. In ^{<9720>}Psalms 72:10 it is said, “The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents;” and in ^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 9:21 we read, “The king’s (Solomon’s) ships went to Tarshish with the servants of Hiram; every three years once came the ships of Tarshish bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes and peacocks.” Now Hiram’s city, Tyre, lay on the Mediterranean coast, and it is easy to see how Solomon’s vessels might be associated with his in a voyage towards the west to fetch merchandise. In ^{<2369>}Isaiah 66:19 we find Tarshish mentioned in a way which confirms this view: “And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations (or Gentiles); to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan to the isles afar off.” These passages make it clear that Tarshish lay at a distance from Judaea, and that that distance was in a north-westerly direction; and the mention of such names as Lud, Javan, and the isles carries the mind to the extreme north-west, and suggests Spain as the place for Tarshish. But Tarshish must have been on the sea-coast, for it was famous for its ships. “The ships of Tarshish” were celebrated under that designation, which may have been used in that wide sense in which we speak of an East India man, reference being made rather to the place whither the vessel traded than to that where it was built; or the phrase may have come to denote a particular kind of vessel, i.e. trading or merchant ships, from the celebrity of Tarshish as a commercial port (1 Kings 10:22; ^{<1987>}Psalms 48:7; ^{<2316>}Isaiah 2:16; 23:1-14; 60, 9; ^{<3725>}Ezekiel 27:25). These six times do we meet with the phrase, ships or navy of Tarshish; which of itself shows how noted a seaport we have under consideration, if it does not prove also that in process of time the terms had: come to describe vessels according to their occupation rather than their country, as we say “a slaver,” denoting a ship engaged in the slave-trade (comp. Horat. “sevis Liburnis,” *Cari.* 1, 27; “Bithyna carina,” 1, 35; “trade Cypria,” 1, 1). In ^{<3712>}Ezekiel 27:12-25 the place is described by its pursuits and its merchandise—“Tarshish (here again in connection with a western country, Javan, ver. 13) was thy (Tyre’s) *merchant*, in all riches with silver, iron, tin, and lead, they traded in thy fairs. The ships of Tarshish did sing of thee in thy market, and thou wast replenished and made very glorious in the midst of the seas.” The last words are admirably descriptive of the south-western coast of Spain. How

could a Hebrew poet better describe the locality where the songs of the sailors of Tarshish made the name of Tyre glorious? Let the reader turn to the map and cast his eye on the ‘embouchure of the Guadalquivir, and say if this spot is not pre-eminently, when viewed from Palestine, “in the midst of the seas.” There is a propriety, too, in the words found in ^{<987>}Psalm 48:7 (comp, ^{<535>}Ezekiel 28:26) “Thou breakest the ships of Tarshish with, an east wind,” if we suppose merchant vessels working eastwardly up the Mediterranean towards Tyre, encountering an east, or rather north-east, gale, which is a very violent and destructive wind to this day. ^{<409>}Jeremiah 10:9 tells us that “silver spread into plates” was brought from Tarshish; and from the connection the silver appears to have been elaborately wrought; whence we infer that at one period there was in Tarshish the never-failing connection found between commerce, wealth, and art. An important testimony occurs in ^{<583>}Ezekiel 38:13, “Sheba and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? to carry away silver and gold? to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?” whence it is clear that Tarshish was an opulent place, abounding in cattle and goods, in silver and gold. We are not sure that the words “the young lions thereof” are intended to be taken literally. They may refer to the lion-hearted chiefs of the nation; but if they are understood as implying that lions were literally found in Tarshish, they only concur with, other parts of Scripture in showing that the name is to be taken in a wide acceptation, as denoting, besides modern Andalusia, those parts of Africa which lie near and opposite to Spain. Nor is it impossible that a part of, thee trade of arshish lap in these and in other animals; for we certainly know that Solomon’s ships brought that prince apes and peacocks: the lions may have been caught in Africa and conveyed in ships of Tarshish to Tyre. Sheba and Dedan, however, are mentioned here in connection with Tarshish, and they were certainly Eastern countries, lying probably on the western side of the Persian Gulf in Arabia. But the object of the writer may have been to mention the countries placed at the extremities of the then known world—Tarshish on the west, Sheba and Dedan on the east. In ^{<221>}Isaiah 23:1-14 we read, as a part of the burden of Tyre, that the ships of Tarshish are called on to howl at her destruction, because Tyre afforded them no longer a commercial port and a haven: words which entirely agree with the hypothesis that makes Tarshish a city on the seaboard of Spain, trading up the Mediterranean to Tyre. Nor are the words found in ver. 6 discordant-”Pass ye over to Tarshish; howl, ye inhabitants of the isles.” Let us now turn to the book of Jonah (^{<300>}Jonah

1:1-3; 4:2). The prophet was commanded to go and prophesy against Nineveh on the Tigris. For this he should, on quitting Jerusalem, have gone in an easterly direction but he shunned the duty and fled. Of course he naturally fled in a direction the opposite of that in which the avoided object lay; he proceeded, in fact, to Tarshish. Tarshish, then, must have been to the west, and not to the east, of Jerusalem. In order to reach Tarshish, he went to Joppa and took ship for the place of his destination, thus still keeping in a westerly course and showing that Tarshish lay to the west. In Tarshish, indeed, placed in the extreme north-west, he might well expect to be distant enough from Nineveh. It is also worthy of notice that, when he arrived at Joppa, on the coast of Palestine, “he found a ship going to Tarshish;” which fact we can well understand if Tarshish lay to the west, but by no means if it lay on the Red Sea. *SEE OPHIR.*

Thus far all the passages cited agree, with more or less evidence, in fixing Tarshish somewhere in or near Spain. But in ^{<1016>}2 Chronicles 20:36 it is recorded that Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, joined himself with Ahaziah, king of Israel, “to make ships to go to Tarshish and they made the ships in Ezion-geber,” that is, on the Elanitic gulf on the eastern arm of the Red Sea. If, then, these vessels built at Ezion-geber were to go to Tarshish, that place must lie on the eastern side of Palestine, instead of the western; for we cannot suppose they circumnavigated Africa; not because such a voyage was impossible, but because it was long and tedious and not likely to be taken when a nearer and safer way to Tarshish lay from the ports of the Palestinian coast. But in the parallel passage, found in ^{<1129>}1 Kings 22:49, these vessels are described as “ships of Tarshish” (merchant vessels), which were intended to go to *Ophir*, not to Tarshish. This removes the difficulty at once, for *Ophir* was in the East, and accounts for the fact that the fleet was built on the Red Sea, since it was an eastern, not a western, voyage which was intended. The reference appears to be to the same eastern trade of which mention is made in 10:22, where we find Hiram and Solomon importing from the East in ships of Tarshish, or merchantmen, gold and silver, ivory, apes and peacocks. We have not space to enter into the critical questions which this contrariety between the books of Kings and Chronicles suggests for consideration; but we may remark that, in a case in which a diversity appears in the statements of these two authorities, no competently informed theologian could hesitate to give the preference to the former. The alternative of two places by the name of Tarshish, one in Spain and the other in India, was adopted by

Bochart, *Phaleg*, 3, 7, and has probably been the ordinary view of those who have perceived a difficulty in the passages of the Chronicles; but the above reconciliation, which was first suggested by Vitranga, has been adopted by the acutest Biblical critics of our own time, such as De Wette, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Parker's translation, Boston, .1843), 2, 267; Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, s.v.; Gesenius, *Thesaurus Linguae Heb. et Chald.* s.v.; and Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1st ed.), 3, 76; and is acknowledged by Movers, *Ueber die Chroniken* (1834), p. 254, and Havernick, *Spezielle Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1839), 2, 237.

It appears, then, clear, from this minute review of the scriptural accounts and allusions, that Tarshish was an old, celebrated, opulent, cultivated, commercial city, which carried on trade in the Mediterranean and with the seaports of. Syria, especially Tyre and Joppa, and that it most probably lay on the extreme west of that sea. Was there, then, in. ancient times any city in these parts which corresponded with these clearly ascertained facts? There was Such was *Tartessus* in Spain, said to have been a Phoenician colony (Arrian, *Alex.* 3, 86), a fact which of itself would account for its intimate connection with Palestine and the Biblical narratives. As to the exact spot where Tartessis (so written originally) lay, authorities are not agreed, as the city had ceased to exist when geography began to receive attention; but it was not far from the Straits of Gibraltar, and near the mouth of the Guadalquivir, consequently at no great distance from the famous Granada of later days. The reader, however, must enlarge his notion beyond that of a mere city, which, how great soever, would scarcely correspond with the ideas of magnitude, affluence, and power that the Scriptures suggest. The name, which is of Phoenician origin, seems to denote the district of South-western Spain, comprising the several colonies which Tyre planted in that country, and so being equivalent to what we might designate Phoenician Spain. We are not, however, convinced that the opposite coast of Africa was not included, so that the word would denote to an inhabitant of Palestine the extreme western parts of the world. We seem, however, authorized, by considerations besides those which have already been elicited, in identifying the Hebrew Tarshish with the Spanish Tartessus, whatever may have been the extent of the neighboring country over which the latter held dominion or possessed immediate influence. Among these considerations we mention:

1. That the two names are similar, if they are not the same; the Greek **Ταρτησσός** with the Aramaic pronunciation would be **vytrrt**, a fact

which would of itself-seem to settle the question in the absence of conflicting evidence and claims.

2. Spain was one of the chief seats of Phoenician colonization; and if we unite therewith the north-west of Africa, we shall have some idea of the greatness of the power of Tyre in these parts, for Tyre is reported to have founded not fewer than three hundred cities on the western coast of Africa, and two hundred in South-western Spain (Strabo, 2, 82). Here, then, was found the chief object of the Phoenician sea-trade. These countries were to Tyre what Peru was to Spain. Confining our remarks to Spain, we learn from Heeren that the Phoenician colonies on the European side of the sea were situated in the south of the present Andalusia. Here, with other important places, lay Tartessus, a name which is borne by a river, an island, a town, and a region. Heeren distinctly says that to Orientalists the word indicated the farthest west generally, comprising, of course, many, places. In the commercial geography of the Phoenicians, he adds, the word obviously meant the whole of their colonial dependencies in Southern Spain. In the, same general way, we use the term West Indies; and thus arose the river, the town, the district of Tartessus, since the country included them all (Heeren, *Ideen*, 2, 44 sq.).

3. It does much to confirm our view that all the articles reported in Jeremiah and Ezekiel to have been brought from Tarshish might have come from South-western Spain. Here there were mines of gold and silver, and Tartessus is expressly named as affording the latter mineral (Strabo, 3, 157; Diod. Sic.5, 35). Tin was brought by the Phoenicians from Britain into Spain, and thence carried to the Oriental markets. According to Diodorus Siculus (5, 38), tin was procured in Spain also, as well as lead, according to Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 3, 4). Pliny's words are forcible: "Nearly all Spain abounds in the metals-lead, iron, copper, silver, gold." We add one or two corroborations of the above identification. Heeren (*Ideen*, 2, 64) translates ~~3575~~ Ezekiel 27:25, "The ships of Tarshish," etc., by Spanish ships were the chief object of thy merchandise; thou (Tyre) wast a full city, and wast honored on the seas." The Phoenicians were as eager in their quest of gold and gold countries as were the alchemists and the Europeans of the 16th century. The lust for gold urged them over the deserts of Arabia and the cliffs of the Red Sea as far as Yemen and Ethiopia; and the same passion carried them westwardly to the coasts of Spain and the Pillars of Hercules. "Spain," says Heeren, "was once the richest land in the world for silver; gold was found there in great abundance, and the baser metals as well. The

silver mountains were in those parts which the Phoenicians comprised under the general name of Tartessus, or Tarshish. The immeasurable affluence of precious metals which, on their first arrival, they found here so astounded them, and the sight thereof so wrought on the imagination of the people, that fact called fable to its aid, and the story gained currency that the first Phoenician colonists not only filled their ships with gold, but made thereof—their various implements, anchors not excepted.” *SEE COMMERCE.*

In the absence of positive proof, we may acquiesce in the statement of Strabo (3, 148) that the river Betis (now the Guadalquivir) was formerly called Tartessus, that the city Tartessus was situated between the two arms by which the river flowed into the sea, and that the adjoining country was called Tartessus. But there were two other cities which some deem to have been Tartessus; one, Gadir or Gadir (Cadiz) (*Sallust, Fragnm.* lib. 2; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 4:36; and Avienus, *Descript. Orb. Terr.* p. 614); and the other, Carteia, in the Bay of Gibraltar (Strabo, 3, 151; Ptolemy, 2, 4; Pliny, 3, 3; Mela, 2, 6). Of the three, Carteia, which has found a learned supporter at the present day (Ersch and Gruber, *Encyclop.* s.v.), seems to have the weakest claims, for, in the earliest Greek prose work extant, Tartessus is placed beyond the Columns of Hercules (Herodotus, 4:152); and in a still earlier fragment of Stesichorus (Strabo, 3, 148) mention is made of the *river* Tartessus, whereas there is no stream near Carteia (=El Rocadillo) which deserves to be called more than a rivulet. Strictly speaking, the same objection would apply to Gadir; but, for poetical uses, the Guadalquivir, which is only twenty miles distant, would be ‘sufficiently near. It was, perhaps, in reference to the claim of Gadir that Cicero, in a letter to Atticus (7, 3), jocosely calls Balbus a native of that town, “Tartessium istum tuum.” But Tartessus was likewise used by poets to express the extreme west where the sun set (Ovid, *Maetam.* 14:416; Silius Italicus, 10:358; comp. id. 3, 399). See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v. “Tartessus.” See, in addition to the works cited by Bochart and Winer, *ut sup.*, the *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 226 sq.

5. (A. V. “beryl.”) A precious stone, so-called as brought from Tarshish, as Ophirism also put for the gold brought thence (^{<2831>}Exodus 28:20; 39:13; ^{<3016>}Ezekiel 1:16; 10:9; 28:13; ^{<2154>}Song of Solomon 5:14; ^{<2706>}Daniel 10:6). The Sept., followed by Josephus, makes it the “chrysolite,” i.e. the topaz of the moderns, which is still found in Spain: so Braun, *De Vestitu Sacerd.* 2, 17. Others suppose it to be “amber;” but this does not agree with the

passages in Exodus, which make the Tarshish to have been one of the engraved stones of the high-priest's breastplate. *SEE BERYL.*

Tar'sus

(**Ταρσός**), the chief town of Cilicia, “no mean city” in other respects, but illustrious to all time as the birthplace and early residence of the apostle Paul (^{<401>}Acts 9:11; 21:39; 22:3). The only other passages in which the name occurs are ^{<403>}Acts 9:30 and ^{<412>}Acts 11:25, which give the limits of that residence in his native town which succeeded the first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, and preceded his active ministerial work at Antioch and elsewhere (^{<402>}Acts 22:21 and ^{<812>}Galatians 1:21). It was during this period, no doubt, that he planted the Gospel there, and it has never since entirely died out. There is little doubt that Paul was there also at the beginning of his second and third missionary journeys (^{<454>}Acts 15:41; 18:23). *SEE PAUL.*

Picture for Tarsus 1

Tarsus was situated in a wide and fertile plain on the banks of the Cydnus, the waters of which are famous' for the dangerous fever caught by Alexander when bathing, and for the meeting of Antony and Cleopatra. The river flowed through it and divided it into two parts. Hence it is sometimes by Greek writers called **Ταρσοί** in the plural, perhaps riot without some reference to a fancied resemblance in the form of the two divisions of the city to the wings of a bird. This part of Cilicia was intersected in Roman times by, good roads, especially one crossing the Taurus northward by the “Cilician Gates” to the neighborhood of Lystra and Iconium, the other joining Tarsus with Antioch and passing eastward by the “Aunanian” and “Syrian Gates.”

Picture for Tarsus 2

Tarsus was founded by Sardanapalus, king of Assyria. The Greeks, however, claimed a share in its colonization; and Strabo (14, 673) has preserved an ancient legend of certain Argives having arrived there with Triptolemus in search of Io. It appears first in authentic history in Xenophon's time, when it was a city of some considerable consequence (*Anab.* 1, 2, 23). It was occupied by Cyrus and his troops for twenty days and given up to plunder. After Alexander's conquests had swept this way (*Q. Curt.* 3, 5) and the Seleucid kingdom was established at Antioch,

Tarsus usually belonged to that kingdom, though for a time it was under the Ptolemies. In the civil wars of Rome it took Caesar's side, and on the occasion of a visit from him had its name changed to *Juliopolis* (Caesar, *Bell. Alex.* 66; Dion Cass. 47, 26). Augustus made Tarsus free (Appian, *Bell. Civ.* 5, 7). This seems to have implied the privilege of being governed by its own laws and magistrates with freedom from tribute; but did not confer the *jus coloniarum* nor the *jus civitatis*; and it was not, therefore, as usually supposed, on this account that Paul enjoyed the privilege of Roman citizenship. Tarsus, indeed, eventually did become a Roman colony, which gave to the inhabitants this privilege; but this was not till long after the time of Paul (Deyling, *Observat. Sacr.* 3, 391 sq.). **SEE CITIZENSHIP; SEE COLONY.** We thus find that the Roman tribune at Jerusalem ordered Paul to be scourged, though he knew that he was a native of Tarsus, but desisted on learning that he was a Roman citizen (⁴⁹¹Acts 9:11; 21:89; 22:24, 27). We ought to note, on the other hand, the circumstances in the social state of Tarsus, which had, or may be conceived to have had, an influence on the apostle's training and character. It was renowned as a place of education under the early Roman emperors. Strabo compares it in this respect to Athens and Alexandria, giving, as regards the zeal for learning shown by the residents, the preference to Tarsus (14, 673). Some distinguished names adorn its annals; among others, Athenodorus; the tutor of Augustus, and Nestor, the tutor of Marcellus, the nephew of Augustus; Artemidorus and Diodorus, celebrated grammarians, and Dionysides, a tragic writer. Tarsus, also, was a place of much commerce, and Basil describes it as a point of union for Syrians, Cilicians, Isaurians, and Cappadocians (*Ep. Euseb. Samos. Episc.*). Owing to its commercial advantages, Tarsus continued to flourish under the Roman emperors, until it fell into the hands of the Saracens. It was taken from them after a memorable siege by the emperor Nicephorus, but soon afterwards restored to them. In the time of Abfeda, that is, towards the end of the 13th and beginning of the 14th century, Tarsus was still large and surrounded by a double wall, and in the occupation of Armenian Christians (*Tab. Syrice*, p. 133). It still survives, though greatly reduced, under the modern name *Tersus*. Kinneir, who spent a week in Tarsus, states (*Travels*, p. 121) that hardly a vestige of the former magnificence of Tarsus remains; nor does, perhaps, the modern town occupy one fourth part of the area of the ancient city. He observed a few ancient ruins, but not a single inscription or any monument of beauty or art. The houses are intersected by gardens and orchards; they seldom exceed one story in height, are flat-roofed, and the

greater part of them are constructed of hewn stone, to furnish which the more ancient edifices have been leveled with the ground. The inhabitants amount to about thirty thousand souls, mostly Turks and Turcomans. The adjoining villages are chiefly inhabited by Greeks, who prefer agricultural pursuits to a town life. The sea is not visible from the town. The Cydnus is there about forty-yards wide, and small canals are cut from it for irrigation.

Picture for Tarsus 3

See Heumann, *De Claris Tarsensib.* (Gött. 1748); Altmann, *Exerc. de Tarso* (Bern. 1731); Zeibich, *Συμμικτά Antiq. Tarsens.* (Viteb. 1760); Mannert, 2, 97 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Bibl., Geo.* 3, 38; Beaufort, *Ksaramania*, p. 275; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 502-506; Bellev, in vol. 27 of the *Academic des Inscript.*; Rennell, *Geog. of West. Asia*, 2, 87; Cramer, *A sia Minor*, 2, 344; Leake, *Asia Minor*, p. 214; Barker, *Lares and Penates*, p. 31, 173, 187; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.; Lewin, *St. Paul*, i, 78 sq.; *Murray's Handbook for Turkey in Asia*, p. 370.

Tar'tak

(Heb. *Tartak'*, **קִּטְרַק**; Sept. **Θαρθάκ**; Vulg. *Tharthac*), one of the gods of the Avite, or Avvite, colonists who were planted in the cities of Samaria after the removal of the tribes by Shalmaneser (^{<1273>}2 Kings 17:31). According to Rabbinical tradition, T'artak is said to have been worshipped under the form of an ass (Talm. Babyl. *Sanhedrin*, fol. 63 b). From this it has been conjectured that this idol was the Egyptian *Typho*; but; though in the hieroglyphics the ass is the symbol of *Typho*, it was so far from being regarded as an object of worship that it was considered absolutely unclean (Plutarch, *Is. et Os.* c. 14). A Persian or Pehlvi origin has been suggested for *Tartak*, according to which it signifies either "intense darkness," or "hero of darkness," or the underworld, and so, perhaps, some planet of ill-luck, as Saturn or Mars (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v.; Fürst, *Handw.* s.v.). The Carmanians, a warlike race on the Persian Gulf, worshipped Mars alone of all the gods, and sacrificed an ass in his honor (Strabo, 15:727). Perhaps some trace of this worship may have given rise to the Jewish tradition.

Tar'tan

(Heb. *Tartan'*, **תַּרְתַּן**; Sept. **Θαρθάν** v.r. **Τανάθαν** or **Ταραθάν**; Vulg. *Tharthan*), which occurs only in ^{<1287>}2 Kings 18:17 and ^{<230>}Isaiah 20:1, has been generally regarded as a proper name (Gesenius, *Lex. Heb.* s.v.).

Winer assumes, on account of the identity of name, that the same person is intended in the two places (*Realw.* s.v.). Recent discoveries make it probable that in Tartan, as in Rabsaris and Rabshakeh, we have not a proper name at all, but a title or official designation, like Pharaoh among the Egyptians, or Surena among the Parthians (*Tacit. Ann.* 6:42). The Assyrian Tartan is a general, or commander-in-chief. It seems as if the Greek translator of 2 Kings had an inkling of the truth, and therefore prefixed the article to all three names, which he very rarely prefixes to the names of persons where they are first mentioned. If this be the true account of the term Tartan, we must understand in ^{<12187>}2 Kings 18:17 that Sennacherib sent “a general,” together with his “chief eunuch” and “chief cup-bearer,” on an embassy to Hezekiah, and in ^{<2310>}Isaiah 20:1 that “a general”—probably a different person—was employed by Sargon against Ashdod, and succeeded in taking the city. *SEE TRIBUTE.*

Tascodrugites

(*Τασκοδρούγγιται, Τασκοδρούγίται*, from *τασκός*, a wooden nail or stake, and *δρουγγός*, nose, in Epiphanius, *Haeret.* 48, n. 14), a heretical sect of Galatia (Hieron. *Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.*) belonging probably to the 4th century, are by some included among the Gnostics of the school of Mark, *SEE MARCUS THE HERESIARCH*, e.g. by Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* 1, 9, 10, and by others among the Montanists, e.g. by Epiphanius, *vt sup.* The term is unquestionably a nickname, applied to these heretics because they were accustomed during prayer to place a finger to the nose or mouth like a pole, at the same time observing the profoundest silence. See Aulugustine, *De Haeres.* 63; Philastr. *Haeres.* 76; and Epiphanius. Theodoret says that they ridiculed the sacraments, rejected the creeds, repudiated all revelation; ‘and others charge on them a denial of the incarnation. Their assemblies were legally prohibited after the 4th century, but traces of them are seen in Theodore Studita in the 9th. They are by some supposed to be identical with the Passalorynchites. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tasmania

formerly VAN DIEMEN’S LAND, is a considerable island in the South Pacific Ocean, lying between 40° 40’ and 43° 40’ south :lat. and 144° 30’ and 148° 30’ east long., at the south of, and separated from Australia by Bass’s Strait. Its greatest length from Cape Grim on the north-west to

Cape Pillar on the south-east is 240 miles, and its greatest breadth from east to west 200 miles. Its area, including the adjacent islands, is about 26,000 square miles. Its capital is Hobart-Town, with a population of 25,044. In 186 Lic total population of Tasmania was 133,791.

I. History. — Tasmania was first discovered by Tasman, Dec. 1, 1642, and named by him Van Diemen's Land in honor of his patron, the then governor of the Dutch West Indies. In 1803 Lieut. Bowen was dispatched from Sydney with a few soldiers and convicts to form a settlement in the south of the island, which was finally fixed upon the spot where Hobart-Town now stands. From 1817 commenced a rapid increase in the number of free settlers; and in 1825 Tasmania was declared independent of New South Wales. The transportation of convicts ceased in 1853, and on Jan. 4, 1856, on petition of the Legislative Council to the home government, the name of the colony was officially changed to Tasmania. Of the 3000 aborigines found in the country the number rapidly decreased, until now not one remains.

II. Climate, Soil, etc. — The climate of Tasmania is fine and salubrious; the mean temperature of the hottest month (January) is $63^{\circ} 57'$, of the coldest (July) $45^{\circ} 82'$, and of the whole year $54^{\circ} 92'$. The agricultural lands may be divided into three classes—alluvial deposits, Tertiary clays, and loamy soils. In their virgin state some of the lands are marvelously productive; but in many cases, through improvident management, the soil has deteriorated.

III. Administration. — Since the passing of the Constitutional Act in 1854, the governing authority has been vested in a Parliament, consisting of the governor, as the queen's representative, and two elective Houses the Legislative Council of eighteen, and the Assembly of thirty-six members. The qualification of voters is, for the former, a freehold of the annual value of fifty pounds, and, for the latter, a freehold valued at one hundred pounds, or a ten pounds rental.

IV. Religion and Education. — By the Constitutional Act fifteen thousand pounds were annually reserved for the support of religion, divided among the various religious denominations, but this is now withdrawn. They were, in 1870: Church of England, 53,047; Roman Catholic, 22,091; Presbyterians, 9064; Wesleyans, 7187; Independents, 3931; Baptists, 931; Jews, 232. For the support of elementary education twelve thousand

pounds a year is appropriated by Parliament, the disbursement of which is entrusted to a Central Board holding its sittings at Hobart-Town. The teachers are appointed by the board, and are under the supervision of the inspector of the schools. There were, in 1881, 204 public schools; 14,241 pupils. with an average attendance of 10,933; 105 male teachers, 108 female teachers, and 32 pupil teachers. There are eight superior schools—Horton College, High school, Hutchins's School, the Church Grammar-school, etc. The efforts of the Wesleyan missionaries in Tasmania have been directed mainly to the English population. The mission was begun in 1820 by the Rev. Mr. Horton, who was on his way to New South Wales. The mission was approved by the governor of the colony, and another missionary was soon sent out, who was followed by two more in 1827, and by a fifth in 1832. The following is the report of the mission for 1876: Chapels and other preaching places, 95; missionaries and assistants, 16; local preachers, 70, full members, 1286; persons on trial, 202; Sunday-schools, 47; teachers, 401; scholars, 3076; attendants on worship, 9176.

The Primitive Methodist Mission reported in 1873: Principal stations, 4; ministers, 4; members, 223.

The United Methodist Free Churches had, in the same year, 3 lay agents and 38 members.

Tasschemacher

(Dutch, Tesschenmaeker), PETNUS, one of the earliest ministers of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in the United States, was born in Holland, and educated at the University of Utrecht. He was settled in the United States first at Kingston, N. Y., in 1676-77, then went to Dutch Guiana, S. A., 1677-78, and in 1679-80 we find him at New Amstel, now New Castle, Del. Here difficulties arose which induced him to leave that people. He supplied the Church on Staten Island occasionally, 1682-83. In 1684 he took charge of the Church at Schenectady, N. Y., which he retained until his death. Meantime, in 1684, as the records show; he organized the Church at Hackensack, N. J., with thirty-three communicants. He was never their pastor, but seems to have made them occasional visits, to preach and receive members and dispense the Lord's supper, until 1789. This service must have cost him then much time and labor; but in this apostolic method of journeying and visitations many of the old churches were planted and sustained in their primitive worship. At Schenectady Mr. Tasschemacher was the first pastor, although the Church was probably

organized before he went to them. He was the most prominent victim of the Indian massacre and burning of that city. Feb. 8, 1690. "The French, in order to control the Indian trade, had planned the capture of Albany and New York the year before. The plan was not wholly carried out; but a party of French and Indians left Montreal, and, proceeding by way of Lake Champlain, intended attacking Albany. But, the Indian chiefs not consenting, they turned off towards Schenectady. They gave orders that Tasschemacher's life should be saved on account of the information they could obtain from him; but his house was not known, and before he could be personally recognized he was slain and his house and papers burned. His head was cloven open and his body burned to the "shoulderblades." Sixty persons lost their lives on that fatal Saturday midnight before they could escape or defend themselves from their stealthy and cruel foes. The remnant that escaped kept the Church of Schenectady alive. Without a pastor to instruct them, they met for worship amid the ruins of the city, chose their elders and deacons from year to year, who were ordained by the Rev. Godfriedus Dellijs, of Albany, and his successor, Rev. Petrus Van Dressen, until, in 1702, the little flock thus kept alive, and having gained in numbers and strength, called the Rev. Bernardus Freeman and received him as their pastor. Little more is known of Mr. Tasschemacher's history. He died a martyr among his flock, and his ministry and death illustrate the perils amid which the Gospel was preached and churches were established in their early days upon the frontier. See Corwin, *Manual of the Ref. Church*, p. 486. (V. J. R.T.)

Tassel

In mediaeval times the sacred vestments of the ministers of the Church were adorned with tassels, to which, in the case of dalmatics and tunics, balls of crystal were attached. The word also denotes a thin plate of gold or silver worn on the back of the cope and episcopal gloves.

Tate, Nahum

a well-known psalmodist, was born in Dublin, Ireland, in 1652, and at the age of sixteen was admitted to Dublin College, but does not appear to have followed any profession. He succeeded Shadwell as poet-laureate, and continued in that office till his death, which happened Aug. 12, 1715, in the Mint, where he resided as a place of refuge from his creditors. He was the author of nine dramatic performances and a large number of poems; but is

at present better known for his version of the Psalms, in which he was joined by Dr. Brady. For a complete list of his works, see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v. **SEE PSALMODY.**

Tatian

a notable Christian writer of the 2nd century, was a native of Assyria, though Clemens Alexandrinus and later fathers term him a Syrian. He had mastered the Graeco-Roman culture of his day, largely through extended travels; and his reading was very wide, no fewer than ninety-three classic authors being referred to in his works. In the course of his wanderings as a strolling rhetorician he came to Rome, at that time the great center for all intellectual interests and tendencies, and there turned his attention to Christianity. To justify this action he wrote his **Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας**, a work in which he confesses himself a convert to the barbarian philosophy of the despised sect, and invites his contemporaries to examine it, that they too might observe the astonishing contrasts it presents, with its simplicity and its clearness, to the darkness of the heathenism of that and every other age. At Rome Tatian was associated with Justin, perhaps as a pupil; but he soon became himself a teacher of Christianity. His attitude was apologetic, and necessarily involved the most marked antagonism to paganism. Stern and even harsh in his morality, he could recognize no truth in heathen philosophy, and feel no sympathy, even though but of a scientific or vesthetical nature, with heathen life and culture. To him, as to his contemporary Christians, the belief in *one* God was of the highest moral significance. The loss of this faith, he taught, had exposed the soul of man to the rule of the dark powers of material nature, the daemons with whom polytheistic views originate. Its recovery delivers from servitude to the wandering daemons (the planets) upon which astrological fate is based. In opposition to the materialistic pantheism of the Stoics, Tatian defended the supermundane spirituality of the one God, the Creator and First Cause of all things, in whom, as the Great Source of being, all things, including matter, potentially existed at the first. At the beginning the Logos sprang into being as the first-born work of the-Father, that he might produce the world, himself creating the material. The created universe is everywhere pervaded by the spirit of material life, which is inferior to the Divine Spirit being in man the soul, which is indissolubly connected with the body, and in the world the world-soul (**πνεῦμα ὑλικόν**). Human nature in its pure state is, however, privileged to a substantial and intimate union (**συζυγία**)

with the perfect nature, the Spirit of God himself. This throws a significant light upon Tatian's conception of the Trinity. He teaches that as the Father is (in his essence) Spirit, so the Logos proceeding from the Father is Spirit; and the latter, that he might imitate the Father, has made man in the image of immortality, to the end that man might have part in God and attain to immortality. The Spirit thus became the life-companion of the soul. In this way God himself lives in man by his ministering Spirit, by which is to be understood simply the hypostatized efficiency of the Logos. The fall involved the removal of the Divine Spirit from the soul, and plunged the latter deeper into the condition of the merely hylic, so that but faint sparks of the Spirit and dim longings after God remain. It is possible, however, for the soul to turn away from evil and towards God in the exercise of its freedom-how, Tatian does not clearly state. The fame which Tatian acquired through his apology, from which the foregoing sketch is principally taken, was lost in consequence of his perversion to Gnosticism. He went to Syria, it would seem, after the death of Justin (in 166?). He is charged with holding to the existence of means after the fashion of Valentinus (q.v.), and similar speculations; with an ascetical course of life, carried even to the extent of using water instead of wine; with rejecting marriage as a state of practical fornication; with promulgating Docetic ideas respecting the person of Christ, etc. — all of which must be regarded as substantially a truthful indictment. He would seem, however, to be more nearly related to Saturninus (q.v.) than to Valentinus in his views. The time of Tatian's death is not exactly known, but it seems to have been prior to the date of the work by Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* (c. 175). His most famous work was a harmony of the Gospels, the *Diates saron*, of which the Jacobite bishop Bar-Salibi (12th century) reports that Ephraem Syrus (q.v.) wrote a commentary on it, and Theodoret the: genealogical tables and all the passages by which the Lord's descent from David is made apparent. The *Oratio ad Graec.* was first published at Tigur. 1540, fol., and afterwards often. See Daniel, *Tatianus, der Apologet.* (Halle, 1837); Mohler, *Patrologie*; Ritter, *Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie*, vol. 1; Dorner, *Person Christi*, 1, 438; Moller, *Kosmologie d. griech. Kirche*, p. 168 sq.; Stockl, *Gesch. d. Philos. in d. patrist. Zeit*, p. 148 sq.; Huber, *Philos. d. Kirchenvoter*, p. 20 sq.; Duneker, *Apologet; Secund. Sec. de Essential. Naturae Hum. Partibus Placitc* (Gott. 1850), pt. 2; and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 104.

Tatiani Evangelium

Epiphanius (Haeres. 46, 1; 47, 4) mentions a Gospel of Tatian as being used by the Encratites, and even among the Catholic Christians of Syria. Being compiled from the four gospels, it is also called **εὐαγγέλ. διὰ τεσσάρων** (Theodoret. *Haeret. Facbul.* 1, 20; *Coll. Ambros. Proam. in Luc;* Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 4:20). Epiphanius erroneously identified it with the *Evangelium sec. Hebraeos* (see Fabric. 1, 377). See Semisch, *Tatiani Diatessaron, Antiquissimum N.1. Evangeliorum in unum Digestorum Specimen* (Breslau, 1856). Tatian is otherwise also censured as being a dangerous compiler and falsifier of Holy Writ (Fabric. 2, 538). The still extant gospel harmony (reprinted in *Orthodoxographis* and *Bibl. Patrum*, s.v. Tatian), ascribed to Tatian by Victor Capuanus in *Praefatio. ad Anonymi Harmoniam Evangelicam*, does not belong to him. See Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus N.T.* 1, 378; 2. 510. (B. P.)

Tatianists

followers of Tatian (q.v.). **SEE ENPCRATITES.**

Tat'nai

(Heb. *Tatnay'*, **יַתַּנַּי**; Pers., *perhaps-gift*; Sept. **Θανθαναΐ** v.r. **Θαναναΐ**, **Θαθθαναΐ**, etc.; Vulg. *Thathanazi* a Persian governor (**hj P**, i.e. *pasha*) who succeeded Rehum in the rule of Samaria, and probably of other provinces north of Judea, in the time of Darius Hystaspis and Zerubbabel (^{1518B}Ezra 5:3, 6; 6:6, 13), B.C. 520. He appears to have been a more just person, and more friendly to the Jews, than his predecessor. An adverse report of their proceedings at Jerusalem reached him; but he resolved to suspend his judgment till he had examined into the matter on the spot. He accordingly repaired thither, accompanied by another great officer, named Shethar-boznai (q.v.), and their colleagues, and, finding that the Jews alleged the authority of a royal decree for their proceedings, he sent to the supreme government a temperate and fair report, founded on the information he had obtained, suggesting that the statement made by the Jews as to the decree of Cyrus and other matters should be verified by reference to the archives at Babylon. Then, without one word to influence the decision or to prejudice the claim advanced, Tatnai concludes with intimating that he awaits the royal orders. 'This official letter of the Persian governor is quite a model of exactness, moderation, and truth, and gives a

very favorable idea of the administrative part of the Persian government. The rescript being favorable to the claim of the Jews, whose statement had been verified by the discovery of the original decree of Cyrus, Tatnai and his colleagues applied themselves with vigor to the execution of the royal commands. *SEE EZRA.*

Tattam, Henry

a learned English divine, was born in Ireland, Dec. 28, 1788; and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and at the universities of Göttingen and Leyden, where he received his doctorate in laws, theology, and philosophy. He took orders in the Church of England; was rector of St. Cuthbert's, Bedford, 1818-45; and for a portion of that time was rector also of Great Woolstone, Bucks. In 1845 he became archdeacon of Bedford, and in 1849 rector of Stamford Rivers, Essex. He was afterwards chaplain in ordinary to the queen. He died at Stamford Rivers, Jan. 8, 1868. Traveling in the East, he laid the foundation of an intimate knowledge of Oriental languages, and became the chief modern authority concerning the Coptic. He discovered at the Convent of Nitria, in the N.W. desert of Egypt, a splendid collection of ancient Syriac MSS. which he secured for the British Museum. He is the author of *Helps to Devotion* (2d ed. Lond. 1862, 12mo), *Compendious Grammar of the Egyptian Language* (1828, 8vo): — *Lexicon Egyptiaco-Latinum ex Veteribus Linguae Egyptiaca Monumentis*, etc. (Oxon. 1835, 8o): *Duodecim Prophetarum Minorum Libros, in Lingua Eegyptiaca, vulgo Coptica sen Menphitica*, etc. (Latine edidit; Lat. et Copt. 1836, 8vo): — *Defense of the Church of England against the Attacks of a Roman Catholic* (Lond. 1843, 12mo): — *The Ancient Coptic Version of the Book of Job the Just* (transl. into English and edited, 1847, 8vo): — *Apostolical Constitutions in Coptic* (English transl. 1849, 8vo): — *Prophete Majores in Dialecto Lingue Egyptiace* (Oxon. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allis bone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tau Cross

is a cross formed like the Greek letter T (Tat), and one of the most ancient forms. *SEE STAFF, PASTORAL.*

Tauler (original form Tauweler), Johannes

the famous Dominican preacher and mystic, was born at Strasburg in A.D. 1290 the authorities differ with respect to both time and place. He was of honorable family and early devoted to the priestly office. In (about) 1308 he became a monk and went to Paris, to the College of St. James, to study theology. He found greater pleasure in the study of the writings of the Areopagite St. Bernard, and the two Victors, and especially of Augustine, than in the popular philosophy; his attention was also given to the Neo-Platonists, and, among schoolmen, to Aquinas with respect to ethics. On his return to Strasburg, Tauler came under the influence of Master Eckart, and also of a more simple and practical company of mystical thinkers among the monks, including Nicholas of Strasburg and others. He became a preacher, and associated himself with the Friends of God—a society formed to teach and comfort the people upon whom rested the ban of the Church imposed by pope John XXII; and in this society he labored all his life. His sermons were clear and adapted to the popular needs, but not, it would seem, at this time pervaded by the power of a personal union of the preacher with Christ. In 1340 occurred an event of decisive importance to Tauler. He was then visited by Nicholas of Basle (q.v.), and by him led to realize his need of a personal conversion to God. During two years, in which he refrained from preaching and became an object of ridicule to his fellow-monks, who were unable to understand the reason for such struggles as he was passing through, did he wrestle with his sense of sin and his need of pardon. Finding peace at length, he passed through further discipline by reason of a disgraceful failure in an attempt to preach; but from that time he preached persistently, and with a power not previously possessed. Wicked clergymen were unable to endure the faithful rebukes with which he visited their sins, and they prohibited him from preaching; but the magistracy prevented the enforcement of their order. Under the preaching of the first sermon after his conversion a number of persons fell down as dead, and he was besought to discontinue the sermon. He was one of the few who refused to cease from preaching to the people in obedience to the papal interdict, and braved the anger of his immediate superiors in the execution of that duty. In 1348 the “black death” swept over Strasburg, carrying off sixteen thousand victims, and adding to the horrors of the situation. Oily l’Tauler and two other monks had pity upon the people, and they appealed in writings (whose circulation was at once prohibited) to the other clergy to do what they could that the “poor ignorant populace should

not thus die under the ban.” Charles IV soon afterwards came to Strasburg and caused the three monks to be brought before him, and, after inquiring into their principles, dismissed them with the admonition not, to “offend against the Church and its interdict again.” Tauler retired to Cologne; and became preacher in the nunnery of St. Gertrude, but after a few years returned to Strasburg, where he had a last interview with Nicholas of Basle. He committed to the care of that friend the writings he wished to have given to the world, and died June 16, 1361. He was buried in his convent, and the stone which covered his grave is preserved in the “New Church” of Strasburg.

Tauler’s works consist of sermons, homilies, and an *Imitation of the Life of Christ in its Poverty*. The sermons are extant in manuscript in several libraries, the oldest MS. being a parchment at Strasburg. In printed form the first ed. appeared at Leipsic, 1498, in 4to, and others at Augsburg (1508, fol.) and Basle (1521 and 1522, fil.), the latter being superior to the former. Of modernized editions that of Frankfort (1826, 3 pts. 8vo) is best. The *Imitation of Christ* also exists in different MSS. and editions, the best ed. being that of Schlosser (Frankf. 1833, 8vo). A number of other writings are attributed to Tauler, but without authority.

The teachings of Tauler are not presented in his works in systematic form. His aim was practical, and the edifying element predominates over the speculative in his theology. As with Eckart, the speculative ideas may be traced back to the concept *Being* the absolute, simple, uncreated entity, which involves neither distinctions nor relations, and which no name is adequate to express. It is the hidden Deity, whose nature requires, however, revelation and operation. Revelation is the process of the Trinity; operation, with the Deity, is begetting. Hence the Deity in operation becomes Father, as he knows himself, and in that act of knowledge expresses himself, the word which he speaks being the Son. Between them exist reciprocal approval and love, and this love is the Holy Spirit, proceeding from both the Father and the Son. This conception of the Trinity evidently involves a distinction of relations rather than of *hypostases* in the Godhead. The Son is eternal. With reference to the creation, Tauler comes very near to the teachings of pantheism at times, but nevertheless preserves the distinction between the Creator and the creature, and was constantly opposed to the teachings of the Beghards and Brethren of the Free Spirit. The human soul came forth from God, and contains a divine *spark*, in which the Trinity is reflected, and which strives

to return to God, while the sensual part of man yearns for the creature world. Sin consists in giving way to the latter impulse. It cannot wholly deprive the soul, which is at bottom noble and in harmony with the good, of its yearning for reunion with God; but man possesses in himself no power to return to God. Righteousness can be recovered only through faith in the merits of Christ. Meditation on the work and imitation of the life, especially the sufferings, of Christ form the way by which to return to God. This imitation should be outward, but also inward, transforming the entire man. By this way the soul rises superior to all creature control; God enters in with all his blessing, and supplies the place of grace with his immediate operation. As the soul becomes, in this way, "free from grace," so it also becomes "free from virtue," i.e. it no longer practices an isolated virtue, but, with a being transformed into love, he permits God to work in him all virtues as the outflow of that love. No idle contemplation or passive asceticism finds the approval of Tauler, but a life of active love and pity, of patience and meekness—a life in the imitation of Christ. Tauler did not contradict the doctrines of his Church, but he was animated by an exalted reformatory spirit; his mysticism displayed a free, practical, evangelical tendency which has given it historical importance; and we may appropriately retain for him the title, early bestowed, of *Doctor Illuminatus*.

See the preface to Tauler's works; Bohringer, *Die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen*; Schmidt, *Joh. Tauler von Strasburg*; Noack, *Christliche Mystik* (1853); *Biblioth. Sacra*, 15:253 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1869, I, art. 3; and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. **SEE NICHOLAS OF BASLE**.

Tausan (or Tagesen), Johan

a Danish Reformer, was born at Birkinde, island of Funen, 1494; and was educated at Aarhus and Odense. Becoming a monk, he entered the convent of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem at Antworskow, where he became acquainted with the writings of Luther. He visited Wittenberg, and formed the acquaintance of Melancthon. Returning to his native country, he delivered lectures on theology in the University of Copenhagen, and in 1524 avowed himself a disciple of Luther. After being expelled from one convent and imprisoned in another, he was, in 1526, appointed chaplain to Frederick I, king of Denmark; and in 1529 was appointed to the Church of St. Nicholas at Copenhagen, where he remained till 1537. He was then appointed professor at Roeskilde, and in 1542 was made bishop of Ripen,

and died in 1561. He published several theological treatises, some Danish hymns, and a Danish translation of the Psalms. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.; Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lex.* 4:1030.

Tav

SEE ALPHABET.

Tavern

SEE THREE TAVERNS.

Taverner, Richard

a learned and pious layman, was born at Brisley, England, in 1505. 'He is said to have studied at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and afterwards at Oxford, and then law in the Inner Temple. Having been appointed one of the clerks of the signet in 1537, he held that office until the reign of queen Mary. He was a friend of the Reformation, and, in order to promote it, undertook a new translation or edition of the English Bible (Loud. 1539, fol.). It was dedicated to the king and allowed to be read in the churches; but in 1545 the Romish bishops committed him to the Tower. He was, however, soon released, restored to the king's favor, and elected a member of Parliament in 1545. Taverner's edition of the Bible is a correction of what is called Mattheue's Bible, many of whose marginal notes are adopted, many omitted, and others inserted by the editor. On the accession of king Edward, Taverner, although a layman, received a special license in 1552 to preach throughout the king's dominions, from which he was obliged to desist upon the accession of queen Mary. He resumed his preaching when Elizabeth came to the throne, and, besides receiving other commissions, was made high sheriff of Oxford County in 1569. He died July 14, 1575. Besides his Bible, we have the following list of his publications: *The Sum and Pith of CL Psalms of David*, etc. (Lond. 1539, 8vo): — *The Epistles and Gospels, with a Brief Postill*, etc. (ibid. 1540, 2 pts. 4to): — *Fruit of Faith*, etc. (ibid. 1582, 12mo): — *The Garden of Wisdome*, etc. (ibid. 1539, 2 bks.): — *Flores aliquot Sententiarum ex Variis Scriptoribus* (translated from *Erasmus*): — *Catonis Disticha Moralia* (ibid. 1553, 8vo; 1555, 4to): — *In Mimium Publiasnum Lib. I* (ibid. 1562): — *Catechismus Fidei*: — *Proverbs, or. Adages* (ibid. 1545, etc.). See Masters, *History of Corpus Christi College*; Ward, *Gresham Professors*;

Newcombe, *English Biblical Translations*; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict. s.v.* *SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION.*

Tavthe

the Babylonian name for “the mother of the gods,” thought to be the same as *Tihanmtu* or *Tihamat*, “the sea.”

Tawals

in Slavonic mythology, was a god of the fields, bestower of blessings, worshipped by the Polanders. Tawbutte, a talbot (i.e. a hunting dog), frequently used in mediaeval heraldic devices. In an inventory of church goods at Easington, Oxford, is the following: “Item, a vestment powdered with stars and tawbuttes.”

Tawdry

a name given to the necklace worn of old by English peasant girls, in memory and honor of St. Ethelreda, or Awdry, patroness of the diocese of Ely, who, after she had become religious, mourned for the vanity in which she had indulged by wearing gold necklaces.

Tax, Hebrew

(some form of *Ērī*; *to arrange*). Taxes of some kind must have been coeval with the origin of civilized society. The idea of the one is involved in that of the other, since society, as every organization, implies expense, which must be raised by the abstraction of property from the individuals of which it consists, either by occasional or periodical, by self-imposed or compulsory, exactions. In the history of Israel, as of other nations, the student who desires to form a just estimate of the social condition of the people must take into account the taxes which they had to pay. According as these are light or heavy may vary the happiness and prosperity of a nation. To them, though lying in the background of history, may often be traced, as to the true motive power, many political revolutions. We find a provision of income made at the very commencement of the Mosaic polity. Taxes, like all other things in that polity, had a religious origin and import. While the people were in the migratory stage during their marches through the desert, only such incidental taxes were levied, or rather such voluntary contributions were received, as the exigencies of the time demanded. It was not till their establishment in Canaan that taxation assumed a regular

and organized form. We propose, therefore, in the following article (which treats only of public and stated imposts) to consider the subject chronologically from that point. *SEE ASSESSMENT.*

I. *Under the judges*, according to the theocratic government contemplated by the law, the only payments obligatory upon the people as of permanent obligation were the tithes (q.v.) the first-fruits (q.v.), the redemption-money of the first-born (q.v.), and other offerings as belonging to special occasions. *SEE PRIEST.* The payment by each Israelite of the half-shekel as “atonement-money” for the service of the tabernacle, on taking the census of the people (^{<1230>}Exodus 30:13), does not appear to have had the character of a recurring tax, but to have been supplementary to the free-will offerings of ^{<1230>}Exodus 25:1-7, levied for the one purpose of the construction of the sacred tent. In later times, indeed, after the return from Babylon, there was an annual payment for maintaining the fabric and services of the Temple; but the fact that this begins by the voluntary compact to pay one third of a shekel (^{<6102>}Nehemiah 10:32) shows that till then there was no such payment recognized as necessary. A little later the third became a half, and under the name of the *didrachma* (^{<10724>}Matthew 17:24) was paid by every Jew, in whatever part of the world he might be living (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:9,1). From the Talmudical tract *Shekalim* (Mishna, 2, 4), the time of payment appears to have been between the 15th and the 25th of the month Adar, that is, in March. After the destruction of the Temple, this didrachm was ordered by Vespasian to be paid into the Capitol, “as,” says Josephus, “they used to pay the same to the Temple at Jerusalem”, (*War*, 7:6, 6). During the prosperity of Palestine, large sums were thus collected in Babylon and other Eastern cities, and were sent to Jerusalem under a special escort (Josephus, *Ant.* loc. cit.; Cicero. *Pro Flacc.* c. 28). We have no trace of any further taxation than this during the period of the judges. It was not in itself heavy it was lightened by the feeling that it was paid as a religious act. In return for it the people secured the celebration of their worship, and the presence among them of a body of men acting more or less efficiently as priests judges, teachers, perhaps also as physicians. We cannot wonder that the people should afterwards look back to the good old days when, they had been so lightly burdened.

II. *Under the monarchy*, its centralized government and greater magnificence involved, of course, a larger expenditure, and therefore a heavier taxation. This may have come, during the long history of the

kingdom, in many different forms, according to the financial necessities of the times. The chief burdens appear to have been

- (1) a tithe of the produce both of the soil and of live-stock, making together with the ecclesiastical tithe, twenty percent on incomes of this nature (^{<0985>}1 Samuel 8:15, 17);
- (2) forced military service for a month every year (ver. 12; ^{<1092>}1 Kings 9:22; ^{<1270>}1 Chronicles 27:1);
- (3) gifts to the king, theoretically free, like the old benevolences of English taxation, but expected as a thing of course at the commencement of a reign (^{<0902>}1 Samuel 10:27) or in time of war (comp. the gifts of Jesse, 16:20; 17:18). In the case of subject princes the gifts, still made in kind—armor, horses, gold, silver, etc. appear to have been regularly assessed (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:25; ^{<1092>}2 Chronicles 9:24). Whether this was ever the case with the presents from Israelite subjects must remain uncertain. Besides the foregoing, there were
- (4) import duties, chiefly on the produce of the spice districts of Arabia (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:15);
- (5) the monopoly of certain branches of commerce, as, for example, that of gold (^{<1092>}1 Kings 9:28; 22:48), fine linen or byssus from Egypt (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:28), and horses (ver. 29);
- (6) the appropriation to the king's use of the early crop of hay (^{<3000>}Amos 7:1). This may, however, have been peculiar to the northern kingdom or occasioned by a special emergency (Ewald, *Proph.* ad loc.).

It is obvious that burdens such as these, coming upon a people previously unaccustomed to them, must have been almost intolerable. Even under Saul exemption from taxes is looked on as a sufficient reward for great military services (^{<0975>}1 Samuel 17:25). Under the outward splendor and prosperity of the reign of Solomon there lay the deep discontent of an overtaxed people, and it contributed largely to the revolution that followed. The people complain, not of Solomon's idolatry, but of their taxes (^{<1104>}1 Kings 12:4). Of all the king's officers lie whom they hate most is Adoram, or Adoniram (q.v.), who was "over the tribute" (ver. 18). At times, too, in the history of both the kingdoms, there were special burdens. A tribute of fifty shekels a head had to be paid by Menahem to the Assyrian king (^{<1250>}2 Kings 15:20), and under his successor, Hoshea, this assumed

the form of an annual tribute (^{<12704>}2 Kings 17:4; amount not stated). After the defeat of Josiah by Pharaoh-Necho, in like manner, a heavy income-tax had to be imposed on the kingdom of Judah to pay the tribute demanded by Egypt (^{<12335>}2 Kings 23:35), and the change of masters consequent on the battle of Carchemish brought in this respect no improvement (Josephus, *Ant.* 10:9, 1-3).

III. *Under the Persian empire*, the taxes paid by the Jews were, in their broad outlines, the same in kind as those of other subject races. The financial system which gained for Darius Hystaspis the name of the “shopkeeper king” (κάπηλος, Herod. 3, 89) involved the payment by each satrap of a fixed sum as the tribute due from his province (ibid.), and placed him accordingly in the position of a *publicanus*, or farmer of the revenue, exposed to all the temptation to extortion and tyranny inseparable from such a system. Here, accordingly, we get glimpses of taxes of many kinds, In Judaea, as in other provinces, the inhabitants had to provide in kind for the maintenance of the governor’s household (comp. the case of Themistocles, Thucyd. 1, 138, and Herod. 1, 192; 2, 98), besides a money-payment of forty shekels a day (^{<16154>}Nehemiah 5:14,15). In ^{<16043>}Ezra 4:13, 20; 7:24, we get a formal enumeration of the three great branches of the revenue. 1. The **hDmæi** fixed, *measured* payment, probably direct taxation (Grotüls). 2. **/I B]** the excise, or *octroi*, on articles of *consumption* (Gesenius, s.v.). 3. **ËI h]** probably the toll payable at bridges, fords, or certain stations *on* the high-road. The influence of Ezra secured for the whole ecclesiastical order, from the priests down to the Nethinim, an immunity from all three (^{<15724>}Ezra 7:24); but the burden pressed heavily on the great body of the people, and they complained bitterly both of this and of the **ἀγγαρήιον**, or forced service, to which they and their cattle were liable (^{<16187>}Nehemiah 9:37). They were compelled to mortgage their vineyards and fields, borrowing money at twelve per cent the interest being payable apparently either in money or in kind (^{<16181>}Nehemiah 5:1-11). Failing payment, the creditors exercised the power (with or without the mitigation of the year of jubilee) of seizing the persons of the debtors and treating them as slaves (ver. 5; comp. ^{<13411>}2 Kings 4:1). Taxation was leading at Jerusalem to precisely the same evils as those which appeared from like causes in the early history of Rome. To this cause may probably be ascribed the incomplete payment of tithes or offerings at this period (^{<16130>}Nehemiah 13:10, 12; ^{<34183>}Malachi 3:8), and the consequent necessity of a special poll-tax of the third part of a shekel for the services of the Temple

(~~1602~~ Nehemiah 10:32). What could be done to mitigate the evil was done by Nehemiah, but the taxes continued, and oppression and injustice no doubt marked the government of the province in a large degree. The miseries of an Oriental system of taxation have in modern times received their most revolting illustration in the history of Turkey over these same regions, the settled policy of whose government has ever been to grind the people by the utmost extent of extortion, peculation, and espionage, in all the grades of official administration.

IV. *Under the Egyptian and Syrian kings* the taxes paid by the Jews became yet heavier. The “farming” system of finance was adopted in its worst form. The Persian governors had been obliged to pay a fixed sum into the treasury. Now the taxes were put up to auction. The contract sum for those of Phoenicia, Judaea, and Samaria had been estimated at about 8000 talents. An unscrupulous adventurer (e.g. Joseph, under Ptolemy Euergetes) would bid double that sum, and would then go down to the province, and by violence and cruelty, like that of Turkish or Hindi collectors, squeeze out a large margin of profit for himself (Josephus, *Ant.* 12. 4, 1-5).

Under the Syrian kings we meet with an ingenious variety of taxation. Direct tribute (φόροι), an excise duty on salt, crown-taxes (στέφανοι, golden crowns, or their value, sent yearly to the king), one half the produce of fruit-trees, one third that of corn land, a tax of some kind on cattle: these, as the heaviest burdens, are ostentatiously enumerated in the decrees of the two Demetriuses remitting them (1 Macc. 10:29, 30; 11:35). Even after this, however, the golden crown and scarlet robe continue to be sent (13, 39). The proposal of the apostate Jason to farm the revenues at a rate above the average (460 talents, while Jonathan [11, 28] pays 300: only), and to pay 150 talents more for a license to open a circus (2 Macc. 4:9), gives us a glimpse of another source of revenue. The exemption given by Antiochus to the priests and other ministers, with the deduction of one third for all the residents in Jerusalem, was apparently only temporary (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 3).

V. *Roman taxation*, in its pressure, if not absolutely heavier, was probably more galling, as being more thorough and systematic, more distinctively a mark of bondage. The capture of Jerusalem by Pompey was followed immediately by the imposition of a tribute, and within a short time the sum thus taken from the resources of the country amounted to 10,000 talents

(Josephus, *Ant.* 14:4, 4, 5). The decrees of Julius Caesar showed a characteristic desire to lighten the burdens that pressed upon the subjects of the republic. The tribute was not to be farmed. It was not to be levied at all in the sabbatic year. One fourth only was demanded in the year that followed (*ibid.* 14:10, 5, 6). The people, still under the government of Hyrcanus, were thus protected against their own rulers. The struggle of the republican party after the death of the dictator brought fresh burdens upon the whole of Syria, and Cassius levied not less than 700 talents from Judaea alone. Under Herod, as might be expected from his lavish expenditure in public buildings, the taxation became heavier. Even in years of famine a portion of the produce of the soil was seized for the royal revenue (*ibid.* 15:9, 1), and it was not till the discontent of the people became formidable that he ostentatiously diminished this by one third (*ibid.* 15:10, 4). It was no wonder that when Herod wished to found a new city in Trachonitis, and to attract a population of residents, he found that the most effective bait was to promise immunity from taxes (*ibid.* 17:2, 1), or that on his death the people should be loud in their demands that Archelaus should release them from their burdens, complaining specially of the duty levied on all sales (*ibid.* 17:8, 4).

When Judaea became formally a Roman province, the whole financial system of the empire came as a natural consequence. The taxes were systematically farmed, and the publicans appeared as a new curse to the country. *SEE PUBLICAN*. The *portoria* were levied at harbors, piers, and the gates of cities. These were the τέλη of ^{<41724>}Matthew 17:24; ^{<5137>}Romans 13:7. In- addition to this, there was the κῆνσος, or poll-tax (*Cod. D* gives ἐπικεφάλαιον in ^{<41215>}Mark 12:15), paid by every Jew, and looked upon, for that reason, as the special badge of servitude. It was about the lawfulness of this payment; that the rabbins disputed, while they were content to acquiesce in the payment of the customs (^{<41217>}Matthew 22:17; ^{<41213>}Mark 12:13; ^{<42111>}Luke 20:20). It was against this apparently that the struggles of Judas of Galilee and his followers were chiefly directed (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:1, 6; *War*, 2, 8, 1). United with this, as part of the same system, there was also, in all probability, a property-tax of some kind. Quirinus, after the deposition of Archelalul, was sent to Syria to complete the work begun, probably, at the time of our Lord's birth-of valuing and registering property, and this would hardly have been necessary for a mere poll-tax. *SEE CYRENIUS*. The influence of Joazar, the high-priest, led the people generally (the followers of Judas and the Pharisee Sadduc were the

only marked exceptions) to acquiesce in this measure and to make the required returns (*Ant.* 18:1, 1); but their discontent still continued, and, under Tiberius, they applied for some alleviation (Tacitus, *Ann.* 2, 42). In addition to these general taxes, the inhabitants of Jerusalem were subject to a special house-duty about this period; Agrippa, in his desire to reward the good-will of the people, remitted it (Josephus, *Ant.* 19:6,3). It can hardly be doubted that in this, as in most other cases, an oppressive taxation tended greatly to demoralize the people. Many of the most glaring faults of the Jewish character are distinctly traceable to it. The fierce, vindictive cruelty of the Galileans, the Zealots, the Sicarii was its natural fruit. It was not the least striking proof that the teaching of our Lord and his disciples was more than the natural outburst of popular feeling—that it sought to raise men to the higher region in which all such matters were regarded as things indifferent—and, instead of expressing the popular impatience of taxation, gave, as the true counsel, the precept “Render unto Caesar the ‘things that are Caesar’s,’” “Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom.”

SEE TRIBUTE.

Tax, Clerical.

SEE TAXES.

Taxatio Ecclesiastica

Anciently the first-fruits of all ecclesiastical benefices were paid to the pope. Innocent IV, in 1253, gave the same for three years to Henry III which occasioned a taxation made by Walter, bishop of Norwich, who was delegated to the task by the pope in the following year. It was sometimes called the *Norwich Taxation*, and sometimes *Pope Innocent’s Valor*. In 1288 Nicholas IV granted the tenths to Edward I for six years towards defraying the expense of an expedition to the Holy Land; and in order to their collection a taxation by the king’s precept was begun in that year, and finished, as to the province of Canterbury, in 1291, and as to York in the following year; the whole being superintended by John, bishop of Winchester, and Oliver, bishop of Lincoln. A third taxation, entitled *nova taxatio*, as to some part of the province of York was made in 1318 by virtue of a mandate directed by Edward II to the bishop of Carlisle, principally because the Scottish invasion had rendered the border clergy unable to pay the tax. Pope Nicholas’s taxation is an important record, because all taxes were regulated by it until the *valor beneficiorum* of Henry

VIII was completed; and because the statutes of colleges founded antecedently to the Reformation were interpreted by this criterion, according to which their benefices under a certain value were exempted from the restriction respecting pluralities in the 21st Henry, c. 13. It was published in 1802 by the Record Commission, and the original rolls for many dioceses are still preserved in the Exchequer. In pursuance of an act of Parliament of Henry VIII, commissioners were appointed to inquire “of and for the true and just whole and yearly values of all the manors, lands, tenements, hereditaments, rents, tithes, offerings, emoluments, and other profits, etc., appertaining to any archbishopric, bishopric,” etc. The result of their inquiries was the *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, sometimes called the *King’s Books*. It has been published by the Record Commission. In 1647 Parliament issued commissions for surveying all the Crown and Church lands in England, and copies of the surveys returned were deposited in most of the cathedrals, but the originals were destroyed in the great fire of London. In 1835 a report of the ecclesiastical commissioners for England and Wales was laid on the table of both houses of Parliament, which contained the results of their inquiry into the revenues of the Church of England. *SEE FIRST-FRUITS*.

Taxes, Clergy Exempted From

By the favor of Christian emperors, the clergy were exempt from some of the taxes which were laid upon the rest of the Roman empire. They did not, however, claim this exemption as a divine right, but freely acknowledged it to be owing to the pious munificence and favor of the Christian princes. Baronius does the clergy great injustice in pretending that they claimed a freedom from tribute by the law of Christ; and that no emperor ever imposed any tax upon them except only Julian the Apostate, Yalens the Arian, and the younger Valentinian, who was wholly under the influence of his mother, Justina, an Arian empress (An. 378, 4:538). Bellarmine asserts (*De Clericis*, 1, 28) that the exemption of the clergy in political matters, whether relating to their persons or their goods, was introduced by human right only, and not by divine. The following is a table of the taxes levied in the empire showing the exemptions of the clergy:

1. Census Capitem (or personal tribute). Clergy exempted.
2. Ingtatio, Juga, Capitatio, etc. (tax on lands, etc.). Clergy exempted in special cases.

3. Anruim Tiroenicum etc. (soldiers and horses furnished to the emperors). Clergy (probably) exemptedini special cases.
4. Chrysargyrum (or Lustral Tax). Clergy exempted.
5. Metatum (entertaining emperor or retinue). Clergy exempted.
6. Superiudicta et Extraordinaria (or special taxes). Clergy exempted.
7. Road and Bridge Tax. Clergy sometimes exempted.
8. Anyarise et Parlingariae (conveying corn for the army). Clergy sometimes exempted.
9. Denarismus, or Ulcise, and Descriptio Lucratiornm (tax paid to the curia of every city). Clergy exempt under Justinian. The clergy were also exempt from all civil personal offices; from all sordid offices (e.g. building and repairing roads, etc.), both predial and personal; and from all curial or municipal offices. In order to check the practice of rich men seeking to avoid taxes by taking orders, Constantine made a law that no rich plebeian who was qualified by his estate to serve *in curia* and bear civil offices in any city should become an ecclesiastic. The laws respecting exemption of the clergy were frequently changed, but the above is their general tenor. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 5, ch. 3.

Taxing

is the rendering, in the A. V., of a Greek word, which occurs in two passages, ἡ ἀπογραφὴ (Vulg. *descriptio*, ^{<411P>}Luke 2:2; *professio*, ^{<415T>}Acts 5:37). The cognate verb ἀπογράφεσθαι in like manner is rendered by “to be taxed” in the A.V., while the Vulg. employs “ut describeretur universus orbis” in ^{<411P>}Luke 2:1, and “ut profiterentur singuli” in ver. 3. In ^{<812>}Hebrews 13:23 (πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς), where the idea is that of the registration of the first-born as citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, the A. V. has simply “written,” the Vulg. “qui conscripti sunt.” Both the Latin words used in the two passages first cited; above are found in classical writers with the meaning of a registration or formal return of population or property (Cicero, *Ver.* 2, 3, 47; *De Qf* 1, 7; Sueton. *Tiber.* 30). The English word conveys to us more distinctly the notion of a tax or tribute actually levied, but it appears to have been used in the 16th century for the simple assessment of a subsidy upon the property of a given county (Bacon, *Henry VII*, p. 67), or the registration of the

people for the purpose of a poll-tax (Camden, *Hist. of Elizabeth*). This may account for the choice of the word by Tyndale in lieu of “description” and profession,” which Wycliffe, following the Vulg., had given. Since then “taxing” has kept its ground in most English versions with the exception of “tribute” in the Geneva, and “enrolment” in the Rhemish of ^{<4457>}Acts 5:37. The word ἀπογραφή by itself leaves the question undetermined whether the returns made were of population or property. Josephus, using the words ἡ ἀποτίμησις τῶν οὐσιῶν (*Ant. 18:1, 1*) as an equivalent, shows that “the taxing” of which Gamaliel speaks included both. That connected with the Nativity, the first step towards the complete statistical returns, was probably limited to the former (Greswell, *Harmony*, 1, 542). In either case “census” would have seemed the most natural Latin equivalent; but in the Greek of the New Test., and therefore probably in the familiar Latin of the period, as afterwards in the Vulg., that word slides off into the sense of the tribute actually paid (^{<427>}Matthew 22:17; 17:24). **SEE CENSUS.**

Two distinct registrations, or taxings, are mentioned in the New Test., both of them by Luke. The first is said to have been the result of an edict of the emperor Augustus that “all the world (i.e. the Roman empire) should be taxed” (ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην) (^{<411>}Luke 2:1), and is connected by the evangelist with the name of Cyrenius, or Quirinus. The second, and ‘more important’ (ἡ ἀπογραφή, ^{<4457>}Acts 5:37), is referred to in the report of Gamaliel’s speech, and is there distinctly associated, in point of time, with the revolt of Judas of Galilee. The account of Josephus (*Ant.* 18, 50, 1; *War.* 2, 8, 1) brings together the two names which Luke keeps distinct, with an interval of several years between them. Cyrenius comes as governor of Syria after the deposition of Archelaus, accompanied by Coponius as procurator of Judaea. He is sent to make an assessment of the value of property in Syria (no intimation being given of its extension to the οἰκουμένη), and it is this which rouses Judas and his followers to their rebellion. The chronological questions presented by these apparent discrepancies have been discussed, so far as they are connected with the name of the governor of Syria, under CYRENIUS **SEE CYRENIUS.** An account of the tumults caused by the taxing will be found under **SEE JUDAS OF GALILEE .**

There are, however, some other questions connected with the statement of ^{<411>}Luke 2:1-3, which call for some notice. The truth of the statement has been questioned by Strauss (*Leben Jesu*, 1, 28) and De Wette (*Comment. ad loc.*), and others, who conclude, from various objections, that this

statement belongs to legend, not to history; that it was a contrivance, more or less ingenious, to account for the birth at Bethlehem (that being assumed in popular tradition as a preconceived necessity for the Messiah) of one whose kindred lived, and who himself had grown up at Nazareth; that the whole narrative of the infancy of our Lord, in Luke's Gospel, is to be looked upon as mythical. We summarize these objections, and under each we present, within brief limits, what appears to us a sufficient answer.

1. The foremost ground of objection is that neither Josephus nor any other contemporary writer mentions a census extending over the whole empire at this period (A.U.C. 750). An edict like this, causing a general movement from the cities where men resided to those in which, for some reason or other, they 'were to be registered, must, it is said, have been a conspicuous fact, such as no historian would pass over.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that our history of this portion of the reign of Augustus is defective. Tacitus begins his *Annals* with the emperor's death. Suetonius is gossiping, inaccurate, and ill-arranged. Dion Cassius leaves a gap from A.U.C. 748 to 756, with hardly any incidents. Josephus does not profess to give a history of the empire. It might easily be that a general census, cir. A.U.C. 749-750, should remain unrecorded by them. If the measure was one of frequent occurrence, it would be all the more likely to be passed over. The testimony of a writer like Luke, obviously educated and well informed, giving many casual indications of a study of chronological data (~~<BIB>~~ Luke 1:5; 3; ~~<BIB>~~ Acts 24:27), and of acquaintance with the Herodian family (~~<BIB>~~ Luke 8:3; 23:8; ~~<BIB>~~ Acts 12:20; 13:1) and other official people (ch. 23-26) recognizing distinctly the later and more conspicuous ἀπογραφή, must be admitted as fair presumptive evidence, hardly to be set aside in the absence of any evidence to the contrary. How hazardous such an inference from the silence of historians would be, we may judge from the fact that there was undoubtedly a geometrical survey of the empire at some period in the reign of Augustus, of which none of the above writers take any notice (comp. the extracts from the *Rei Agrarime Scriptores* in Greswell, *Harmony*, 1, 537). It has been argued further that the whole policy of Augustus rested on a perpetual communication to the central government of the statistics of all parts of the empire. The inscription on the monument of Ancyra (Gruter. *Corpus Inscript.* 1, 230) names three general censuses in A.U.C. 726, 746,-767 (comp. Sueton. *Octav.* c. 28; Greswell, *Harm.* 1, 535), Dion Cass. (4, 13) mentions another in Italy in A.U.C. 757. Others in Gaul are

assigned to A.U.C. 727, 741, 767. Strabo (6, 4, 2), writing early in the reign of Tiberius, speaks of **μία τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τιμήσεων**, as if they were common things. In A.U.C. 726, when Augustus offered to resign his power, he laid before the senate a “rationarium imperii” (Sueton. *Octav.* c. 28). After his death, in like manner, a “breviarium totius imperii” was produced, containing full returns of the population, wealth, resources of all parts of the empire, a careful digest apparently of facts collected during the labors of many years (*ibid.* c. 101; Dion Cass. 55; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1, 11). It will hardly seem strange that one of the routine official steps in this process should only be mentioned by a writer who, like Luke, had a special reason for noticing it. A census, involving property-returns, and the direct taxation consequent on them, might excite attention. A mere **ἀπογραφή** would have little in it to disturb men’s minds. or force itself upon a writer of history. There is, however, some evidence, more or less circumstantial, in confirmation of Luke’s statement.

(1.) The inference drawn from the silence of historians may be legitimately met by an inference drawn from the silence of objectors. It never occurred to Celsus or Lucian or Porphyry, each questioning all that he could in the Gospel history, to question this.

(2.) A remarkable passage in Suidas (s.v. **Απογραφή**) mentions a census, obviously differing from the three of the Ancyran monument, and agreeing, in some respects, with that of Luke. It was made by Augustus, not as censor, but by his own imperial authority (**δόξαν αὐτῷ**; comp. **ἐξήλθε δόγμα**, ~~αὐτῷ~~ Luke 2:1). The returns were collected by twenty commissioners of high rank. They included property as well as population, and extended over the whole empire.

(3.) Tertullian, incidentally, writing controversially, not against a heathen, but against Marcion, appeals to the returns of the census for Syria under Sentius Saturninus as accessible to all who cared to search them, and proving the birth of Jesus in the city of David (Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* 4:19). Whatever difficulty the difference of names may present, **SEE CYRENIUS**, here is, at any rate, a strong indication of the fact of a census of population, cir. A.U.C. 749, and therefore in harmony with Luke’s narrative.

(4.) Greswell (*Harm.* 1, 476; 4 6) has pointed to some circumstances mentioned by Josephus in the last year of Herod’s life, and therefore coinciding with the time of the Nativity, which imply some special action of the Roman government in Syria, the nature of which the historian

carelessly or deliberately suppresses. When Herod attends the council at Berytus there are mentioned as present, besides Saturninus and the procurator, οἱ περὶ Πεδάγιον πρέσβεις, as if the officer thus named had come, accompanied by other commissioners, for some purpose which gave him for the time almost co-ordinate influence with the governor of Syria himself (*War*, 1, 27, 2). Just after this again, Herod, for some unexplained reason, found it necessary to administer to the whole people an oath, not of allegiance to himself, but of good-will to the emperor; and this oath six thousand of the Pharisees refused to take (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:2, 4; *War*, 1, 29, 2). This statement implies, it is urged, some disturbing cause affecting the public tranquility, a formal appearance of all citizens before the king's officers, and lastly, some measure specially distasteful to the Pharisees. The narrative of Luke offers an undesigned explanation of these phenomena.

2. As a further objection, it is urged that Palestine was, at this time, an independent kingdom under Herod, and therefore would not have come under the operation of an imperial edict.

This objection admits of as satisfactory an answer as the foregoing. The statistical document already referred to included subject kingdoms and allies, no less than the provinces (Sueton. *loc. cit.*). If Augustus had any desire to know the resources of Judea, the position of Herod made him neither willing nor able to resist. From first to last we meet with repeated instances of subservience. He does not dare to try or punish his sons, but refers their cause to the emperor's cognizance (Josephus, *Ant.* 16:4, 1; 17:5, 8). He holds his kingdom on condition of paying a fixed tribute. Permission is ostentatiously given him to dispose of the succession to his throne as he likes best (*ibid.* 16:4, 5). He binds his people, as we have seen, by an oath of allegiance to the emperor (*ibid.* 17:2, 4). The threat of Augustus that he would treat Herod no longer as an ally, but as a subject (*ibid.* 16:9, 3), would be followed naturally enough by some such step as this, and the desire of Herod to regain his favor would lead him to acquiesce in it.

3. Another objection alleged is that if such a measure, involving the recognition of Roman sovereignty, had been attempted under Herod, it would have roused the same resistance as the undisputed census under Quirinus did at a later period. In reply to this, we may say that we need not wonder that the measure should have been carried into effect without any popular outbreak. It was a return of the population only, not a valuation of

property; there was no immediate taxation as the consequence. It might offend a party like the Pharisees; it was not likely to excite the multitude. Even if it seemed to some the prognostication of a coming change; and of direct government by the Roman emperor, we know that there was a large and influential party ready to welcome that change as the best thing that could happen for its country (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:11, 2).

4. The statement of Luke that “all went to be taxed, every one into his own city,” is said to be inconsistent with the rules of the Roman census, which took cognizance of the place of residence only, not of the place of birth.

On the other hand, this apparent inconsistency of what Luke narrates is precisely what might be expected under the known circumstances of the case. The census, though Roman in origin, was effected by Jewish instrumentality, and was in harmony, therefore, with Jewish customs. The alleged practice is, however, doubtful; and it has been maintained (Huschke, *Ueber den Census*, etc., in Winer, s.v. “Schatzung”) that the inhabitants of the provinces were, as far as possible, registered in their *forum originis*— not in the place in which they were only residents. It may be noticed incidentally that the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem belongs to a time when Galilee and Judaea were under the same ruler, and would therefore have been out of the question (as the subject of one prince would certainly not be registered as belonging to another) after the death of Herod the Great. The circumstances of the Nativity indicate, if they do not prove, that Joseph went there only for personal enrolment, not because he was the possessor of house or land.

5. It is asserted that neither in the Jewish nor the Roman census would it have been necessary for the wife to travel with her husband in order to appear personally before the registrar (*censitor*). This objection is, perhaps, the most frivolous and vexatious of all. If Mary were herself of the house and lineage of David, there may have been special reasons for her appearance at Bethlehem. In any case, the Scripture narrative is consistent with itself. Nothing could be more natural, looking to the unsettled state of Palestine at this period, than that Joseph should keep his wife under his own protection instead of leaving her by herself, in an obscure village, exposed to danger and reproach. In proportion to the hopes he had been taught to cherish of the birth of a Son of David; in proportion, also, to his acceptance of the popular belief that the Christ was to be born in the city of David (~~4115~~ Matthew 2:5; ~~4072~~ John 7:42), would be his desire to guard

against the accident of birth in the despised Nazareth out of which “no good thing” could come (1, 46).

The literature connected with this subject is, as might be expected, very extensive. Every commentary contains something on it. Meyer, Wordsworth, and Alford may be consulted as giving the latest summaries. A very full and exhaustive discussion of all points connected with the subject is given by Spanheim, *Dubiavtrng.* 2, 3-9; and Richardus, *Diss. de Censu Augusti*, in Menthe, *Thesaurus*, 2, 428; comp. also Ellicott, *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 57.

Ta' gete

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

Taylor, Charles C.

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, died Feb. 2, 1855, at Kalamazoo, Mich. In 1844 he went to Michigan and took charge of St. Andrew's Church, Ann Arbor; and in July, 1853, became rector of St. Luke's Church, Kalamazoo, where he labored until the last. He had frequently represented his diocese in the General Convention, and had for a long time been a member of the standing committee; he was a faithful and eloquent preacher. See *Amer. Quar. Church Review*, 1855, p. 161.

Taylor, Chauncey

a Congregational minister, was born in Williamstown, Vt., Feb. 17, 1805. After preliminary study at Hinesburgh, he entered the University of Vermont, from which he graduated in 1831, and then studied theology with Rev. Ira Ingraham, of Brandon. Jan. 21, 1835, was the date of his ordination, when he was installed pastor at Chittenden, and remained until 1837. One year, from 1838, he preached at James's Island, near Charleston, S. C.; from 1839 to 1841, he was acting pastor at Chittenden, Vt. The two years following he was without charge, living at one time in Winooski and at another in Milton. From 1843 to 1846 he was acting pastor at Alburgh. In the latter year he was reinstalled at Chittenden, where he remained until August, 1854, when he went to Langdon, N. H., and

served there as acting pastor for two years. Then he became a home missionary at Algona, Kossuth Co., Ia., beginning his ministry there in 1856 gathering a Church in 1858, and being installed in 1867. After serving this congregation until July, 1873, he was dismissed, and never resumed the care of a parish. He died there Feb. 29, 1876. See *Cong. Quar-Rev.* 1877, p.426.

Taylor, Cornelius H., D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1821. Soon after the completion of his theological studies he became pastor of the Church of Huron, O. From thence he removed to Illinois, and was installed pastor of the Church at Alton, where he labored ten years. In 1868 he received a call from the Third Presbyterian Church at Cincinnati, O. He was a leading man in the Church in all places where he labored. He died at Cincinnati, Feb. 25, 1875. See *Praesbyteriain*, March 13, 1875. (W. P. S.)

Taylor, David

one of Wesley's early helpers, began to preach the Gospel in Cheshire and Derbyshire about the time that Wesley began his public labors. Many were saved through his instrumentality, among whom was John Bennett. He lived for a time in the family of lady Huntingdon (q.v.). On one occasion he was waylaid, with Charles Wesley, and severely wounded. He eventually erred with respect to marriage, not submitting to the mode prescribed by law, and his usefulness became neutralized thereby. He united with the Moravians, but soon left them and attended the meetings of the Quakers. He afterwards returned to his old friends the Methodists, and attempted to preach once more; "but, alas!" says Atmore, "his gifts were gone." He died, in obscurity, about 1780. See Atmore, *Meth. Memorial*, s.v.; Smith, *Hist. Wesl. Methodism*, 1, 182, 191-196, 201.

Taylor, Edward

a Congregational minister, was born (according to president Stiles) at Coventry, England, in 1642, and received an excellent education in his native country. Upon the restoration of Charles, he resolved not to conform, and sailed for the United States April 22, 1668, arriving at Boston July 5. On July 23 he entered Cambridge University, from which he graduated in 1671. Invited to preach at Westfield, he consented, and arrived there Dec. 3, 1671. The paucity of population and the insecurity of

person and property delayed for a long time the formation of a Church; but this was done Aug. 27, 1679, O. S., and Mr. Taylor was ordained as its pastor. He continued to labor here until his death, June 29, 1729. He left in manuscript, *A Commentary on the Four Gospels*, theological treatises, sermons, and poems, none of which have been published. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 177.

Taylor, Ellison

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in South Carolina, Feb. 19, 1788. He first received license to exhort, and afterwards, April 13, 1816, to preach. Soon after this he joined the traveling connection, and in due time was made deacon and elder. He died in 1826. Mr. Taylor possessed excellent talents, was uniformly acceptable, and greatly beloved by the friends of true religion. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 541.

Taylor, Ezekiel Dunton

a Congregational minister, was born in Bristol, Vt., June 2, 1817—the youngest of five brothers, all ministers. His early education was received at St. Lawrence Academy, Potsdam, N. Y., and Western Reserve Preacher's Seminary. After leaving the latter institution he became principal of Shaw Academy, Euclid, O., and remained in that position until he began the study of theology, which he prosecuted under the direction of the Grand River Presbytery and with his brother Chauncey. From Jan. 1, 1845, to 1847, he was acting pastor at De Ruyter, N. Y.; and after one year's labor was ordained at West Stockholm, Dec. 9, 1847, where he remained three years, until 1850, at which time he was dismissed. His next field was at Heuveltou and De Peyster as acting pastor, at which places he preached one year (from 1850 to 1851); then at Chagrin Falls, O., four years, until 1855. At Clarendon he preached eighteen years, until 1873, from which time successively, until his death, he served at South Newbury, Parkman, and Troy. He died at his home in Troy, Dec. 19, 1878. (W. P. S.)

Taylor, Fitch W.

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, died in Brooklyn, N. Y., July 24, 1865, aged sixty-two years. He was the oldest chaplain in the United States Navy, and served under commodore Reed in his expedition against the Malays; was in the Mexican War; and was chaplain of the flag-

ship "Hiartford," in command of admiral Farragut, during the Rebellion. See *Amer. Quar. Church Review*, Oct. 1865, p. 499.

Taylor, Henry

an English Baptist and Methodist minister, was born at Rossendale, Lancashire, and began to preach, in a local capacity, in the Methodist connection at an early period of his life. He soon after united with the Close-communication Baptists, and was for several years a respectable minister in that Church, and a pastor of a congregation in Birmingham. In 1788 he offered himself to the Methodist Conference, was accepted, and appointed to Liverpool. He was a popular preacher, especially in Sheffield, in 1796, where several persons were converted. Some circumstances coming to light, in 1797, which reflected upon his moral conduct, he was suspended by the district meeting until the next Conference. He retired to Liverpool, and was sent, before the Conference met, by an owner of possessions in the West Indies to teach school on his plantations. Taylor died on the passage across, in 1798. See *Atmore, Meth. Memorial*, s.v.; Smith, *Hist. of Wesl. Meth.* 2, 294.

Taylor, Isaac (1)

a Dissenting minister, known as "Taylor of Ongar," was born in London in 1759, and was for a time a successful engraver in that city. He removed to Lavenham, Suffolk, in 1786. He was minister of an Independent Church at Colchester, Essex, 1796-1810, and of another at Ongar, Essex, from 1811 until his death, Dec. 11, 1829. Besides other works, he published, *Book of Martyrs for the Young* (12mo): *Bunyan Explained to a Child* (2 vols. 12mo): — *Child's Life of Christ* (12mo): — *Self-cultivation Recommended* (12mo; Boston, 1820, 12mo): — *The Glory of Zion: — and other single Sermons*. For a fuller list of publications, see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Taylor, Isaac (2), LL.D.

a Christian philosopher, was born at Lavenham, Suffolk, Aug. 17, 1787. He was designed by his father for an artist, began to study for a Dissenting minister, but became a member of the Established Church and settled down at Stanford Rivers as a literary recluse. In 1862 he received a civil service pension of one hundred pounds for his services to literature in the departments of history and philosophy. He died at his home, Stanford

Rivers, June 28, 1865. He published, among other works, *Elements of Thought* (Lond. 1823, 8vo; N. Y. 1851, 12mo; 11th ed. 1867, 8vo): — *The Process of Historical Proof Exemplified and Explained* (ibid. 1828, 8vo; 1859, 8vo): — *Balance of Criminality, or Mental Error Compared with Immoral Conduct* (ibid. 1828, 12mo): — *Natural History of Enthusiasm* (ibid. 1829, 8vo; Boston, 1830; 12mo; 10th ed. Lond. 1845, 8vo): — *New Model of Christian Missions* (ibid. 1829, 8vo; new ed. 1866, 8vo): — *Fanaticism* (ibid. 1833, 8vo, N. Y. 1834, 12mo; 1866, fp. 8vo): — *Spiritual Despotism* (ibid. 1835, 8vo; 2d ed. 1835, 8vo; N. Y. 1835, 12mo): *Physical Theory of Another Life* (Lond. 1836, 12mo; N. Y. 1836, 1852, 1853, 1866, 12mo): — *Home Education* (ibid. 1838, fp. 8vo; 7th ed. 1867, 8vo; 2d Am. ed. N. Y. 1838, 16mo): — *Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts for the Times* (ibid. 1839-40, in eight 8vo parts; 4th ed. with supp. and indexes, 1844, 2 vols. 8vo): *Man Responsible for his Dispositions, etc.*, a lecture (ibid. 1840, 8vo): — *Loyola and Jesuitism in its Rudiments* (Lond. 1849, 1850, 1863, 8vo; N. Y. 1849, 1851, 12mo) : — *Wesley and Methodism* (Lond. 1851, 1863, 1865, 8vo; N. Y. 1852, 12mo): — *The Restoration of Belief* (Lond. 1855, 8vo; Phila. 1855, 12mo; Camb. 1864, 8vo): — *Loicin Theology, and other essays* (Lond. 1859, fp. 8vo; with a sketch of author's life and catalogue of his writings, N. Y. 1860, 12mo): — *The Liturgy and the Dissenters* (Lond. 1860, 8vo): — *The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry* (ibid. 1861; N. Y. 1861, 8vo; 1862, 8vo): — *Considerations on the Pentateuch, etc.* (ibid. 1863, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *Chambers's Encyclop.* s.v.

Taylor, James A.

a Methodist Episcopal minister was received on trial in the Ohio Conference in 1847, and appointed to Goshen Circuit; in 1848, to Madisonville; in 1850, to Gallipolis Circuit; and in 1851, to Jackson, which was his last appointment. He died Aug. 10, 1851. He was a young man of undoubted piety, good mind, and remarkable zeal. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 4:665.

Taylor, James Brainerd

a young Congregational minister of ardent piety and great promise, was born at Middle Haddam, Conn., April 15, 1801. His parents being members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, he was trained up in religious

associations, and while clerk in a store in New York city was converted, and joined the Church of Dr. Romeyn. He early became useful in all Christian activities. The departure of Dr. Scudder for India turned his attention to the ministry, and after a preparatory course of two years at Lawrenceville Academy, N. J., he went to Princeton College as a sophomore in 1823. On his graduation in 1826, he entered the Yale Theological Seminary, but he soon had symptoms of lung-disease, which compelled him to seek relief in a tour through the South. He was licensed to preach by the Middlesex Convocation at East Haddam, Oct. 8, 1828, but the state of his health was such that he resolved to spend the winter at the Theological Seminary in Richmond, Va. He died there March 29, 1829, leaving a bright example of the power of divine grace and the triumph of Christian hope. See his *Memoir* by Dr. Rice (N.Y. 1833).

Taylor, Jane

daughter of the Rev. Isaac Taylor of Ongcar, and as a writer for youth the worthy rival of Mrs. Barbauld, was born Sept. 23, 1783, in London, where her father then resided in the practice of his profession as an artist. Even from her third and fourth year, in connection with her sister Anne, who was two years older, she is said to have composed little tales and songs, which they would sing together; and Jane especially seemed to live in a fairy-land of her own imagination. Her father removed to Colchester in 1796. There Jane, in her fifteenth year, gave decided indications of personal piety. She was also one of a select society of young friends for the reading of original essays and the promotion of intellectual improvement. A visit to London in 1802 first brought her before the public. Her first contribution, *The Beggar's Boy*, appeared in the *Minoo's Pocket-book* for 1804. It was followed not long after by the two volumes of *Original Poems for Infant Minds, Rhymes for the Nursery*, etc., the joint production of Jane and her sisters, which quickly gained the favor of the public, were reprinted in America, and translated into German. Few books have been found more agreeable to children, or more useful in the business of early education. In 1809 she contributed to *The Associate Minstrels*, and soon after engaged with her sisters in the more difficult task of composing *Hymns for Children*. This volume must be pronounced equal, if not superior, both in merit and popularity, to Dr. Watts's *Divine Songs*. Its success called forth a second volume adapted for Sunday-schools, the contents of which have been incorporated with almost every subsequent collection for that purpose, and are now continually sung by millions of

infant voices in different parts of the world. In 1814 she published *Display*, and in 1816 her *Essays in Rhyme on Morals and Manners*, which gained her a large increase of well-merited reputation. Her *Contributions of Q. Q.* to the *Youth's Magazine* were among her last and best literary efforts. They have since been republished in two vols. 12mo. She died at Ongar, April 13, 1824, confiding, calm, and happy in the Lord. See *Memoirs and Remains*, by her brother.

Taylor, Jeremy, D.D.

a distinguished Anglican divine, was born at Cambridge in 1613. He entered as a sizar in Caius College, Cambridge, in 1626, and became chaplain to archbishop Laud and to Charles I; was made fellow of All-Souls College, Oxford, in 1632; and was rector of Uppingham, Rutlandshire, 1638; sequestered by Parliament in 1642; and after the defeat of the Royalists suffered frequent but short imprisonments. During the first year of the Protectorate, he kept a school in Wales in conjunction with William Nicholson, and officiated as chaplain to the earl of Carberry at Golden Grove, Carmarthenshire. In 1658 he settled in Ireland and preached alternately at Lisburn and Portmore. He returned to London in the spring of 1660, and signed the loyal *Declaration of the Nobility and Gentry* April 24, thirty-five days before the Restoration. He was consecrated bishop of Down and Connor in January, 1661, made a member of the Irish Privy Council in February, entrusted with the diocese of Dromore in March, and in the same year was elected vice-chancellor of the University of Dublin. He died at Lisburn, Aug. 13, 1667, and was interred in the choir of the cathedral at Dromore. His funeral sermon was preached by his chaplain, Dr. George Rust, who said of him: "His endowments were so many and so great as really made him a miracle. He was a rare humanist and deeply versed in all the polite arts of learning, and thoroughly concocted all the ancient moralists, Greek and Roman poets and orators. He had the good-humor of a gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolman, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a chancellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint. He had devotion enough for a cloister, learning enough for a university, and wit enough for a college of *virtuosi*." To sum up all his attainments, Thompson calls him, in his *Biog. Hist.*, the "Homer of divines;" Hannah More, the "Shakspeare of the Church;" earl Shaftesbury, the "Spenser of English theological literature." An account of his writings and the various editions would fill a volume. We

give an outline of his works, and simply the first editions': *The Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy* (Oxford, 1642, 4to): — *A Discourse concerning Prayer* (Lond. 1646, 4to): — *New and Easy Institution of Grammar: Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying* (1647, 4to): *The Great Exemplar of Sanctity and Holy Life* (1649, 4to): — *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Living* (1650, 12mo): — *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Dying* (1651, 12mo): — *A Discourse of the Office Ministerial* (Lond. 1651; 8vo): — *Sermons for all Sundays in the Year* (ibid. 1653, 2 vols. fol.): — *Manual of Daily Prayers* (1655, 8vo): — *Doctrine and Practice of Repentance* (Lond. 1655, 8vo): — *Polemical and Moral Discourses* (1657, fol.): *Discourses of the Nature, Offices, and Measures of Friendship* (1662, 12mo): — *Offices or Forms of Prayer* (1658, 8vo): — *The Rule of Conscience* (1660, 2 vols. fol.): *The Worthy Communicant* (1660, 8vo): — *Rules and Advices to the Clergy of the Diocese of Down and Connor* (Dublin, 1661, 8vo): — *Discourse of Confirmation* (1664, 8vo): — *Dissuasives from Popery; addressed to the People of Ireland* (ibid. pt. 1, 1864, 4to; pt. 2, 1867, 4to, some 8vo).: — *Contemplations of the State of Man* (1684, 4to and 8vo). There have also been published separately, *Christian Consolations Taught from Religion* (24mo): — *Guide to Eternal Happiness* (12mo): — *Baptists Justified, with Notes by Dr. Anderson* (12mo): — *Reverence Due to the Altar; Preparation for the Sacrament* (12mo): — *Comforts of Piety* (12mo): — *Marriage Ring* (Lond. 1838, 32mo): — *Warning Vain* (1848, 18mo): — *Godly Fear* (1867, 32mo): — *Selections from his Prayers* (1811, 8vo): — *Beauties of Jeremy Taylor* (Lond. 1845): — *Selections from his Writings* (in Sparks, *Essays and Tracts in Theology*, vol. 6:No. 11). There have been numerous editions of Dr. Taylor's works: *Select Works* (1819, 6 vols. 8vo, Longman); *Select Works*, by Bradley (2 vols.); *Select Works*, by T. S. Hulghes, D.D. (5 vols. 8vo); *Practical Works*, by George Croly, D.D. (2 vols. 8vo); *Whole Works, with Essay Biographical and Critical*, by Henry Rogers (1835, 3 vols. imp. 8vo); *Whole Works*, by Rev. J. R. Pitman, with life of the author and a critical examination of his writings; *Life of Bishop Taylor*, by bishop Heber; and also *Life*, by Rev. J. Wheeldon, in which the pure spirit of his writings is extracted and exhibited for the general benefit. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v. (W. P. S.)

Taylor, John (1)

“the Water Poet,” was born at Gloucester, England, in 1580, and was educated at a free school in that town. He went to London, where he was apprenticed to a waterman, and followed this occupation for the most of his life; hence his appellation of “the Water Poet.” He was also collector of the wine fees for the lieutenant of the Tower, and keeper of a public-house at Oxford and Westminster. He died in 1654. His productions, in prose and verse, number about 140, among which we notice, *Urania*, etc., *with a Narration of the Thirteen Sieges and Six Sackings of Jerusalem*, etc. (1615, 8vo): — *Superbice Flagellum, or the Whip of Pride* (1621, 8vo): — *Against Cursing and Swearing*, in prose and verse (*Works*, 1, 39-55): — *The Life and Death, of the Most Blessed among Women, the Virgin Mary*, etc. (1622, 8vo): — *Verbum Sempiternum*, an epitome of the Old Test. in verse (*Works*, pt. 3): — *Salvator Mundi*, an epitome of the New Test. in verse (with preceding, in 1693, 64mo, called *The Thumb Bible*): — *Book of Martyrs* (1639, 18mo) (*Works*, 3, 136-141): — *The Church’s Deliverances*, from the year 1565 to 1630, in verse (*Works*, 3, 142-146): — *A Swarm of Sectaries and Schismatiques* (1641, 4to). For full list and description of works, see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Taylor, John (2), D.D.

a learned English Dissenter and educator, was born near Lancaster in 1694, and was educated at Whitehaven. He settled first at Kirkstead, Lincolnshire, where he preached to a small congregation and taught a grammar-school for nearly twenty years. In 1733 he was settled over a Presbyterian Church at Norwich, but in 1757 went to Warrington, in Lancashire, to superintend an academy, and died there, March 5, 1761. Among his publications are, *The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin* (Lond. 1738 and later): *A Paraphrase on Romans* (ibid. 1745): — *A Scripture Catechism with Proofs* (ibid. 1745): — *A Collection of Tunes, etc., with a Scheme for Supporting the Spirit and Practice of Psalmody* (ibid. 1750): — *The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement* (1753): — *A Hebrew-English Concordance* (ibid. 1754, 2 vols. fol.); -*The Lord’s Supper Explained upon Scripture Principles* (1754): — *The Covenant of Grace in Defense of Infant Baptism* (1755): — *A Sketch of Moral Philosophy* (1760). His greatest work is his *Hebrew Concordance*, adapted to the English Bible, in which every word in the Hebrew Bible, with all its forms and significations, is to be found. His *Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin* called forth the

celebrated answer of Edwards, in his treatise on *Original Sin*, which, whatever else may be said, it was not in the power of Taylor of Norwich to answer. In his *Paraphrase on the Romans*, with notes, he also found opportunity to broach freely his Arian sentiments, although the work also contains many valuable illustrations and comments on the Epistle.

Taylor, John (3)

an English divine, was born at Shrewsbury, and baptized at St. Alkmund's Church, June 22, 1704, and was educated at the expense of Mr. Owen, of Conover, at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his A.B. in 1727. He afterwards became both fellow and tutor of this college, and in March, 1732, was appointed librarian, which office he held but a short time, being; in 1734, appointed registrar of the university. In 1744 he was made chancellor of the diocese of Lincoln, and in April, 1751, was preferred to the rectory of Lawford, in Essex; while in January, 1753, he became archdeacon of Buckingham. He was made canon residentiary of St. Paul's in July, 1757, and removed to London, where he resided until his death, April 14, 1766.

Taylor, John (4)

a Revolutionary patriot and professor of natural philosophy and mathematics in Queen's College. He was elected by the trustees at their first meeting in 1771, and Rev. Dr. Jacobus Rutsen Hardenbergh was chosen as president. The college went into operation at once, and before the war several students were graduated. When the war broke out, these two illustrious men threw themselves ardently into the cause of independence. Professor Taylor drilled the students as a military company, and they were quite expert in the use of arms. The irruption of the British troops who occupied New Brunswick broke up the college. An advertisement is still extant that the exercises of the college would be continued at a private house at the head of the Raritan during one of these years. Subsequently professor Taylor became colonel of the New Jersey State regiment; but he continued to discharge his professional duties for a time. In a letter to governor Livingston, Sept. 25, 1779, he speaks of "the necessity of attending the examination of the students; and as the trustees insist upon my fulfilling my engagements, I hope I shall be discharged from the regiment as soon as possible." Of his subsequent life there is no public record accessible to the writer; but his name and relationship to the college

are important and interesting as showing the patriotism of both officers and students of the infant college, and the close connection between enlightened academic education and the spirit of independence in that period of New Jersey history. Among those whom Prof. Taylor drilled in the company of students the most eminent was the first graduate of the college, Simeon De Witt, who was Washington's chief "geographer to the army," or topographical engineer, as the office is now termed. See *Revolutionary Correspondence of N. J.* p. 177; *Hist. of Rutgers College.* (W. J. R. T.)

Taylor, John S.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Delaware County, Pa., Aug. 29, 1795; converted March 10, 1827; admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference in 1833, and appointed to Milford Circuit; in 1835, to Cambridge Circuit; in 1836-37, to Accomac Circuit; in 1838, to Northampton Circuit; in 1839-40, to Snow Hill Circuit; in 1841-42, to Dorchester Circuit; in 1843-48, to Mariners' Bethel, Philadelphia; in 1849, superannuated. He died Aug. 21, 1849. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 4:423.

Taylor, Jonathan

a minister of the Society of Friends, was a resident of Mount Pleasant, in the State of Ohio. He was much esteemed by the society of which he was a member. He was sent as a delegate to the societies in England and Ireland in the year 1831. During his journey he was attacked with inflammation of the lungs, and died at Kilnock, near Carlow, Ireland, June 11, 1831. See *Annual Monitor*, 1833, p. 57.

Taylor, Joseph

a Congregational missionary to India, was born in 1786; commenced his labors in India in 1812, laboring some time in the Bellary Mission, and removing thence to Belgaum, where he continued until 1852, when he retired to Bombay. Here he died, Nov. 19, 1859. See (Lond.) *Cong. Year-book*, 1861, p. 242.

Taylor, Joshua

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Princeton, N.J., Feb. 5, 1768. At the age of seventeen he was apprenticed to a

cabinetmaker, and continued in his employ three years, when the death of his mother awakened his mind to his spiritual condition. After a severe struggle against skepticism, he entered fully into communion with the Church in 1791; became an itinerant preacher, and was appointed to Flanders Circuit, N.J. The next year he went to New England, and labored in the circuits of Fairfield, Middletown, Granville, and Trenton, in Connecticut. In 1797 he was transferred to Maine, and appointed presiding elder of the newly formed district in that State. In 1798 he united with his duties as presiding elder the care of Readfield Circuit. In 1801 Mr. Taylor was appointed to the Boston District; in 1803 he was returned to the "District of Maine." and in 1804 was stationed at Portland, Me. He located in 1806, continuing to preach in Portland and vicinity, and teaching a private school. In 1824 he was chosen one of the presidential electors of Maine, and cast his vote for John Q. Adams. From 1826 to 1848 he confined his labors principally to Cumberland. In the latter year he re-entered the Conference, was entered as superannuated, and was appointed chaplain to the almshouse, where he attended to the duties of his office till June, 1852, when he was disabled by paralysis. He died at his home in Portland, March 20, 1861. About 1802 he was engaged in a pamphlet controversy with a Rev. Mr. Ward, a Congregational minister who attacked Methodist doctrines. "The Methodist party was entirely satisfied with the result of the controversy." See *Zion's Herald*, April 3, 1861.

Taylor, Michael S.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Scott County, Ky., Oct. 28, 1798; licensed to preach September, 1824, and some time afterwards received on trial in the Kentucky Conference. He traveled about four years in the Kentucky Conference; was then transferred to the Illinois Conference, and thence to the Indiana; was subsequently retransferred to the Illinois Conference, and appointed presiding elder in the Wabash District, where he continued his labors for four years. In 1836 he was appointed presiding elder of the Quincy District. He died July 20, 1838. In all the relations of life he was irreproachable. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1839, p. 661.

Taylor, Nathaniel (1)

an English clergyman was assistant minister in Westminster in 1683, and appointed pastor of a congregation at Salter's Hall in 1695. He died in

1702, at the age of about forty. He published, *Sermons* (Lond. 1688, 4to): — *Funeral Sermon* (1691, 4to): — *Preservative against Deism* (1698, 4to): — *Funeral Sermon* (1699, 4to): — *Discourse of Faith in Jesus Christ*, etc. (1700, 4to): — *Dr. William Sherlock's Case and Letter of Church Communion, etc., Considered* (17028vo): — *Practical Discourses* (1703, 8vo). See Allibone. *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Taylor, Nathaniel (2)

a Congregational minister, was born at Danbury, Conn., Aug. 27, 1722 (O.S.). He graduated at Yale College in 1745, and was ordained pastor, June 29, 1748, at New Milford, Conn., where he remained until his death, Dec. 9, 1800. For twenty-six years he was one of the Yale College board of trustees. His only publications were two occasional *Sermons*. In 1759 he was chaplain, under Col. N. Whiting, at and around Crown Point and Ticonderoga. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 467.

Taylor, Nathaniel William, D.D.

an eminent Congregational preacher and divine, and the grandson of the preceding, was born at New Milford, Conn., June 23, 1786. He spent his early years on a farm, was prepared for college by Rev. Dr. Azel Backus, and graduated at Yale College in 1807, having had twice to relinquish his studies on account of disease of the eyes. He was private tutor for a year in Albany and Montreal, studied theology four years with Dr. Dwight, and in 1812 succeeded Moses Stuart in the pastorate of the First Church, New Haven, where he labored with great success for ten years. Of his preaching, Dr. Dutton thus speaks: "The intellectual qualities of his preaching were thorough and profound, yet lucid and scriptural exposition and discussion of weighty themes; a marshalling of comprehensive forces of luminous and enkindled logic, to bear, with compacted and converging unity and climacteric power, on the one question in hand; a full and frank meeting of difficulties; bold, defiant, and powerful grappling with objections; fearless reference, in defense of scriptural doctrine and precept, to reason and common-sense; close and pungent applications to conscience, and earnest and tender appeals to the heart." Dr. Taylor was considered one of the ablest preachers of his time, and in certain aspects was thought to have had no equal. After he became theological instructor, especially in times of revival, his labors were widely sought by the Church and freely given. In 1822 upon the formation of the theological department in Yale College, he

was chosen Dwight professor of didactic theology, which position he held until March 10, 1858, when he quietly and peacefully passed away from earth. It was as a teacher of theology that his influence has been most widely felt. In this field, he was an original investigator, and few men have left a deeper impress upon American divinity. In several important respects lie diverged from the traditional theology of New England. He held that the mind, however affected by sin in intellect, sensibility, or will, is yet a free agent, capable by intellect to perceive and understand the objects and motives of choice, capable by sensibility to feel their influence, and capable by will to choose or refuse any one of them; and that the power of will, by which it makes a given choice, is a power that could in the time and circumstances have chosen differently and oppositely. He repudiated the predicating of the words "predestinated" and "decreed" to God, and substituted the word "purposed." While depravity is universal to the race, it is not to be ascribed to any property, propensity, or disposition of the soul, prior to actual transgression, as sinful in itself, or as the necessary cause of sin, nor to a sinful nature corrupted in or derived from Adam, sin being traced to the constitutional propensity of man for natural good, as perverted by his own moral agency. "Sin comes in as an unavoidable result, so far as divine prevention is concerned, of such materials as God uses, and must use, in a *moral* universe to wit, free agents." God, having created man moral and responsible, cannot prevent the entrance of sin without contradicting himself. He admitted and taught that sin is among the things which are according to the counsel of God's will, yet only in an indirect and remote sense, God preferring a moral system in which sin is necessarily incidental to the nonexistence of a moral system. As to the originality and soundness of Dr. Taylor's views concerning sin, much difference of opinion has prevailed. Some of his followers have claimed that they are original with him; others quote Whately, Woodward, and Dr. John Young as having enounced views in consonance with his. Dr. Pond charges him with reviving "the old Arminian deistical hypothesis," while Dr. Dutton claims, on the contrary, that "time has fully proved that his mode was altogether best for the refutation of Arminianism." Dr. Whedon says that while Dr. Taylor "vindicated the divine government by introducing into his system the Arminian view of sin, he overthrows his own work by admitting the principle of preordination." At all events, the enunciation of Dr. Taylor's views gave rise to a prolonged and exciting controversy, which was carried on with unusual persistency and ability between himself and his colleagues, on the one hand, and Drs. Tyler, Woods, and other prominent

Congregational divines, on the other. Dr. Taylor never admitted that his opinions were heretical, judged by the standard theologians of New England, but labored hard to prove their substantial conformity to the latter. Defended and enforced by his intense earnestness and eloquence, and by his powerful logic, his theology has won many adherents, and so it has been claimed has silently modified, and in a true sense rationalized, the Calvinistic theology. Dr. Taylor attached much importance to the truths of natural religion, and he also laid much stress upon true theories of mind. A correct mental philosophy he deemed fundamental, and elaborated with much care a system of his own. With Dwight and Edwards, he held that all motives find their ultimate ground of appeal in the desire of personal happiness, and that the idea of right in its last analysis is resolved into a tendency to the highest happiness. As a teacher, Dr. Taylor won the admiration and affection of his pupils, near seven hundred being under his training, and inspired them with enthusiasm and pleasure in the pursuit of their studies. In his social and domestic relations, he was peculiarly attractive and lovely, and peculiarly beloved. As an author, Dr. Taylor is known principally by posthumous works. His controversial articles were contributed principally to the *Monthly and Quarterly Christian Spectator* and to the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*. Since his death there have appeared the following, edited by Noah Porter, D.D. *Practical Sermons* (N. Y. 1858, 8vo): — *Lectures on the Moral Government of God* (ibid. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo), his greatest and most celebrated performance: — *Essays, Lectures, etc., upon Select Topics in Revealed Theology* (ibid. 1859, 8vo). See the *Congregational Quarterly*, 1860, p. 245 sq. (by Dr. Dutton); *Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *Appleton's Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; also the *Christ. Quar. Spec.* vols. 2, 4:5; *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, vols. 5, 6; *New-Englander*, Nov. 1859 (by Prof. Martin); *Amer. Theol. Rev.* 1859, p. 391 sq. (by Dr. Pond); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1859, p. 317, 667; 1860, p. 146, 656-669 (by Dr. Whedon); *Memorial of Nathaniel W. Taylor, D.D.* (New Haven, 1858, 8vo), comprising sermons by Drs. Bacon, Dutton, and Fisher. **SEE THEOLOGY; SEE TYLER, BENNET.**

Taylor, Oliver Alden

a Congregational minister, was born at Yarmouth, Mass., Aug. 18, 1801. He graduated at Union College, 1825; entered the ministry November, 1828; and, spending the next eleven years in study and teaching, he became pastor at Manchester Sept. 18, 1839, and died Dec. 18, 1851. He published, *Catalogue of the Andover Theological Seminars* (1838): *Piety*

in *Humble Life* (1844, by the Mass. S. S. Society): — and numerous articles, original and translated, and some poems, in various periodicals. A memoir of his life by Rev. T. A. Taylor, his brother, was published in 1853, a second edition of which appeared in 1856. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 725.

Taylor, Richard Cowling

an eminent English antiquary, was born at Hinton, Suffolk, Jan. 18, 1789, and emigrated to the United States in July, 1830, settling in Philadelphia. He was a surveyor and geologist, and was greatly useful in developing the mineral resources of various parts of the country. He died Oct. 26, 1851. In addition to scientific works, he published *Index Anasticus, or the Abbeys and other Monasteries, Alien Priories, Friaries, Colleges, Collegiate Churches, hospitals, etc., in the City of Norwich* (Lond. 1821, fol.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Taylor, Rowland, LL.D.

Picture for Taylor

an English clergyman and martyr, is supposed to have been a Yorkshireman; and after being educated at Cambridge, became the head of Border Hostle, near Caius College. He was presented by archbishop Cranmer to the rectory of Hadleigh, where lie attended faithfully to the spiritual needs of his parishioners. In 1553 he was summoned before Gardiner for resisting the popish mass at Hadleigh. He defended his cause with firmness, but was committed to the King's Bench Prison, where he remained till Jan. 22, 1555, when he was sentenced to be burned. The execution took place Feb. 8, 1555, on Aldham Common, near Hadleigh. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* s.v.

Taylor, Samuel

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Nova Scotia, Sept. 14, 1795; graduated at the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1825; was licensed to preach the same year, and shortly after was ordained and installed pastor of the Millersburg and Stoner Mouth churches of Bourbon Count', Ky. In 1831 became pastor of the Nicholasville and Cedar Creek churches, Ky.; in 1836, at Frankfort, Ind.; in 1845, Waveland, Ind.; in 1852, Washington, Ind.; in 1854, Waco, Texas. He died June 9, 1855. Mr. Taylor was a close

student and a man of literary tastes. As a theologian he was acute, prolific, and systematic. He was for a number of years an active member of the Board of Trustees. of Hanover College, Ind., and of the New Albany Theological Seminary, Ind. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 206.

Taylor, Stephen, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Tyringham, Berkshire Co., Mass., Feb. 26, 1796. He pursued his preparatory studies at Lenox Academy; graduated at Williams College, with the highest honor, in 1816; was preceptor of the academy at Westfield, Mass., for one year, and tutor in Williams College 1817-19; studied theology in Andover Theological Seminary, and afterwards privately; was licensed to preach in 1824. and shortly after was ordained pastor of a church in Halifax Co., Va. In 1826 he became pastor of the Shockoe Hill Church, Richmond, Va.; in 1835 was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the Union Theological Seminary in Prince Edward Co.; in 1838 resigned, and shortly after became pastor of a church in Abingdon, Va.; in 1843, of the High Street Church in Petersburg, Va.; in 1847 returned to Richmond, and engaged in teaching; in 1850 became pastor of the Duval Street Church, Richmond, and continued in charge of it until his death, March 4, 1853. Mr. Taylor was an instructive preacher, an excellent pastor, and a learned tutor. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 4:673.

Taylor, Thomas (1)

a learned Puritan divine, was born at Richmond, Yorkshire, in 1576; and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow, and afterwards Hebrew lecturer. On leaving the university, he settled first at Watford, Hertfordshire; then at Reading, Berkshire; and in 1625 he obtained the living of St. Mary Aldermanbury, London, which he retained during the remainder of his life. He died early in 1632. His contemporaries unite in giving him a high character for learning, piety, and usefulness. Among his works are, *Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul written to Titus* (Camb. 1612, 4to; 1616, 1619, best ed. 1658, fol.): — *Treatise of Christian Religion* (1616, 4to): — *Exposition upon Parable of the Sowe*, etc. (Lond. 1621, 4to; 1631, 1634): — *Christ's Victory over the Dragon* (1633, 4to): — *Christ Revealed, or the Old Testament Explained*, etc.

(1635, sm. 4to). Other works, with *Life*, appeared (Lond. 1653, fol.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Taylor, Thomas (2)

“the Platonist,” was born in London, May 15, 1758. He studied for three years at St. Paul’s school, with the design of becoming a Dissenting minister, but afterwards entered Lubbock’s banking house. Later he received the appointment of assistant secretary to the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, which post he held several years. During the last forty years of his life he resided at Walworth (partially supported by an income of £100 from his friend W. Meredith). He died Nov. 1, 1835. His works comprise sixty-three volumes, of which twenty-three are large quartos. Besides treatises on arithmetic and geometry, and a few minor essays, etc., his principal work was the translation of Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek and Latin authors. *The Works of Plato, viz. — his Fifty-five Dialogues and Twelve Epistles; Nine of the Dialogues by the late Floyer Sydenham, and the Remainder by Thomas Taylor*, etc. (1304, 5 vols. 4to), was printed at the expense of the duke of Norfolk, who locked up nearly the whole edition in his house, where it remained till 1848, when it was sold. Of his translation of Aristotle (1806-12, 10 vols. 4to) only fifty complete copies were struck off, the expense being defrayed by W. Meredith. His latest works were translations of Proclus, *O Providence and Evil* (1833, 8vo; 1841, 8vo); and Plotinus, *On Suicide* (1834, 8vo). His translations have been commended by some, but by others very severely criticized. For full catalogue of Taylor’s works, see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Taylor, Thomas House, D.D.

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born of English parents in Georgetown, S.C. Oct. 18, 1799. His early education was acquired at Guilford, Conn.; he graduated from South Carolina College, Columbia, as valedictorian of his class; studied theology under bishop White; was ordained deacon in 1821, and priest in 1826. For nine years he was rector of St. John’s Church, Colleton, John’s Island, S. C. In April, 1834, he became rector of Grace Church, New York city, where he remained until the close of his life. He died at West Park, on the Hudson, Sept. 9, 1867. Dr. Taylor was a fine scholar, a man of marked character, and retained the respect and affection of his people. He held several

positions of honor and trust. See *American Quar. Church Rev.* Jan. 1868, p. 665.

Taylor, Timothy

an English clergyman, was born at Hempstead, Hertfordshire, in 1609, and entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1626. He became vicar of Almeley, Hertfordshire; subsequently a Presbyterian, and then an Independent. In 1668 he removed to Dublin, and became assistant to Samuel Mather, and afterwards to Nathaniel Mather, and died there in 1681. He wrote *Defense of Sundry Positions and Scriptures alleged to Justify the Congregational Wy.* (Lond. 2 pts. 4to: pt. 1, 1645; pt. 2, 1646). They were answered by Richard Hollingsworth in his *Certain Queries* (1646, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Taylor, Timothy Alden

a Congregational minister and author, was born at Hawley, Mass., Sept. 7, 1809. He graduated at Amherst College in 1835, and at the Andover Theological Seminary in 1838. He was ordained at Slatersville, R. I., 1839, where he preached until his death-cut off suddenly in the midst of his usefulness, March 2, 1858. Mr. Taylor was honest and unflinching in his attachment to his principles, earnest and faithful. He was a diligent student, and wrote much for the periodical press. He also published a *Memoir* of his brother, Rev. Oliver Alden Taylor (Boston, 12mo, 1853; 2d ed. 1856): — *The Solace* (32mo): — *The Two Mothers* (32mo): — *Zion* (32mo): — *Zion's Pathway* (12mo): — *Bible View of the Death Penalty* (8vo). . See *Cong. Quarterly*, 1859, p. 96; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Taylor, Veron D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Hinesburg, Vt., in '1798; received an academical education; studied theology privately; was licensed by the Addison Congregational Association, Vt., and ordained by a Congregational council in 1826. His fields of labor were as follows: Elizabeth town, N.Y.; Litchfield, South Farms, Conn.; Amenia, N. Y.; Galesburg, Mich.; Huntsburg and Dover, Ohio; and was Seaman's chaplain at Buffalo, N. Y., and Cleveland, Ohio. He died Sept. 6, 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 228.

Taylor, William Cooke, LL.D.

an Irish author, was born at Youghal in 1800, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He went to London in 1829, where he remained until 1847, when he returned to Ireland, to serve the vice regal household in the capacity of statistician. He died in Dublin, Sept. 12, 1849. In addition to many works on secular subjects, he wrote, *Catechism of the Christian Religion* (Lond. 1828, 12mo): — *History of Mohammedanism and its Sects* (1834, 12mo): — *History of Popery* (new ed. 1837, -8vo): — *Illustrations of the Bible and Confirmations of Sacred History from the Monuments of Egypt* (1838, 12mo): — *History of Christianity from its Promulgation to its Legal Establishment in the Roman Empire* (1844, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tchu-chor

the prayer-mill used by the Buddhist priests in Chinese Tartary. It is constructed in two forms.

- (1.) One is a small wheel with flies, which move either by wind or water. On these flies are written prayers, and it is supposed that all the merit of their recitation is conferred upon him that sets the wheel in motion.
- (2.) The other is a huge egg-shaped barrel, as large as a hogshead, upon an upright spindle, composed of endless sheets of paper pasted one over the other, and on each sheet is written a different prayer. At the bottom of this pasteboard barrel is a cord, which gives to it a rotary motion. The lamas make this spin rapidly, and thus acquire the merit of the repetition of all the prayers written on all the papers at every rotation of the barrel. The lamas spend much of their time in plying the tchu-chor by way of interceding for the people. In return they receive from each person a small compensation for their trouble.

Teach

(Heb. prop. **למד** ; but also many other words; Gr. prop. **διδάσκω**, but often other terms). Teaching is an important branch of the commission which Christ gave to his apostles before he left the earth. “Go,” said he, “teach all nations,” or, as we have it recorded by another of the evangelists, “Preach the Gospel to every creature.” In this way they were to make disciples, as the word **μαθητεύσατε** imports. It is one of the precious

promises of the new covenant that all its subjects shall be “taught of the Lord” (^{<2543>}Isaiah 54:13). The Lord Jesus quoted these words in the days of his public ministry (^{<4065>}John 6:45), and describes the effect of this teaching thus: “Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me,” which he afterwards explains to mean neither more nor less than believing on him. *SEE PREACHING.*

Teachers, or “doctors” (v.r.), are mentioned among divine gifts in ^{<4011>}Ephesians 4:11, and it is possible that the apostle does not mean such ordinary teachers (or pastors) as the Church now enjoys; but as he seems to reckon them among the *extraordinary* donations of God, and uses no mark of distinction or separation between apostles, with which he begins, and doctors, with which he ends, it may be that he refers to the nature of the office of the Jewish doctors; meaning well-informed persons, to whom inquiring Christian converts might have recourse for removing their doubts and difficulties concerning Christian observances, the sacraments, and other rituals, and for receiving from Scripture the demonstration that “this is the very Christ;” and that the things relating to the Messiah were accomplished in Jesus. Such a gift could not but be very serviceable in that infant state of the Church, which, indeed, without it, would have seemed, in this particular, inferior to the Jewish institutions. With this agrees the distinction (^{<4517>}Romans 12:7) between doctors (*teaching*, διδάσκων) and exhorters, q. d. “he who gives advice *privately*, and resolves doubts, etc., let him attend to that duty; he who exhorts with a loud voice (παρακαλῶν), let him exhort” with proper piety. The same appears in ^{<4128>}1 Corinthians 12:28, where the apostle ranges, 1st, apostles, public instructors; 2d, prophets, occasional instructors; 3d (διδάσκαλοι), doctors or teachers, private instructors. *SEE GIFTS.*

For monographs on our Lord as the Great Teacher, see Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 130 sq. *SEE JESUS CHRIST.*

Tears

(ἡ[μ]π[α]ρδάκρυα) are the well-known emblem and usual accompaniment of grief; and as grief is generally most violent when it is indulged for the dead, so in the two following passages the wiping away of tears is connected with the abolition of death: ^{<2318>}Isaiah 25:8, “And the Lord Jehovah shall wipe away the tear from off all faces;” ^{<4977>}Revelation 7:17, “And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.” Tears are wont to be

poured out on occasions of mortality: thus in ^{<2815>}Jeremiah 31:15, “A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping, Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not;” again in 22:10, “Weep ye not for the dead, neither bemoan him, but weep sore for him that goeth away, for he shall return no more, nor see his native country.” Tears are sometimes shed for national calamities: thus in ^{<3002>}Lamentations 1:2, “She weepeth sore in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks;” again in ^{<0441>}Numbers 14:1, “And all the congregation lifted up their voice ‘and cried, and the people wept that night.” In ^{<0215>}Genesis 21:15, 16, Hagar’s pitiable case is thus described, “And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bow-shot; for she said, Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lifted up her voice and wept.” Tears are often the symbol of divine judgments, as they are sometimes also of human oppressions. (See ^{<2001>}Ecclesiastes 4:1; ^{<4019>}Acts 20:19; ^{<2447>}Jeremiah 14:17.) They are sometimes the fruit of repentance and contrition. (See ^{<3107>}Hebrews 12:7: ^{<0135>}Matthew 26:15.) But commonly they are the result of natural affection deploring a beloved object, of which the examples are too obvious and numerous to cite. But whatever the causes of tears to the righteous, all these shall be abolished, which is what is meant by “God’s wiping away all tears from their eyes.” For death, oppression, calamity, repentance, shall have no place in the heavenly region. Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. Those who sow in tears shall reap in joy. **SEE GRIEF.**

For the *valley of tears* (^{<1306>}Psalm 84:6), **SEE BACA.** For monographs on the tears of Christ over Jerusalem (^{<0194>}Luke 19:41), see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 53. Comp. Kiesling, *De Lacrimis Vatum* (Lips. 1747). **SEE JESUS CHRIST.** The so-called *lachrymatories*, or “tear-bottles,” supposed by some to have been used for collecting the tears of the mourners at the graves of the ancients (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 147), were rather vessels for perfumery or flowers (see the *Penny Cyclop.* s.v.).

Teashur

SEE BOX-TREE.

Te'bah

(Heb. *Te'bach*, **j bīf** *slaughter*, as often; Sept. **Ταβέκ**; Josephus, **Ταβαῖος**, *Ant.* 1, 6, 5; Vulg. *tebee*), the oldest of the four sons of Nahor by his concubine Reumah (^{<0224>}Genesis 22:24). B.C. cir. 2050.

Tebali'ah

(Heb. only in the prolonged form *Tebacya'hu*, **Why| bīf** *purified* [Fürst, *protected*] by *Jehovah*; Sept. **Ταβελίας** v.r. **Ταβλαΐ**; Vulg. *Tabelias*), third of the four sons of Hosah “of the children of Merari” (^{<1361>}1 Chronicles 26:11). B.C. 1014.

Te'beth

(Heb. *Tebeth'*, **tbē** *e* apparently of Assyrian origin, *Tibituo*), the tenth month (Esth. 2:16) of the sacred year of the Hebrews, corresponding in the main to *January*. Jerome has the following comment upon ^{<390>}Ezekiel 29:1: “Decimus mensis, qui Hebrseis appellatur *Tebeth*, et apud Egyptios [with whom it was the fifth month] **Τύβι** [or **Τωβί**, Coptic *Tobi*]; apud Romanos. *Januarius*.” In Arabic it is called *Tubah*, in Greek **Τυβί** or **Τήβ**, and in Sanskrit *Tapas*. **SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.**

Tebul Yom

SEE TALMUD.

Te Deum Laudamus

(i.e. “We praise thee, O God”). This hymn, which is written *in honorem Sanctissinim Trinitatis*, commonly called *Hymnus SS. Ambrosii et A ugeusfini*, and known as the *Ambrosian Hymn*, is erroneously ascribed to Ambrose. In a manuscript chronicle preserved at Milan, and erroneously ascribed to Decius (d. 553), bishop of Milan, we are told that at the baptism of Augustine, which Ambrose performed in the year 387, both the Baptist and the candidate spontaneously, as if inspired by the Holy Ghost, intoned this hymn. This tradition would seem to have been corroborated by a passage of a spurious (the 92d) sermon of Ambrose which treats of the baptism of Augustine. But, in truth, the tradition owes its origin to this passage. Augustine himself, who speaks, in his *Confessions*, of his conversion and baptism, does not mention anything of the kind. Some have

ascribed this hymn to Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria; others to Nicetius, about the year 535; and a third class to Hilary of Poitiers. The whole tenor of this hymn proves its Eastern origin, and at a very early time. Indeed, the *Codex Alexandrinus* contains a morning hymn commencing **Καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν εὐλογῶ σε καὶ αἰνῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα**; and this circumstance, together with the fact of its great resemblance with the *Te Deum*, induced Daniel (*Thesaur. Hymnol.* 2, 289 sq.) to say, “The *Te Deum* is based upon an ancient Greek hymn which, extensively known in the East, has found many translators, which fact not only accounts for the variety-of readings, but also for the various authors to whom it is ascribed. Of these versions, the one which Ambrose made for the service of the Milan Church met with the most approval and was finally adopted, and this explains why it was commonly called the *Ambrosian Hymn*.”

Even before the time of Charlemagne, this hymn was sung on special occasions in both churches of the East. The Roman Breviary uses it as one of the morning hymns to be sung throughout the year, with the exception of the Sundays in Advent, Lent, and the Feast of the Holy Innocents. Long before the Reformation, it was known in a German translation. In 1533 it was translated by Luther, “Herr Gött, dich loben wir,” and since that time it has been translated into German and English by different authors. We subjoin a few lines of the original:

“Te Deum landamus, te Dominum confitemur. Te seternum Patrem omnis terra veneratur. Tibi omnes angeli, tibi caeli et universae potestates, Tibi Chertubim et Seraphim incessabili voce proclamant: Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Plenli Sunt celi et terra majestatis gloriise tuae.” This beautiful and inspiring composition is read or chanted at the morning service of the Church of England after the reading of the first lesson. The rubric enjoins that it shall be said or sung daily throughout the year in the vernacular language. The ancient offices of the English Church gave this hymn the title of the “Psalm Te Deum” or the “Song of Ambrose and Augustine” indifferently. As used it may be considered as a responsory psalm, since it follows a lesson; and here the practice of the Church of England resembles that directed by the Council of Laodicea, which decreed that the psalms and lessons should be read alternately. The hymn consists of three equal parts-praise, confession of belief, and supplication. See Rambach, *Anthologie christlichen Gesänge*, 1, 87 sq.; Bassler, *Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder*, p. 44 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 1, 275 sq. (2d ed. p. 328 sq.); Tentzel, *Exercitationes X de hymno Te Deum Laudamus* (Lips.

1692); Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 14:ch. 11:§ 9; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 134. (B. P.)

Te Igitur

(i.e. “Thee therefore”), the first two words of the canon of the Latin mass. This part of the eucharistic service is said to have been drawn up under the direction of Gregory the Great, though portions of it are doubtless of much earlier date. It was also called *Obsecratio*. This service, as distinct from the missal, was used, and is still used, by bishops, prelates, and other dignitaries; *and* as the canon is the most sacred part of the service, oaths upon the *Te Igitur* were regarded as especially solemn. The *Te Igitur* appears to have been used in the ordeal of compurgation.

Teen

(Chinese, *heaven*), a word generally used by the early Roman Catholic missionaries to denote the Supreme Being; but, to render it more evidently descriptive of a person, the Inquisition ordered the addition to it of the word *Choo*, “Lord?” Thus Teen-Choo meant “Lord of heaven,” and came to be the recognized appellative of God by Romish converts. The Protestant missionaries rejected Teen, and substituted *Shin* or *Shang-te*.

Teenah

SEE FIG.

Tehaph'nehes

(^{<2508>}Ezekiel 30:18). *SEE TAHPANHES.*

Tehin'nah

(Heb. *Techinnah'*, תְּחִינָה *supplication*, as often; Sept. Θανά v.r.

Θαμάν; Vulg. *Tehinna*), a name occurring in the obscure list of the descendants of Judah (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 4:12) as the last-named of the three sons of Eshton (q.v.), and grandson of Chelub (q.v.); with the added epithet “the father of the city of Nahash” (*Abi-Ir-Nachash*), and the statement “These are the men of Rechah” (q.v.). From all this, we can only gather that Tehinnah was probably related to the family of David. B.C. cir. 1083. *SEE NAHASH.*

Tehoroth

SEE TALMUD.

Teil-tree

is properly the linden-tree, or *Tilia Europcaus* of botanists. It is mentioned in the A. V., in ^{<231B>}Isaiah 6:13, “as a teil tree, and as an oak;” but as in the Hebrew the word is **hl aēlâh**, usually rendered “oak,” by many supposed to be the *terebinth*, or “turpentine-tree,” there is no reason for giving it a different signification in this from what it has in other passages. SEE OAK.

Teind

the name given in the law of Scotland to TITHES SEE TITHES (q.v.).

Te'kel

(Chald. *Tekel'*, **l qē**] weighed, as immediately explained in the context; Sept. **θεκέλ**; Vulg. *thecel*), the second of the ominous words in the sentence of the Babylonian king (Daniel 5, 25,27). SEE MENE.

Tekeleth

SEE BLUE.

Teko'a

(Heb. *id.* **[/qT]**[once with *h* directive, **h[/qT]** ^{<104D>}2 Samuel 14:2], a stockade; Sept. **Θεχωέ** and **Θεχουέ**, Josephus **Θεκωά** and **Θεκωέ**; Vulg. *Thecue*; A.V. “Tekoah” in 2 Samuel 14), a town in the tribe of Judah (^{<14106>}2 Chronicles 11:6, as the associated places show; and inserted in its place in ^{<165>}Joshua 15:59, 60 in the Sept. [see Keil, *ad loca.*]), on the range of hills which rise near Hebron, and stretch eastward towards the Dead Sea. These hills bound the view of the spectator as he looks to the south from the summit of the Mount of Olives. Jerome (*in. Amos, Poem.*) says that Tekoa was six Roman miles from Bethlehem, and that as he wrote (in ^{<241B>}Jeremiah 6:1) he had that village daily before his eyes (“Thekoam quotidie oculis cernimus”). In his *Onomasticon* (s.v. *Ecthei*, **Ἐκθειυκέ**) he represents Tekoa as nine miles only from Jerusalem; but elsewhere he agrees with Eusebius in making the distance twelve miles. In the latter case he reckons by the way of Bethlehem, the usual course in going from the

one place to the other; but there may have been also another and shorter way, to which he has reference in the other computation. Some suggest (*Bachiene, Paldstina*, 2, 60); that an error may have crept into Jerome's text, and that we should read *twelve* there instead of *nine*. In ^{<400>}2 Chronicles 20:20 (see also 1 Macc. 9:33) mention is made of "the wilderness of Tekoa," which must be understood of the adjacent region on the east of the town (see *infra*), which in its physical character answers so entirely to that designation. It is evident from the name (derived from [*qīl*; to strike," said of driving the stakes or pins into the ground for securing the tent), as well as from the manifest adaptation of the region to pastoral pursuits, that the people' who lived here must have been occupied mainly as shepherds, and that Tekoa in its best days could have been little more than a cluster of tents, to which the men returned at intervals from the neighboring pastures, and in which their families dwelt during their absence.

The Biblical interest of Tekoa arises, not so much from any events which are related as having occurred there as from its connection with various persons who are mentioned in Scripture. It is not enumerated in the Hebrew catalogue of towns in Judah (^{<0150>}Joshua 15:49), but is inserted in that passage by the Sept. The "wise woman" whom Joab employed to effect a reconciliation between David and Absalom was obtained from this place (^{<100>}2 Samuel 14:2). Here, also, Ira, the son of Ikikesh, one of David's thirty "mighty men" (*pyr 86e*) was born, and was called on that account "the Tekoite" (^{<1235>}2 Samuel 23:26). It was one of the places which Rehoboam fortified, at the beginning of his reign, as a defense against invasion from the south (^{<1406>}2 Chronicles 11:6). Some of the people from Tekoa took part in building the walls of Jerusalem after' the return from the Captivity (^{<1685>}Nehemiah 3:5, 27). In ^{<240>}Jeremiah 6:1, the prophet exclaims, "Blow the trumpet in Tekoa and set up a sign of fire in Beth-haccerem" — the latter probably the "Frank Mountain," the cone-shaped hill so conspicuous from Bethlehem. It is the sound of the trumpet as a warning of the approach of enemies, and a signal-fire kindled at night for the same purpose, which are described here as so appropriately heard and seen, in the hour of danger, among the mountains of Judah. But Tekoa is chiefly memorable as the birthplace of the prophet Amos, who was here called by a special voice from heaven to leave his occupation as "a herdman" and "a puncturer of wild figs," and was sent forth thence to testify against the sins of the kingdom of Israel (^{<3074>}Amos 7:14).

Accustomed to such pursuits, he must have been familiar with the solitude of the desert, and with the dangers there incident to a shepherd's life. Some effect of his peculiar training amid such scenes may be traced, as critics think (De Wette, *Einl. ins Alte Test.* p. 356), in the contents and style of his prophecy. Jerome (*ad Amos* 1, 2) says, "...etiam Amos prophetam qui pastor de pastoribus fuit et pastor non in locis cultis et arboribus ac vineis consitis, ant certe inter sylvas et prata virentia, sed in lata eremi vastitate, in qua versatur leonum feritas et interfectio pecorum, *artis suce usum esse sermionibus.*" Comp. ^{<3123>}Amos 2:13; 3, 4, 12; 4:1; 6:12; 7:1; and see the striking remarks of Dr. Pusey, *Introd. to Amos.*

In the genealogies of Judah (^{<1123>}1 Chronicles 2:24, and 1:5), Ashur, a posthumous son of Hezron and a brother of Caleb, is mentioned as the father of Tekoa, which appears to mean that he was the founder of Tekoa, or at least the owner of that village. See Rediger in Gesen. *Thesaur.* 3, 1518.

The common people among the Tekoites displayed great activity in the repairs of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah. They undertook two lengths of the rebuilding (^{<4025>}Nehemiah 3:5, 27). It is, however, specially mentioned that their "lords" (**μῆνδα**) took no part in the work.

Tekoa is known still as *Tekû'a*, and, though it lies somewhat aside from the ordinary route, has been visited and described by several recent travelers. Its distance from Beit-Lahm agrees precisely with that assigned by the early writers as the distance between Tekoa and Bethlehem. It is within sight also of the Frank Mountain," beyond question the famous Herodium, or site of Herod's Castle, which Josephus (War 4:9, 5) represents as near the ancient Tekoa. It lies on an elevated hill, which spreads itself out into an irregular plain of moderate extent. Its "high position" (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* i, 486) "gives it a wide prospect. Towards the north-east the land slopes down towards Wady Khureitin; on the other sides the hill is surrounded by a belt of level table-land; beyond which are valleys, and then other higher hills. On the south, at some distance, another deep valley runs off south-east towards the Dead Sea. The view in this direction is bounded only by the level mountains of Moab, with frequent bursts of the Dead Sea, seen through openings among the rugged and desolate intervening mountains." In the spring there are often encampments of shepherds there, consisting of tents covered with the black goatskins so commonly used for that purpose; they are supported on poles and turned up in part on one

side, so as to enable a person without to look into the interior. Flocks pasture near the tents and on the remoter hillsides in every direction. There are horses and-cattle and camels also, though these are not so numerous as the sheep and goats. A well of living water, on the outskirts of the village, is a center of great interest and activity, the women coming and going with their pitchers, and men filling the troughs to water the animals which they have driven thither for that purpose. The general aspect of the region is sterile and unattractive; though here and there are patches of verdure, and some of the fields, which have yielded an early crop, may be seen recently ploughed up, as if for some new species of cultivation. Fleecy clouds, white as the driven snow, float towards the Dead Sea, and their shadows, as they chase each other over the landscape, seem to be fit emblems of the changes in the destiny of men and nations, of which there is so much to remind one at such a time and in such a place. Various ruins exist at Tekoa, such as the walls of houses, cisterns, broken columns, and heaps of building-stones. Some of these stones have the so-called "beveled" edges which are supposed to show a Hebrew origin. There was a convent here at the beginning of the 6th century, established by St. Tabus, and a Christian settlement in the time of the Crusaders; and undoubtedly most of these remains belong to modern times rather than ancient. Among these should be mentioned a baptismal font, sculptured out of a limestone block, three feet nine inches deep, with-an internal diameter at the top of four feet, and designed evidently for baptism as administered in the Greek Church. It stands in the open air, like a similar one at Jufna, near Beitin, the ancient Bethel. See more fully in the *Christian Review* (N. Y.), 1853, p. 519.

Near Tekû'a, among the same mountains, on the brink of a frightful precipice, are the ruins of Khureitun, possibly a corruption of Kerioth (~~(1855)~~ Joshua 15:25), and in that case perhaps the birthplace of Judas the traitor, who was thence called Iscariot, i.e. "man of Kerioth." 'It is impossible to survey the scenery of the place and not to feel that a dark spirit would find itself in its own element amid the seclusion and wildness of such a spot. High up from the bottom of the ravine is an opening in the face of the rocks which leads into an immense subterranean labyrinth, which many suppose may have been the Cave of Adullam, in which David and his followers sought refuge from the pursuit of Saul. It is large enough to contain hundreds of men, and is capable of defense against almost any attack that could be made upon it from without, When a party of the Turks fell upon Tekû'a and sacked it, A.D. 1138, most of the inhabitants,

anticipating the danger, fled to this cavern, and thus saved their lives. It may be questioned (Robinson, 1, 481) whether this was the actual place of David's retreat; but it illustrates, at all events, that peculiar geological formation of the country which accounts for such frequent allusions to "dens and caves" in the narrations of the Bible. It is a common opinion of the natives that some of the passages of this particular excavation extend as far as to Hebron, several miles distant, and that all the cord at Jerusalem would not be sufficient to serve as clue for traversing its windings. *SEE ODOLLAM.*

One of the gates of Jerusalem in Christian times seems to have borne the name of Tekoa. Arculf, at any rate, mentions the "gate called Tecuitis" in his enumeration of the gates of the city (A.D. 700). It appears to have led down into the valley of the Kedron, probably near the southern end of the east wall. But his description is not very clear. Possibly to this Jerome alludes in the singular expression in the *Epit. Paulat* (§ 12) "...revertar Jerosolymam et per Thecuam atque Amos, rutilantem montis Oliveti crucem aspiciam." The Church of the Ascension on the summit of Olivet would be just opposite a gate in the east wall, and the "glittering cross" would be particularly conspicuous if seen from beneath its shadow. There is no more *prima facie* improbability in a Tekoa gate than in a Bethlehem, Jaffa, or Damascus gate, all which still exist at Jerusalem. But it is strange that the allusions to it should be so rare, and that the circumstances which made Tekoa prominent enough at that period to cause a gate to be named after it should have escaped preservation. See, in addition to the above authorities, Keland. *Palaest.* p. 1028; Schubert, *Reisen*, p. 24; Raumer, *Palistina*, p. 219. Turner, *Tour*, 2, 240; Irby and Mangles, p. 344; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 402; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 114; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2. 424; Porter in *Murray's Handbook*, p. 251; Badeker, *Palestine*, p. 252.

Teko'ite

(Heb. with the art. *hat-Tekoi'*, **y[wqThi]** [in 2 Sam, 23:26; Nehemiah 3, 27, **y[aph]**], patrial from *Tekoa*; Sept. **ὁ Θεκώϊτης** and **ὁ Θεωΐ** v.r. **Θεκωνίτες** and **Θεκά**; Vulg. *Thecuites*; *Thecuenus*, and *de Thecua*), an inhabitant of Tekoa (q.v.), an epithet of Ira the son of Ikkesh, one of David's warriors (^{<1033>}2 Samuel 23:26; ^{<13128>}1 Chronicles 11:28; 27:9). The name survived the Captivity (^{<1033>}Nehemiah 3:5, 27).

Tela Stragula

a term used to designate the upper covering for the holy table when not being used for the sacrifice. It is commonly called the *altar protector*.

Tel-a'bib

[many *Tel'-abib*] (Chald. *Tel-Abib'*, *bybæʾl Tēcorn-hill*; Sept. *Μετέωρος*; Vulg. *Ad acerum novarum frugum*), was probably a city of Chaldsea or Babylonia (^{<4381>}Ezra 3:15), not of Upper Mesopotamia, as generally imagined (Calmet, *ad loc.*; Winer. *ad loc.*). The whole scene of Ezekiel's preaching and visions seems to have been Chaldea proper; and the river Chebar, as already observed, *SEE CHEBAR*, was not the Khabbfr, but a branch of the Euphrates. Ptolemy has in this region a *Thelbencane* and a *Thal-atha* (*Geog.* 5, 20); but neither name can be identified with Telabib, unless we suppose a serious corruption. *Thiluta and Thelsaphata* of Ammian. Marc. (24, 2; 25:8) have likewise been compared; but they are equally uncertain. The element "Tel," in Tel-abib, is undoubtedly "hill." It is applied in modern times by the Arabs especially to the mounds or heaps which mark the site of ruined cities all over the Mesopotamian plain, an application not very remote from the Hebrew use, according to which "Tel" is "especially a heap of stones" (Gesenius, *ad loc.*). It thus forms the first syllable in many modern as in many ancient names throughout Babylonia, Assyria, and Syria (see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III, 2, 784).

Te'lah

(Heb. *Te'lach*, *י | ת*, *bleach* [Gesenius] or *vigor* [Furst]; Sept. *Θαλέ* v.r. *Θαλέε*; Vulg. *Thale*), son of Resheph and father of Tahar, in the lineage between Ephraim and Joshua (^{<4375>}1 Chronicles 7:25). B.C. ante 1658.

Tel'aim

[some *Tela'im*] (Heb. with the art. *hat Telaim*. *מַיִם אֲגֻנִים*, the young *lambs* [in ^{<2341>}Isaiah 40:11]; Sept. *ἐν Γαλγάλοις*; Vulg. *quasi agnos*), a place where Saul collected and numbered his forces before his campaign against the Amalekites (^{<9504>}1 Samuel 15:4). It is strange that both the Sept. version and Josephus (*Ant.* 6:7,2) read *Gilgal*, which was in the valley of the Jordan, near Jericho, and certainly not a fitting place to marshal an army to war with the Amalekites, seeing it would have to march through the wild passes of the wilderness of Judah (Ewald, *Gesch.* 3, 50). The Targum

renders it “lambs of the Passover,” according to a curious fancy, mentioned elsewhere in the Jewish books. (*Yalkut* on ^{<0950>}1 Samuel 15:4, etc.), that the army met at the Passover, and that the census was taken by counting the lambs. This is partly endorsed by Jerome in the Vulg. A similar fancy is found in the midrash in reference to the name Bezek (^{<09108>}1 Samuel 11:8), which is taken literally as meaning “broken pieces of pottery,” whereby, as by counters, the numbering: was effected. Bezek and Telaim are considered by the Talmudists as two of the ten numberings of Israel, past and future. It is probably identical with TELEM *SEE TELEM* (q.v.), the southern position of which (^{<06524>}Joshua 15:24) would be suitable for an expedition against Amalek; and a certain support is given to this by the mention of the name (Thailam or Thelam) in the Sept. of ^{<0082>}2 Samuel 3:12.

Telas'sar

(Heb. *Telassar'*, $\text{רC} \text{I} \text{I}$ [in Isaiah], fully $\text{רC} \text{a} \text{l} \text{I} \text{I}$ [in Kings], *Assyrian hill*; Sept. $\Theta\alpha\epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, $\Theta\epsilon\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\theta$ v.r. $\Theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\Theta\alpha\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\delta$; Vulg. *Thelassar*, *Thalassar*) is mentioned in ^{<12912>}2 Kings 19:12 (A.V. “Thelassar”) and in ^{<23712>}Isaiah 37:12 as a city inhabited by “the children of Eden,” which had been conquered and was held in the time of Sennacherib by the Assyrians. In both passages it is connected with Gozan (Gauzanitis), Haran (Carrhae, now Harran), and Rezep (the Razappa of the Assyrian inscriptions), all of which belong to the hill country above the Upper Mesopotamian plain, the district from which rise the Khabfr and Belik rivers. *SEE GOZAN; SEE HARAN; SEE MESOPOTAMIA*. It is quite in accordance with the indications of locality which arise from this connection to find Eden joined in another passage (^{<35723>}Ezekiel 27:23) with Haran and Asshur. Telassar, the chief city of a tribe known as the Beni-Eden, must have been in Western Mesopotamia, in the neighborhood of Harran and Orfa. The name is one which might have been given by the Assyrians to any place where they had built a temple to Asshur, and hence perhaps its application by the Targums to the Resen of ^{<0102>}Genesis 10:12, which must have been on the Tigris, near Nineveh and Calah. *SEE RESEN*. Ewald (*Gesch.* 3, 301, Note 3) identifies it with a heap of ruins called *Teleda*, southwest from Racca, the *Theleda* of the *Peut. Tab.* (11, c), not far from Palmyra. It is in favor of this that in that case the places mentioned along with it in the passages cited stand in the order in which they would naturally be attacked by a force invading the territory from the east, as would the Assyrians (*Thenius*,

Exeget. Hanldbuch; ad loc.). Havernick's identification (*Ezekiel* p. 476) with the *Thalatha* (Θαλαθά) of Ptolemy (5, 20, 4) would place it too far south. The Jerusalem Targum (on ^{<0140>}Genesis 14:1) and the Syriac take it from *Ellassar* (q.v.), in the territory of Artemitia (Ptolemy, 6:176; Strabo, 16:p. 744). Layard thinks (*Nineveh*, 1, 257) that it may be the present *Tel Afer*, or perhaps *Arban* (*Nin. and Bab.* p. 283), although no name like it is found there now.

Teleioi

(τέλειοι or τελειούμενοι, *the perfect*), a name of early Christians, which had relation to the sacred mysteries, and denoted such as had been initiated. Baptism was denominated *τελετή*; to join the Church was styled *ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον*, *to attain to perfection*; the participation of the eucharist, which followed immediately on baptism, was called *τελετή τελετῶν*, *perfection of perfections*; and the absolution granted in the eucharist was called *τὸ τέλειον*, *the perfection* of a Christian. The word is, however, used frequently in the New Test., not indeed in this sense, but in relation to Christian perfection.

Teleion

SEE TELEIOI.

Teleioteroi

(τελειώτεροι, *more perfect*), one of the different classes of catechumens among the ancients; the perfect ones, or the proficient, who were the immediate candidates for baptism.

Te'lem

(Heb. *id.* מל פ, *oppression* [Gesenius; but Fürst, *place of lambs*]), the name of a town and also of a man.

1. (Sept. Τελέμ v.r. Μαινάμ; Vulg. *Telem.*) One of the cities which are described as “the uttermost of the tribe of Judah towards the coast of Edom southward” (^{<0153>}Joshua 15:24, where it is mentioned between the southern Ziph and Bealoth). It is not again mentioned except we regard it as identical with TELAIM SEE TELAIM (q.v.) a theory which seems highly probable (Reland, *Palest.* p. 1029). Telem is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome as a city of Judah, but they appear to have been ignorant of its

site (*Onomast.* s.v. "Talem"). The Sept. (Vat.) in ^{<1680>}Joshua 19:7 adds the name **Θαλλά**, between Remmon and Ether, to the towns of Simeon. This is said by Eusebius (*Onomast.*) and Jerome to have been then existing as a very large village called *Thella*, sixteen miles south of Eleutheropolis. The Sept. of 2 Samuel 2, 12, in both MSS., exhibits a singular variation from the Hebrew text. Instead of "on the spot" (**wyTj Tj**; A.V. incorrectly "on his behalf"), they read "to Thailam (or Thelam) where he was." If this variation should be substantiated, there is some probability that Telem or Telaim is intended. David was at the time king, and quartered in Hebron, but there is no reason to suppose that he had relinquished his marauding habits; and the south country, where Telem lay, had formerly been a favorite field for his expeditions (^{<1927>}1 Samuel 27:8-11). The opinion of Wilton that a trace of the ancient Telem is found in the Arab tribe *Dhulldm*, which gives its name to a district lying south-east of Beersheba, is not altogether improbable, especially as the Arabic and Hebrew words are cognate (*The Negeb*, p. 87; comp. Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 102). Rabbi Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 100) thinks Telem was different from Telaim, and he states that there is still "a district south of Madura called *Tulam*," doubtless referring to the above Dhullam. He also cites a reference from the Midrash (*Koheleth*, 5, 10) to a certain Menahem Talmia, as if a resident of Telem. If a more precise-location of the town be sought, it may perhaps be found in the "small site with foundations, called *Sudeid*," mentioned by Dr. Robinson as lying in the above region (*Bibl. Res.* 1, 102), six miles south-east of Tel Arad. **SEE TOCHEN.**

2. (Sept. **Τελλήμ** v.r. **Τελήμ** and **Τελμήν**; Vulg. *Telem*). One of the Temple porters who renounced his Gentile wife after the Captivity (^{<1510>}Ezra 10:24). B.C. 458.

Telemachus

an Asiatic monk and martyr who is justly renowned for the act of daring self-devotion by which he caused the gladiatorial combats at Rome to be abolished. In the year 404, in the midst of the spectacles of the amphitheatre, Telemachus rushed into the arena and tried to separate the gladiators. The spectators stoned him to death, but the emperor Honorius proclaimed him a martyr, and soon after abolished the gladiatorial combats. Some doubt has been thrown upon the story on account of the absence from the Theodosian Code of any edict by Constantine in existence, and no evidence can be produced to show that there were any gladiatorial fights

after this period, although we know that the combats of wild beasts continued till the fall of the Western Empire. See Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Teleology

(τέλος, *an end*, and λόγος, *discourse*) is the doctrine or general philosophical discussion of the subject of causes. It may be ultimate, reaching to God, or proximate, contemplating the more immediate purpose. The word *teleology* is applied to the argument from design in proof of the Deity. Also, when a natural philosopher assigns the purpose or end of any natural arrangement, as the offensive or defensive weapons of an animal, he is said to give a teleological explanation. "Existences must be considered as standing in relation, not merely to *causae efficientes* (to their immediate causes), but also to *causae finales*; indeed, the *cause efficientes* themselves must be conceived as moved by the *cause finales*, or, in other words, by the eternal rational ends meant to be subserved by created objects, which ends, although in one respect yet awaiting realization in the future, must in another respect be supposed to be already *operative*. We cannot fully understand realities unless we look forward to the results intended finally to be attained. Present actualities thus acquire a double significance and receive a double explanation. The whole of modern speculation has a teleological character" (Martensen, *Christ. Dogmat.* p. 78 sq.).

Telepta (or Tella), Council of

properly ZELLA *SEE ZELLA* (q. v).

Telesphorus

pope, is said to have been of Grecian family, and to have occupied the see of Rome from A.D. 128 to 139. Our knowledge of him is altogether legendary. An interpolated passage in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius and a discourse smuggled into the works of Ambrose make the statement that Telesphorus had made the regulations of fasting more strict, that he had extended the fast before Easter to cover seven weeks, and that he directed three masses to be said and the *Gloria in Excelsis* to be sung in the night before Christmas. He is reputed to have energetically contended against the heretical teachings of Marcion and Valentine, and to have died a martyr's

death. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; comp. Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Teletarches

(τελετάρχης), a Greek term for a *consecrator*.

Teletarchikos

(τελεταρχικός), a Greek term signifying *consecrating*. Telete, a term in the Latin Church for the holy eucharist. *SEE TELEIOI*.

Tel-hare'sha

(^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:61). *SEE TEL-HARSA*.

Tel-har'sa

(Heb. [for Chald.] *Tel-charsha'*, **Al Teavnra** *hill of the artificer* [Gesenius, *of the wood*; Fürst, *of the Magus*],; Sept. **Θελαρησά** v.r. **Θελαρσά**; *Vulg. Thelharsa*), one of the Babylonian towns, or villages, from which some Jews, who “could not show their father’s house, nor their seed, whether they were of Israel,” returned to Judaea with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 59; ^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:61 [A.V. “Tel-haresha]). It probably was in the low country near the sea, in the neighborhood of Tel-melah and Cherub, places which are associated with it. Herzfeld’s conjecture (*Gesch. Isr.* 1, 452) that the name is connected with the river *Haran*, in Susiana (Ammian. Marc. 23:p. 325, Bip.) is very precarious.

Telinga

(or TELOOGOO) Version. The Telinga language is spoken within twenty-three miles of Madras, and prevails for about five hundred miles along the coast, from the vicinity of Pulicat to the borders of Orissa. The superficial extent of the entire region in which this language is predominant has been estimated at 118,610 square miles. The natives are Hindus and number about 10,000,000. The Telinga language is also diffused to a greater, or less extent through various countries of Southern India, in which the Tamul and Canarese are the proper vernacular languages. This diffusion in part arises from the early conquests, dating from the 14th century, achieved by the people of Telinga in the South. Like the Romans, they endeavored to secure their conquests and to keep the natives in subjection by the

establishment of military colonies; and the Telinga language is still spoken by the descendants of the Telinga families who were deputed by the kings of Vidyanagara to found these colonies. The roaming tendencies of the Telinga people also serve to account, in part, for the diffusion of the language. On this subject the missionaries have remarked that “in intelligence, migratory habits, secular prosperity, and infrequency of return to their native land this people are in relation to other parts of India what the Scotch are in relation to England and the world.” Benjamin Schultze, the laborious Danish missionary, was the first who engaged in a Telinga version of the Bible. He commenced his translation in 1726, immediately after his completion of the Tamul version (q.v.). He translated from the Greek and Hebrew texts, and finished the Telinga version of the New Test. in 1727, and of the Old Test. in 1732, the whole bearing the title *Biblia Telagica ex Hebraico et Græco Textu, adhibitis multis aliis Versionibus in Linguam Telugicam Translata a Beniamino Schultzio Missionario ad Indos Orientales A. o. 1732*. From some cause hitherto unexplained, this work was never printed; and Marsch. in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 2, 202., says: “Quo vero tempore in publicum prodituri sint Biblia Telugice impressa, divinæ providentiæ reservatum manebit.” Schultze died in 1760 at Halle, and it has been thought that his Telinga MSS. may still be preserved in that city. In 1805 the Serampore missionaries commenced another version of the Scriptures in this language, and in 1809 they had translated the whole of the New Test. and part of the Old. Owing to various causes of delay, the New Test. was not printed till 1818, and in 1820 the Pentateuch was published.

While the Serampore version was in progress, the Rev. Augustus Desgranges, of the London Missionary Society, had commenced another version and carried it on to the close of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Mr. Desgranges, who had been stationed at Vizagapatam since 1805, had the assistance of the Rev. George Cran, also stationed there, and of Anunderayer, a Telinga Brahmin of high caste who had been converted to Christianity. In 1808 Mr. Cran died, and, two years later, Mr. Desgranges. On examination it was found that the first three gospels were the only portions of the translation that were in a state of readiness for the press. Of these one thousand copies were printed at Serampore in 1812, under the care of Anunderayer.

In the meantime another version of the Telinga New Test. had been commenced. Rev. Messrs. Pritchett and Lee, agents of the London

Missionary Society, arrived at Vizagapatam a short time prior to the decease of Mr. Desgranges. Mr. Lee undertook a translation of the book of Genesis, but the preparation of the version afterwards devolved almost exclusively on Mr. Pritchett, who betook himself, in the first place, to the translation of the New Test. In 1819 Mr. Pritchett's New Test. was issued by the Madras Bible Society. He now commenced the translation of the Old Test., but in 1820 he was stopped, in the midst of his work, by death.

In 1823 another version of the Scriptures was offered to the Calcutta Bible Society by the Rev. J. Gordon, also of the London Missionary Society. It was very difficult to decide upon the relative merits of Mr. Pritchett's and Mr. Gordon's translation; but finally Mr. Gordon's prevailed, and the committee of the Madras Society resolved upon adopting his version, requesting him, before he sent it to the press, to compare it carefully with Mr. Pritchett's translation. Mr. Gordon's important labors were closed by death in 1827. After his decease, it was found that Mr. Pritchett's version was, after all, more correct than had been expected, and, after introducing certain emendations, an edition of two thousand copies of the New Test. was printed in 1828, accompanied by two thousand copies of Mr. Gordon's version of Luke. An edition of three thousand copies of the Old Test., based upon the versions of Pritchett and Gordon, was issued from the Madras press in 1855, together with large editions of particular portions of the Teloogoo Scriptures both of the Old and of the New Testament. From the different reports we learn the following facts. The report for 1856 states that "an entirely new translation of the whole Bible, executed by C. P. Brown, Esq., has been deposited by that gentleman with this auxiliary with a view to future publication; and extracts from Genesis, Proverbs, Psalms, Malachi, Mark, and Ephesians are in press, and will be circulated for the opinions and criticism of the Teloogoo scholars." That for the year 1858 states that the Teloogoo revision committee appointed in 1857 had completed a new translation of Paul's epistles to the Romans, Colossians, and Philemon, and of the general epistles of James, John, and Jude, together with the four gospels and Acts, all of which were ready for the press. In 1863 we read: "The Old Test. has been published for the first time, the New Test. newly translated and a revised edition recently published." In 1866 the report states that the "Madras auxiliary has taken up the question of a revision of the Teloogoo Old Test., and has appointed a committee for that purpose, on the same plan as that of the Tamil revision committee. The version of the Teloogoo New Test. now in use

was adopted in 1858, and, after revision by a committee appointed for the purpose of bringing the Rev. Messrs. Hay and Wardlaw's translation into accordance with *the textus receptus* and the rules of the society, was published in 1860." As to the revision of the Old Test., we learn from the report for 1867 that "a committee has been formed by the Rev. John Hay, who has already revised the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua. The remainder of the work is in progress." At present, according to the last report for 1879, the following parts are printed and circulated: the entire Bible according to the Vizagapatam version, the book of Genesis according to the revised version, and the Pentateuch and New Test. published in 1858. See *The Bible in Every Land*, and the *Annual Reports* of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (B. P.)

Teller, Romanus

a Lutheran divine, was born Feb. 21, 1703, at Leipsic, where he also died, April 5, 1750, as doctor and professor of theology-and pastor of St. Thomas's. He wrote, *Dissertation. Sacrar. ad Caussas Hermeneut. Spectantium Decas* (Lips. 1740):*D. Hollaz: Examnen Theol. A croam. denuo edidit et Animadverss. auxit; Demonstratt. Homilet. — theologicae* (ibid. 1728); new edition, *Institut. Theologicae Homilet. Methodo Scientiis Sacris Digna Adornatae* (ibid. 1741). In connection with Baumgarten, Brucker, and Dietelmaier, he published, *Bibel, d. i. vollstdndige Erklarung der heiligen Schrift aus dem Englischen* (ibid. 1748, 19 vols). See Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 107, 186, 297; 2, 59,798; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 413. (B. P.)

Teller, Wilhelm Abraham

a leading theologian of the "enlightenment" party of Germany in the last century, was born in 1734 at Leipsic, where his father was then professor and pastor. In 1755 he was made catechist and bachelor of theology, and began with his earliest literary production to display his sympathy with the liberal school of theologians. He turned his attention more immediately to the criticism of the text of the Old Test. after the manner of Michaelis. In 1756 he published a Latin translation of Kennicott's dissertation on Hebrew text-criticism. In 1761 he was made general superintendent and professor at Helmstedt. In 1764 he issued his *Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens*, which revealed the advanced theological views to which he had

attained, and alarmed the faculties and consistories. Its position was that of the first stage of rationalistic “enlightenment,” and its most noticeable trait a revulsion against the authority of traditional beliefs. The excitement occasioned by its appearance was such that the whole edition was confiscated. in Electoral Saxony, and that he retained his position at Helmstedt with serious difficulty. ‘From this unpleasant situation he was extricated by an appointment to Cologne on the Spree as’ provost and member of the high consistory, where was the very heart of the party of progress, and where he felt free to publish to the world his views without reserve. He did this in a *Wörterbuch d. Neuen Testaments* (1772, and afterwards in six editions), whose preface contained an appeal to preachers that they should expound not only the words, but also, and much more, the ideas, of Scripture, because the latter contains not only Hebrew and Greek forms of expression, but also Hebrew and Greek forms of thought. A further opportunity of showing his independence occurred in 1792 in connection with the trial of a preacher named Schulz, of Gielsdorf, for departure from the standards of the Lutheran Church. The opinion of the high consistory having been required, Teller voted for acquittal on the grounds that under the Lutheran form of Church government every person is constituted his own judge in matters pertaining to the faith, and that all such matters must be determined by Scripture. Schulz was acquitted, but the members of the chamber were afterwards fined and provost Teller was suspended for three months because of this action. The latter nevertheless proceeded, in the same year, to publish a more complete statement of his views in the work *Die Religion der Vollkomomeneren*, whose theme was *the perfectibility of Christianity*. In 1798 he received an address from Jews resident in Berlin demanding admission into the Christian Church without the imposition on them of a Christian creed; but the high consistory negated the request, though with regret, and with a promise to impose on the petitioners no new disabilities. Teller died Dec. 9, 1804. His more important works have been mentioned above. He was not popular as a preacher, but his sermons were printed in a third edition as early as 1792. He published the *Neues Magazin für Predier*, whose tenth volume appeared in 1801, which was also well received, even among Roman Catholic clergyman. In addition to original work, he edited. Turretin’s *Tract. de Scipt. Sac. Interpretatione*; and he was an important contributor to the *Allemn. deutsche Bibliothek*. See Nicolai, *Geddchtnisschrift auf Teller* (1807); *Summarische Lebensnachr.*, appended to Troschel’s

memorial discourse; Herzog, *Real Encyklop. s.v.*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Church in 18th and 19th Cent.* 1, 347, 366, 371, 499.

Tellier, Michael le

a Jesuit and father confessor to Louis XIV, was born at Vire, in Normandy, in 1643. He entered the Order of Jesuits in his eighteenth year, and at first devoted himself to historical studies, whose fruit was an edition of Quintus Curtius in 1678; but he eventually engaged in theology, becoming one of the most violent opponents of the Jansenists. In 1672, 1675, and 1684 he published fulminations against the Mons (properly Amsterdam) version of the Bible by De Sacy and other Port-Royalists. He co-operated with father Bouhours in his translation of the Scriptures, however, and zealously defended the Jesuit missionaries to China against the well-founded complaints raised against them. In 1699 he issued a *Histoire des Cinq Propositions de Jansenius* under the name of Dumas, and in 1705 he assailed; Quesnel (q.v.) as a rebel and heretic. He now became provincial of his order, and in 1709 confessor to the king. In the latter capacity he succeeded in inducing the king to procure from pope Clement XI the condemnation of the New Test. with Quesnel's notes. The bull *Unigenitus*, which occasioned so much controversy in France, and was forcibly executed by the king, is to be charged primarily upon Tellier. His dominion ended, however, in 1715, on the death of Louis, and he was removed first to Amiens and afterwards to La Fleche. He died at the latter place in 1719. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Tel-me'lah

(Heb. *Tel-me'lach*, **תֵּל מֵלַח** *Tesalt hill*; Sept. **Θελμελέχ** and **Θελμελέθ**, v.r. **Θελμεχέλ** and **Θερμελεθα**; Vulg. *Thelmala*) is joined with Tel-harsa and Cherub as the name of a place where the Jews returned who had lost their pedigree after the Captivity (^{<105>}Ezra 2:59; ^{<106>}Nehemiah 3:61). It is perhaps the *Thelme* of Ptolemy (5, 20), which some wrongly read as *Theane* (**ΘΕΑΜΗ** for **ΘΕΑΜΗ**), a city of the low salt tract near the Persian 'Gulf,' whence probably the name (Ges. *Lex. Heb. s.v.*). Cherub, which may be pretty surely identified with Ptolemy's *Chiripha* (**Χιριφά**), was in the same region. Herzfeld (*Gesch. Tsr.* 1, 452) insists that it designates the province of *Melitene* according to Ptolemy (6,3), adjoining Susiana west of the Tigris; but Ptolemy (5, 7, 5) and Pliny (6, 3) know only a Melitene on the border of Cappadocia and Armenia Major.

Te'ma

(Heb. *Teyma'*, **אֲמֵי תַיִן** ^{<K169>} Job 6:19 more concisely *Tema'*, **אֲמֵי** = the Arab. *teyma*, “a *deser-t*” [but Gesen.=Teman, i.e. the *South*]; Sept. **Θαιμάν**, Vulg. *Thema* [but in Isaiah *Auster*]), the name of a person and of a tribe or district.

1. The ninth son of Ishmael (^{<O255>} Genesis 25:15; 1 Chronicles i,30). B.C. post 2020.
2. The tribe descended from him mentioned in ^{<K169>} Job 6:19, “The troops of Tema looked, the companies-of Sheba waited for them,” and by Jeremiah (^{<O253>} Jeremiah 25:23), “Dedan, Tema, and Buz;” and also the land occupied by this tribe: “The burden upon Arabia. In the forest in Arabia shall ye lodge, O ye traveling companies of Dedanim. The inhabitants of the land of Tema brought water to him that was thirsty, they prevented with their bread him that fled” (^{<O213>} Isaiah 21:13, 14).

The name and the tribe appear to have been known to classic writers. Ptolemy mentions the city of *Themme* (**Θέμμη**) among those of Arabia Deserta, and apparently in the centre of the country (*Geogr.* 5, 19). Pliny states that “to the Nabataei the ancients joined the *Thimanei*” (*Hist. Nat.* 6:32). It may be questioned, however, whether he refers to the Biblical *Teman* or *Tema*.

There can be little doubt that the Themme of Ptolemy is identical with the modern *Teima*, an Arab town of some five hundred inhabitants, situated on the western border of the province of Nejd. Wallin, who visited it in 1848, thus describes it: “Teima stands on a mass of crystalline limestone, very slightly raised above the surrounding level. Patches of sand, which have encroached upon the rock, are the only spots which can be cultivated. The inhabitants, however, have considerable date plantations, which yield a great variety of the fruit, of which one kind is esteemed the best flavored in all Arabia. Grain is also cultivated, especially oats of a remarkably good quality, but the produce is never sufficient for the wants of the inhabitants. The greater portion of the gardens are watered from a copious well in the middle of the village. The hydraulic contrivance by which water is raised for distribution through channels among the plantations is the same as is used through Mesopotamia as well as in Nejd, viz. a bucket of camel-skin hung to the end of a long lever moving upon an upright pole fixed in the ground” (*Journal R. G. S.* 20:332). Arab writers state of Teima that “it is a

town in the Syrian desert, and that it is commanded by the castle called El-Ablalk [or El-Ablak el-Fard], of Es-Semawal [Samuel] Ibn-'Adiya the Jew, a contemporary of Imra-el-Keys" (A.D. cir. 550); but according to a tradition it was built by Solomon, which points at any rate to its antiquity (comp. El-Bekri, in *Mardsid.* 4:23). Wallin says no remains of the castle now exist, nor does even the name "live in the memory of the present inhabitants. A small ruined building, constructed of hewn stone, and half buried in sand and rubbish, appeared to me to be too inconsiderable to admit of its being identified with the celebrated old castle" (*ut sup.* p. 333). This fortress seems, like that of Dumat-el-Jendel, to be one of the strongholds that must have protected the caravan route along the northern frontier of Arabia- and they recall the passage following the enumeration of the sons of Ishmael; "These [are] the sons of Ishmael, and these [are] their names, by their *towns*, and by their *castles*; twelve princes according to their nations" (^{<02516>}Genesis 25:16).

It seems probable that the ancient Arab tribe of *BeniTeim* of whom Abulfeda speaks (*Hist. Anteislam.* ed. Fleischer, p. 198), were connected with this place, and were the more recent representatives of the children of Tema. Forster would further identify the tribe of Tema with the *Beni-Temim*, who had their chief stations on the shores of the Persian Gulf; but his proof does not seem satisfactory (*Geog. of Arabia*, 1, 289 sq.). It is interesting to find memorials of the nation founded by this son of Ishmael, not merely referred to by classic and Arab geographers, but existing to the present day, in the very region where we naturally look for them (see D'Anville, *Geog. Ancienne*, 2, 250; Abulfeda, *Descript. Arab.* p. 6 sq.; Seetzen, in Zach, *Monatl. Correspondenz*, 18:374). Like other Arab tribes, the children of Tema had probably a nucleus at the town of Teima, while their pasture-grounds extended westward to the borders of Edom, and eastward to the Euphrates, just as those of the Beni Shummar do at the present time.

To'man

(Heb. *Teyman*, ṁyTṁ 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 (^{<0331>}Genesis 36:11). B.C. cir. 1960. It would appear that Teman was the first *duke* or prince (āwLa) of

the Edomites (^{<0055>}Genesis 5:15); and that, having founded a tribe, he gave his name to the region in which it settled (^{<0088>}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" (^{<2513>}Ezekiel 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" (^{<2519>}Ezekiel 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?" (^{<2407>}Jeremiah 49:7; ^{<8211>}Job 2:11; comp. Baruch 3, 22. See Pusey, *On Obadiah*, ver. 8).

The geographical position of "the land of Teman," or, more literally, the "land of the Temanite," as it is called in ^{<0134>}Genesis 36:34 (γῆ Ταιραμῆ 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 (^{<2407>}Jeremiah 49:7, 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" (^{<3008>}Amos 1:12).

2. Habakkuk joins Teman in parallelism with Mount Paran (^{<3188>}Habakkuk 3:3); and this might probably indicate that the portion of Edom lying over against Kadesh, beside ^ḥ 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 (^{<2513>}Ezekiel 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" (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*, **l a**) the border of Edom, the wilderness of Zin to the Negeb (**hBgñ**) from the extremity of Teman" (**^mytñxqjm**). 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 **hxqm** being 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.*

Te'mani

(~~Q364~~ Genesis 36:34) or

Te'manite

Heb. *Teymani'*, ϣⲏⲙⲉⲓ TeSept. Θαἰμανί or Θαἰμανίτης) is the title (ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲛⲉ 1 Chronicles 1:45; ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲛⲉ Job 2:11 sq.) of a descendant of Teman or an inhabitant of that land. **SEE TEMAN**. Tem'eni [some *Te'meni* or *Teme'ni*] (Heb. *Teymeni'*, ϣⲏⲙⲉⲓ TeTemaznite (*Geseni* or *fortunate* [Fürst]; Sept, Θαἰμάν, Vulg. *Themani*), second-named of the four sons of Ashur (q.v.), the "father" of Tekoa by his wife Naarah (ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲛⲉ 1 Chronicles 4:6). B.C. cir. 1618.

Temneh

(or Timneh) Version. Temneh is the language spoken in the Ruiah country, near Sierra Leone, in West Africa. At present there exists a translation of the New Test., Genesis, and Psalms. The Gospel of St. Matthew, translated by the Rev. C. F. Schlenker, was printed only in 1866, the other parts now published having been added since that time. Comp. *Reports* of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (B. P.)

Temper

the disposition of the mind, the sum of our inclinations and tendencies, whether natural or acquired. The word is seldom used by good writers without an epithet, as a *good* or a *bad* temper. Temper must be distinguished from passion. The passions are quick and strong emotions, which by degrees subside. *Temper* is the disposition which remains after these emotions are past, and which forms the habitual propensity of the soul. See Evans, *Practical Discourses on the Christian Temper*; and the various articles **SEE FORTITUDE**, **SEE HUMILITY**, **SEE LOVE**, **SEE PATIENCE**, etc. Temperance (ἐγκράτεια, *self-restraint*), that virtue which a man is said to possess who moderates and restrains his sensual appetite. It is often, however, used in a much more general sense, as synonymous with *moderation*, and is then applied indiscriminately to all the passions. "Temperance," says Addison, "has those particular advantages above all other means of health, that it, may be practiced by all ranks and conditions at any season or in any place. It is a kind of regimen into which every man may put himself without interruption to business, expense of money, or loss of time. Physic, for the most part, is nothing else but the substitute of exercise or temperance." In order to obtain and practice this virtue, we should consider it,

1. As a divine command (~~3015~~Philippians 4:5; ~~4213~~Luke 21:34; ~~4230~~Proverbs 23:1-3);
2. As conducive to health;
3. As advantageous to the powers of the mind;
4. As a defense against injustice, lust, imprudence, detraction, poverty, etc.;
5. The example of Christ should be a most powerful stimulus to it. e . z

Temperance Reform

As an organized movement, the temperance reformation is of very modern origin. For ages, indeed, wise men have deplored the miseries of the habit at whose extinction it aims; yet it is but recently that the enormous magnitude of those evils seems to have been fully apprehended, the true basis of reform recognized, and united and persistent effort made for the suppression of the gigantic mischief.

I. *The Habit of Drunkenness.* — An interesting fact lies at the foundation of the habit of indulgence in intoxicants. Man discovered, long ago, that his mental state is affected by the action of certain drugs, and that they have power, not only to lend increased enjoyment to social hours, but to lessen pain, cheer the desponding, and, for a brief period, lift even the despairing out of the depths. Thus Homer describes the effects of *nepenthe* (*Odyssey*, bk. 4):

“Meantime, with genial joy to warm the soul,
Bright Helen mixed a mirth-inspiring bowl,
Tempered with drugs of sovereign use, to assuage
The boiling bosom of tumultuous rage;
To clear the cloudy front of wrinkled Care,
And dry the tearful sluices of Despair.
Charmed with that potent draught, the exalted mind
All sense of woe delivers to the wind.
Though on the blazing pile his father lay,
Or a loved brother groaned his life away;
Or darling son, oppressed by ruffian force,
Fell breathless at his feet, a mangled corpse;
From morn to eve, impassive and serene,
The man, entranced, would view the deathful scene.”

This is a true portrait, and fits our own times as accurately as it did those of Homer. This state, which we have been accustomed to characterize by the term intoxication, or drunkenness, is in reality a combination of two effects, narcosis and exhilaration. Not only when the victim has become visibly drunk, but from the moment when the dose begins its impression, the circulation loses force, the blood cools, physical strength declines, the nerves are less sensitive, mental acumen is dulled, and every power of mind and body is lessened. But at the very time when the drug is working this result, there is a mental exhilaration, a delusive lifting-up of the spirits, which cheats the victim with a false consciousness of augmented powers. He never before felt so strong, or realized that he was so intellectual, so wise, so witty; he never before had so much confidence in his own powers, or contemplated himself generally with so much satisfaction. This delusion continues, and even increases, while he is sinking rapidly into utter imbecility, mental and physical. There are various substances which have less or more of this strange potency. Those chiefly used for the deliberate purpose of producing these effects are alcohol, opium, the hemp poison (*Cannabis Indica*), tobacco, the coca-leaf, the betel-nut, and the thorn-apple. While the general effect of these substances is the same, there is some variety in their action. Alcohol benumbs the body more rapidly than opium and Indian hemp, and tends more to noise and violence at first, and a paralytic stagger afterwards. The thorn-apple produces temporary delirium as the final symptom. The coca-leaf, tobacco, and the betel-nut are milder forms of the intoxicating principle, and seem to be used chiefly to allay mental and physical disquiet, and super induce a feeling of ease and comfort.

But continued indulgence tends to the formation of a tyrannical habit, whose force grows out of the fact that repeated druggings produce an abnormal condition of the brain and of the whole nervous system. The novice experiences his dreamy joys for a brief space, and then comes out of them in a condition more or less morbid, according to the power of the dose. He generally recovers his usual condition in a day or two, and perhaps has no desire to repeat his experience; but if he repeats it again and again, it will not be long before he finds himself in the clutches of a new appetite, and burdened by a new and pressing want. Now, when the force of the last dose of the drug has been spent, he is in a condition of unrest, mental and physical, which may be only a slight degree of uneasiness, or amount to direst agony, according to the stage which he has reached in his

downward road. From this disquiet, or distress, he knows of only one method of quick relief, and that is another dose of the same drug. And so the drug-becomes the tyrant and he the slave. As the coils of the serpent tighten about him, he sinks, mentally, morally, socially. At last he cares only for his drug, or rather is driven to it by the lash of remorse and horror, which come upon him whenever he is not under the spell. He cares not for poverty, rags, and dirt. for cold and hunger. He cares less for his wife and children than a tiger does for his mate or a wolf for his cubs. The pity of the good, the scorn of the brutal, the prayers and tears of those who love him the wrath of the living God, have no power to move him, and in passive and hopeless shame and despair, alternating with brief seasons of attempted reform, he goes down to his doom.

II. *Extent and Evils of Intoxication.* — Thus the Asiatic peoples bear the burden of evil caused by indulgence in opium and the hemp intoxicant. Thus Europe and America groan under the woes inflicted by alcohol. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, there were 156,122 retail dealers in ardent spirits in the various states and territories of the Union, and the total receipts from the taxes levied on distilled liquors were over \$52,000,000. This is an increase over the previous year of 1082 in the number of dealers, and \$2,000,000 in the receipts. The same year, 327,000,000 gallons of malt liquors paid into the Treasury over \$10,000,000, making the total receipts from taxes on alcoholic liquors \$63,000,000. The increased consumption of malt liquors the same year was 25,000,000 gallons. The total annual outlay in the United States for distilled and malt liquors cannot be less than \$700,000,000. In England, during the year ending Sept. 30, 1878, there were 156,589 licensed venders of intoxicating liquors, and, as the report of the committee of the House of Lords shows, the drinking habits of the people cost them the sum of \$718,000,000.

But this enormous waste, which swallows up so large a part of the earnings of the people, is only the beginning of woes. Vice, crime, pauperism, public evils, and public burdens of every kind multiply in direct proportion to the prevalence of the alcoholic habit. What are usually called the dangerous classes in our cities are its creation. It is a prolific source of political corruption. Powerful in votes and money, and with an instinctive dread of integrity in public men, the liquor interest gravitates to the wrong side of every public question. By its aid bad men are exalted to office, the laws are imperfectly administered, life and property are rendered insecure, and taxes

increase. In all Christian lands, the liquor habit and the liquor interest are recognized more and more clearly as the direct antagonists of morals; religion, and every element of the welfare of men and nations. On these grounds the temperance reform bases its argument.

III. History of the Temperance Movement. — The first efforts to stay this tide of death date back many years. In all nations—even in ancient times—there were persons who abstained, generally through religious motives, from the intoxicating drinks of their day. Such were the Nazarites among the Jews, and the Vestals among the Romans. All through the ages, excess has been condemned by the thoughtful, while the moderate use of intoxicants was long deemed allowable, if not necessary. Thus the colonies of Massachusetts and Connecticut, as long ago as 1639, passed laws designed to lessen the excessive use of distilled liquors.

John Wesley was the pioneer of the modern reform. In the year 1743 he prepared the “General Rules” for the guidance of his societies, and in warning his people against the sins of the times he names *drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity*. This is one of the rules which, as he declares, “we are taught of God to observe, even in his written Word;” and the rule stands to-day, in the exact words of Wesley, in the *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*. Wesley was equally outspoken in the pulpit. In his sermon *On the Use of Money* is the following passage:

“Neither may we hurt our neighbor in his body; therefore we may not sell anything which tends to impair health. Such is, eminently, all that liquid fire commonly called drams, or spirituous liquors. It is true these may have a place in medicine . . . although there would rarely be occasion for them, were it not for the unskillfulness of the practitioner; therefore such as prepare and sell them only for this end may keep their conscience clear... But all who sell them in the common way to any that will buy are poisoners general. They murder his majesty’s subjects by wholesale, neither does their eye pity or spare. They drive then to hell like sheep; and what is their gain? Is it not the blood of these men? Who, then, would envy their large estates and sumptuous palaces? A curse is in the midst of them; the curse of God cleaves to the stones, the timber, the furniture of them. The curse of God is in their gardens, their walk, their groves; a fire that burns to the nethermost hell. Blood, blood

is there; the foundation, the floor, the walls, the roof, are stained with blood. And canst thou hope, O thou man of blood! though thou art clothed in scarlet and fine linen, and farest sumptuously every day—canst thou hope to deliver down thy fields of blood to the third generation? Not so, for there is a God in heaven; therefore thy name shall soon be rooted out.” These bold words were uttered at a time when the use of intoxicating liquors was universal, both in England and America. Thus John Wesley leaped at once to a position which other reformers did not reach in almost a hundred years. Indeed, in regard to another matter, somewhat akin to alcoholic indulgences, he at once advanced to a position towards which his followers in our own day are feebly struggling, but which no Church, as such, has yet reached. He strongly counseled his people not to use snuff or tobacco, and, in regard to his preachers, made it a positive rule that none of them was “to use tobacco for smoking, chewing, or snuff, unless it be prescribed by a physician.”

In 1651 the people of East Hampton, on Long Island, resolved, at a town meeting, that no one should retail liquor but such as were regularly authorized to engage in the business, and even then not to furnish “above half a pint at a time among four men.” Something like a prohibitory law is said to have been passed by the Virginia colony in 1676, but what the novel experiment amounted to cannot now be ascertained. The practice of providing liquor on funeral occasions generally prevailed; and it was not until about the year 1760 that an earnest combined effort was made by the various churches to abolish it; and even this small reform was not accomplished till many years afterwards.

On Feb. 23, 1777, the Continental Congress, then in session in Philadelphia, passed unanimously the following resolution: “*Resolved*, That it be recommended to the several legislatures of the United States immediately to pass laws the most effective for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived if not quickly prevented.” This, however, seems to have been a war measure rather than an attempt at reform. It makes no mention of present effects, but is prompted by the fear of some future evil, probably a scarcity of grain, caused by the gathering of farm laborers into the army, and the consequent lessened production.

In 1789 two hundred farmers of Litchfield, Conn., united in a pledge not to use distilled liquors in their farm-work the ensuing season. In 1790 a volume of sermons, the authorship of which has been attributed to Dr. Benjamin Rush, an eminent patriot and philanthropist of Philadelphia, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, made a powerful impression in regard to the evils of the alcoholic vice, and the physicians of the city united in a memorial to Congress, in which they compare “the ravages of distilled spirits upon life” to those of “plague or pestilence,” only “more certain and extensive,” and pray the Congress to “impose such heavy duties upon all distilled spirits as shall be effectual to restrain their intemperate use.”

In 1794 Dr. Rush published an essay entitled *A Medical Inquiry into the Effects of Ardent Spirits upon the Body and Mind*, in which he argues that the habitual use of distilled liquors is useless, pernicious, and universally dangerous, and that their use as a beverage ought to be wholly abandoned. Still the blow was aimed at distilled spirits only, and the true ground of reform was not yet reached.

In 1808 a society was formed in Saratoga County, N. Y., which seems to have been the first permanent organization founded for the purpose of promoting temperance. It was called “The Union Temperate Society of Moreau and Northumberland.” The members pledged themselves not to drink any distilled spirits or wine, nor offer them to others, under a penalty of *twenty-five cents*. The penalty for being intoxicated was fifty cents. All this looks ridiculous now; but it was a bold movement for those days, and the projectors of it were, no doubt, duly abused as madmen and fanatics.

Still, the day was dawning. Religious bodies began to awake. In 1812 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted a report which urged all the ministers of that denomination to preach on the subject, and warn their hearers “not only against actual intemperance, but against all those habits and indulgences which may have a tendency to produce it.” The General Association of Connecticut, the same year, adopted a report prepared by Rev. Lyman Beecher, which recommended entire abstinence from all distilled liquors. Thus they reached, in 1812, the position which John Wesley occupied and inculcated in his “General Rules” in 1743. The same year (1812), the Consociation’ of Fairfield County, Conn., published an appeal which goes one step further. It says, “The remedy we would suggest, particularly to those whose appetite for drink is strong and

increasing, is a total abstinence from the use of all intoxicating liquors.” This, they admit, “may be deemed a harsh remedy,” but they apologize for it on the ground that “the nature of the disease absolutely requires it.” The consociation, at the same time, made a practical beginning of reform by excluding all spirituous liquors from their meetings. In 1813 the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance was formed in Boston. The society, however, aimed only to suppress “the too free use of ardent spirits and-its kindred vices,” and therefore accomplished little. Still, all these movements called public attention to the evil, and kept men thinking. The spell of indifference was broken, the discussion became more earnest and thorough, and appeals, sermons, and pamphlets began to issue from the press. Foremost among these writers was Rev. Justin Edwards, pastor of the Church at Andover, Mass., who afterwards occupied a still more prominent place in the reform movement. In 1823 Dr. Eliphalet Nott, president of Union College, published a volume of *Sermons on the Evils of Intemperance*, which greatly aided the reform. In January, 1826, Rev. Calvin Chapin published in the *Connecticut Observer* a series of articles in which he took the ground that the only real antidote for the evils deprecated is total abstinence, not only from distilled spirits, but from all intoxicating beverages. His position, however, was generally regarded as extreme, and he had few immediate converts to his opinions. In February, 1826, chiefly through the instrumentality of Dr. Edwards, a few friends of the reform met in the city of Boston, and organized the American Temperance Society. The pledge was still the old one-abstinence from ardent spirits-but the movement was nevertheless an advance, inasmuch as the object of the society was to inaugurate a vigorous campaign throughout the country. In April, Rev. William Collier established in Boston the first newspaper devoted to the cause. It was called *The National Philanthropist*, and was published weekly. This same year (1826), Lyman Beecher published his famous *Six Sermons on Temperance*, which in burning eloquence and powerful condensations of truth have not been surpassed by anything since written on the subject. The reform was now fairly begun. In 1827 there were state societies in New Hampshire, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Illinois, while two hundred and twenty local societies, scattered through these and other states, enrolled an aggregate of thirty thousand members. Men of the highest character and position were identified with the reform, such as Dr. Justin Edwards, Dr. Day (president of Yale College), Genesis Lewis Cass, Edward C. Delavan, and eminent physicians, such as Drs. Massey, Hosack, and Sewell. About

this time L. M. Sargent published his *Temperance Tales*, thus bringing into the battle a new and powerful weapon.

The reform made rapid progress. In 1831 there were state societies in all but five states, while the local organizations numbered 2200. In 1832 Genesis Cass, the secretary of war, abolished the spirit ration in the army, and issued an order prohibiting the sale of distilled liquors by sutlers. This action, however, seems to have been repealed by some one of his successors in office, as we find Genesis McClellan, thirty years afterwards, issuing an equivalent order in reference to the Army of the Potomac. The secretary of the navy also issued, in 1832, an order offering the men extra pay and rations of coffee and sugar instead of the spirit ration. In 1833 there were 5000 local societies, with more than a million of members, of whom it was estimated that 10,000 had been intemperate, 4000 distilleries had been closed and 1000 American vessels sailed without liquor.

This year (1833) is notable for another advanced step. Experience was daily demonstrating the insufficiency of a reform which interdicted distilled liquors only. Not a few drunkards signed the pledge against such beverages and kept it, and were drunkards still. Public opinion was steadily moving towards the true ground total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks. Mr. Luther Jackson, of the city of New York, prepared a pledge of this character, and secured a thousand signatures. To him belongs the honor of inaugurating a new era in the history of the reform. In May, 1833, the first National Temperance Convention was held in the city of Philadelphia. Four hundred and forty delegates, representing nineteen states and one territory, counseled together three days. Two important conclusions were embodied in their resolutions—first, that the traffic in distilled liquors as a beverage is morally wrong; second, that it is expedient that the local societies should accept, as soon as practicable, the total-abstinence pledge. A permanent society was formed, which, under the name of the American Temperance Union, accomplished much for the cause. The contest from this time assumed a twofold direction—one line of argument and effort aiming to dissuade the people from all use of intoxicants, and the other taking the shape of an attack upon the traffic and the laws which sanction it. Public sentiment was fast approaching the conclusion that instead of being protected by law, under the pretence of regulating it, the traffic should be prohibited by law. The Grand Jury of the city and county of New York put on record their deliberate judgment that three fourths of the crime and pauperism are caused by the drinking habits of the people, and added, “It is

our solemn impression that the time has now arrived when our public authorities should no longer sanction the evil complained of by granting licenses." Several state conventions the same year adopted resolutions of the same tenor as those of the National Convention.

In 1834 Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, published two sermons on the iniquities of the traffic; and Samuel Chipman made a personal inspection of the almshouses and jails in the state of New York, and published a report, showing how largely the alcoholic vice was responsible for crowding them with inmates. In 1835 Rev. George B. Cheever, then the youthful pastor of a church in Salem, Mass., published, under the title of *Deacon Giles's Distillery*, what purported to be a dream. Daemons were represented as working in the deacon's distillery, and manufacturing "liquid damnation," "murder," "suicide," etc., for the human employer. The stinging satire took effect. Mr. Cheever was assaulted in the streets of Salem, and was also prosecuted for slander by a certain rum-distilling deacon, who thought he recognized his own portrait in the deacon Giles of the dream. Mr. Cheever was convicted and imprisoned for a few days, but on his release returned at once to the attack in another dream concerning *Deacon Jones's Brewery*, in which devils are described as making beer, and, as they dance about the caldron, chanting the spell of the-witches in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*

*"Round about the caldron go;
In the poisoned entrails throw;
Drugs that in the coldest veins
Shoot incessant pains;*

*Herbs that, brought from hell's black door,
Do their business slow and sure
Double, double toil and trouble:
Fire, burn; and caldron, bubble."*

The assault and the prosecution called universal attention to the affair; the dreams were published everywhere; and produced great effect. About the same time another local excitement aided the general cause. Mr. Delavaal exposed the methods of the Albany brewers, whom he charged with procuring water for their business from a foul pond covered with green scum and defiled with the putrid remains of dead cats and dogs. Eight brewers brought suits against him; claiming damages to the amount of three hundred thousand dollars, but did not succeed in recovering a dime.

In 1836 a second National Temperance Convention, attended by four hundred delegates, and presided over by Chancellor Walworth, was held at Saratoga, N. Y. The most important business done was the passing of a resolution that henceforth the pledge should be *total abstinence from all that intoxicates*. This resolution, though offered by Dr. Edwards, supported by Lyman Beecher, and adopted unanimously by the convention, was not approved by all who claimed to be friends of the cause. Not a few, whose temperance zeal consisted in an ardent desire to reform other people from rum and brandy, while they themselves drank wine without scruple, fell out of the ranks of the reform, and were seen no more. Societies disbanded in every direction, prominent workers under the old pledge became silent when the new one was adopted, and once more the cry of “fanaticism” filled the air, this time with some new voices in the chorus. Still, not until this hour had the reform *planted* itself on the right ground and grasped the true weapons of its warfare. The people rallied around the new banner, and the work went on with more efficiency than ever before. In January, 1837, the *Journal of the American Temperance Union*, edited by Rev. John Marsh, was established, and did valiant service till 1865, when it was superseded by the *National Temperance Advocate*.

In 1838 began the legislative war against the traffic a contest which has seen many victories and defeats, and will probably see many more before the final victory. In response to growing public sentiment, the license laws of several states were made more stringent. Massachusetts passed a law prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors in less quantity than fifteen gallons. In 1839 Mississippi followed with a “one gallon law,” and Illinois ‘adopted what would now be termed “local option.”’ The universal agitation on the subject created general alarm among those interested in the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks, and they, too, began to organize and collect funds to be used at the polls and in legislative halls to arrest the reform. Still the good cause advanced. Temperance organizations, temperance journals, lectures, and labors of every kind were multiplying. Good news of progress came from England, and from father Mathew, a Catholic priest in Ireland, who had given himself to reform work and had achieved marvelous successes.

In 1840 the “Washingtonian” movement began in Baltimore. Six hard drinkers, who had met for a night’s carousal, suddenly resolved to reform, signed a total-abstinence pledge, and formed a society for active labor. They held meetings, recited the simple story of their former errors, and

how they were rescued, and invited the most hopeless victims of the vice to join them. Wonderful results followed, the work spread, and in the space of two or three years it is estimated that one hundred and fifty thousand inebriates had signed the pledge. Immense good was done, and yet the movement soon began to wane. The demand for reformed drunkards as lecturers became so great as to bring into the field a crowd of irresponsible men; some without sufficient intelligence for their position, others lacking in principle. These made a trade of the business; they sneered at all workers who had no drunken experiences to relate, abused the churches, and sought to outdo each other in extravagant descriptions of their past lives. Soon that which began as an agonizing struggle for life became a merry popular amusement; the funniest lecturer got the most invitations and the best pay; and the movement, powerful as it was at one time, broke down under the load of the ignorant, unprincipled, and foolish operators who, for their own profit, piled their weight upon it. Still, bitterly as the friends of temperance were disappointed by the collapse of the Washingtonian episode, the general cause continued to advance. In the ten years ending in 1840, while the population of the United States had grown from 12,000,000 to 17,000,000, the consumption of distilled liquors had fallen from 70,000,000 to 43,000,000 gallons. In thirty years the number of distilleries had fallen from 40,000 to 10,306.

In 1842 the order of the Sons of Temperance was founded in the city of New York. This order is the oldest of the compact organizations which not only pledge their members to total abstinence, but unite them on a plan of mutual systematic relief in times of sickness. During the thirty-eight years of its existence the order has varied greatly in numerical strength. In 1850 it numbered 232,233 members. Suffering severely during the late war, the "Sons" in 1866 numbered only, 54,763. Since that date they are again making progress, and now number about 100,000 members. The Independent Order of Rechabites, a society of similar character, established in England in 1835, was introduced into the United States in 1842, and spread with considerable rapidity. In 1845 another order, the Templars of Honor and Temperance, was established in New York City. This fraternity was originally designed to be a branch of the Sons of Temperance, whose members should pass through various degrees, and be known to each other everywhere by signs and passwords; but it was organized as an independent society. They number about 17,000 members.

The discussion in regard to the morality of the license system went on with vigor. In 1845 the matter was by law submitted to the people of Connecticut and Michigan, and the vote was Strongly against license. In 1846 the question was submitted to the people (of the state of New York (the city of New York being excepted); several whole counties voted "no license," and five sixths of the towns and cities gave large majorities in the same direction. In 1846 Maine passed a prohibitory law, which, with many changes, made from time to time to render it more stringent and effective, has remained for thirty-four years the will of the people and the policy of the state, and it is today in full and successful operation, the glory of the commonwealth and the strong defense of its citizens.

For the next ten years (1846 to 1856) the question of license or no license was agitated in almost every part of the Union, but to give the history of the struggle in the several states would require a volume. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Delaware, Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska passed prohibitory laws-some of them more than once. In most of these states, if not all, the question was submitted in some form to the popular vote, and the prohibitory principle received emphatic endorsement. In New Jersey, also, the popular voice was strongly in its favor, but the liquor interest succeeded in thwarting the will of the people. In two states, Pennsylvania and Illinois, a small majority appeared against prohibition. The legislative reform was resisted at every step, fiercely, desperately, and by the use of the most unscrupulous means. After the prohibitory law had been strongly approved by a direct popular vote, and passed by' both Houses of the Legislature of New York, in 1854 governor Horatio Seymour vetoed it on trivial grounds. Gov. Seymour of Connecticut in 1853 did the same thing under similar circumstances. In both cases the people at the next election carried their point by defeating those who had temporarily defeated them. In several states the law was declared unconstitutional by the courts. In New York it was set aside in 1856 on the ground that it destroyed the value of property, to wit, of the liquors already in the hands of the dealers. In several of the states the law was passed, submitted to the people for their approval, approved by large majorities, and then declared unconstitutional by the courts, because thus submitted to the people. An attempt was made in 1846 by the liquor interest to settle the question once for all for the whole country. With Daniel Webster and Rufus Choate as their counsel, the dealers in alcohol carried their case into

the Supreme Court of the United States; but the unanimous decision of the court was that each state has a constitutional right to regulate or even totally suppress the liquor traffic.

In 1849 the first Civil Damage Law, as it has been called, was passed in Wisconsin, prohibiting the retail trade in intoxicating liquors, unless the vender first gave bonds "to support all paupers, widows, and orphans, and pay the expenses of all civil and criminal prosecutions, growing out of or justly attributable to such traffic." Several other states followed the example of Wisconsin, and these laws have been found to be of considerable practical value.

This same year, 1849, the cause received a new impulse from the presence and labors of father Mathew, the Irish apostle of temperance, who came to America in June, and spent sixteen months of hard work, chiefly among the Irish Catholics. Crowds greeted him everywhere, and large numbers took the pledge at his hands. It is not surprising that a reaction followed this swift success. Many pledged themselves by a sudden impulse, moved thereto by the enthusiasm of assembled multitudes, with little, clear, intelligent, fixed conviction of the evils inseparable from the habits which they were renouncing. The pope, their infallible teacher both in regard to faith and morals, had never pronounced moderate drinking a sin, either mortal or venial; and even occasional drunkenness had been treated in the confessional as a trivial offence. The retail traffic, especially in the cities was more largely in the hands of Irish Catholics than any other class of people. Moreover, the Catholic Church wanted donations of land from city authorities, and subsidies from the public treasury for the support of its sectarian institutions, and it could obtain what it wanted only by a political alliance with the liquor interest. For these reasons the Catholic clergy as a body, seem to have made no vigorous effort to hold the ground which the venerable father Matthew won; and the laity, of course, have felt no obligation to be wiser than their teachers.

During the period named, while the battle was raging in reference to the legalizing of the traffic, and year after year went on as fiercely as ever, the liquor interest received powerful reinforcements from an unexpected quarter. During the twenty years previous to 1840 the immigration from Germany numbered 155,000 persons. During the twenty years between 1840 and 1860 the German immigration numbered 1,330,000. This vast multitude brought with them their predilection for beer and Sunday

holidays. Under their auspices the manufacture of beer became a great business interest, and, especially in the towns and cities, saloons sprang up without number, until, in some places, there was a saloon for every score of legal voters. The distillers, brewers, and dealers of all sorts, uniting their forces, became a power in the political arena which no party dared to leave out of its calculations, and before which every mean and mercenary demagogue hastened to fall on his knees.

The temperance cause is so pure, its logic so complete, so utterly unanswerable, that it might have routed all its enemies had the contest gone on without interruption. But while the line of battle, notwithstanding local repulses and temporary defeats, was steadily advancing, its progress was stayed by another overmastering appeal to the patriotism of the people. The series of events which preceded the late civil war were culminating in an agitation which swept all the streams of popular enthusiasm into its mighty current. The same principles and convictions which made men the foes of the alcoholic curse made them feel keenly the national peril; while those who were coining their ill-gotten gains out of the blood of their neighbors could be expected to care little for the life of the nation. Thus, while the true patriot laid aside all else to save his country from the awful peril of the hour, the selfish and traitorous liquor interest had the better chance to plot for the accomplishment of its own sordid ends. Still, while the popular demand for better laws in regard to the traffic in alcohol almost ceased for a time to be felt in current politics, the moral reform made some progress. In 1856 the American Juvenile Temperance Society was founded in the city of New York and the next year a monthly paper for children, called the *Juvenile Temperance Banner*, was established. In January, 1859, four young men, who had met one Sunday evening in a liquor saloon in San Francisco, suddenly resolved to change their evil course, formed a society which they called the "Dashaways," and inaugurated an extensive movement on the Pacific coast much like the Washingtonian campaign of 1840. The next year a similar reform organization, originating in Chicago, spread through the state under the name of the Temperance Flying Artillery. In 1862 the spirit ration in the United States navy, which was made optional in 1832, totally ceased by order of Congress; and coffee was substituted for whiskey in the army of the Potomac. The friends of the cause were everywhere active in their benevolent labors among the soldiers and sailors during the war.

The fifth National Convention, held at Saratoga in August, 1865, organized the National Temperance Society and Publication House, whose headquarters are at 58 Reade Street, New York, and which, by its two periodicals, the *National Temperance Advocate* and the *Youth's Temperance Banner*, and its numerous volumes and tracts, has been an efficient instrument in enlightening and stirring the public mind. In April, 1866, Congress voted to banish the liquor traffic from the Capitol and the public grounds at Washington, and the next winter a Congressional Temperance Society, Hon. Henry Wilson president, was organized. In 1868 the "Friends of Temperance" and the "Vanguard of Freedom," the one a society of white people and the other of the freedmen, were organized in the South. In July, 1868, the sixth National Convention met in Cleveland, Ohio. Its most important resolution declares that the temperance cause "demands the persistent use of the ballot for its promotion." In 1869 women began to form associations for the suppression of the traffic. The first were organized in Rutland, Vt.; Clyde, O.; and Jonesville and Adrian, Mich. This was the beginning of a tidal-wave of enthusiasm which culminated in the Ohio crusades, and crystallized in the establishment of the Woman's National Christian Temperance Union. The churches were actively at work. "Bands of Hope" were formed among the children. The iniquities of the license system, and the wisdom of separate political action on the part of temperance men, were everywhere discussed; and the liquor-dealers, in alarm, were busy organizing leagues and collecting funds, because, as they confessed," of the damage being done to the liquor business."

In January, 1873, the Hon. Henry Wilson introduced in the United States Senate a bill providing for a Commission of Inquiry, whose aim was to secure a thorough investigation of the evils of the alcoholic habit, and ascertain what measures are most efficient in removing or lessening those evils. This bill has been repeatedly brought forward in Congress, backed by memorials from all parts of the country, but has been defeated every time by the influence or the liquor interest. The guilty alone fear the light. In August, 1873, the seventh National Convention was held at Saratoga. It declared again that the legal suppression of the traffic is the only effective policy, and that the time had arrived "fully to introduce the temperance issue into state and national politics," but counseled the friends of the cause to cooperate with existing political parties "where such will endorse the policy of prohibition."

In the winter of 1873-74 a novel movement began which, under the name of the Woman's Crusade, attracted universal attention. In the town of Hillsborough, Highland Co., O., the liquor trade was doing its deadly work, and at the same time the enemies of that traffic were earnest in their labors to lessen its ravages. At a public meeting, Dr. Dio Lewis, of Boston, told how a drunkard's wife, forty years ago, after long and fervent prayer, gathered a band of Christian women and waited upon the liquor-dealer, imploring him to give up his dreadful business, and how their prayers were answered.

The next day seventy-five Christian women, led by Mrs. E. J. Thompson, a daughter of ex-governor Trimble, began a systematic visitation of the drug-stores, hotels, and saloons of Hillsborough, and continued it till victory crowned their efforts. In eight days all the saloons were closed. The work spread from town to town and from city to city, in not a few encountering fierce opposition, but moving on in triumph, and accomplishing great and permanent good. This wonderful movement spread into other states, reclaiming thousands of inebriates, closing thousands of saloons, and giving a mighty impulse to all forms of temperance work.

At this present time (January, 1880) the reform seems to be even more prominently before the public mind than it was before the war. The iniquities of the traffic have been urged upon the attention of the legislatures of the states, and the laws are constantly changing, generally for the better, occasionally for the worse, as Israel or Amalek prevails, so that it is almost impossible to classify them. Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Ohio, and North Carolina prohibit the traffic in all intoxicating liquors. Iowa prohibits the traffic in distilled liquors, but not in wine and beer. Rhode Island, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, and the District of Columbia are under Local Option laws. The people of Kansas are to vote this fall (1880) on a proposed amendment to the State Constitution, which, if adopted, will prohibit both the manufacture and the sale of alcoholic intoxicants. Some of the states, as New York, Ohio, and Illinois, have Civil Damage laws, which make the dealers responsible before the courts for mischief done by means of their wares. Nevada has no law on the subject. In many of the states special laws give particular counties or towns the power to prohibit, by popular vote, the trade in alcohol. Experience has given ample demonstration that where prohibitory legislation is fully sustained by public sentiment the liquor traffic can be stamped out as thoroughly as any other form of crime. All

through the land the active friends of temperance, with scarcely an exception, are fixed in the conviction that the common traffic in alcoholic drinks is a crime against society, and that to license it is to commit another crime against the public: welfare. This conviction grows more intense from year to year, and from this position it may be safely predicted that there will be no retreat.

During the last decade the field of battle has become as broad as the national domain, and new and powerful forces have come into the contest. Previous to 1860, there were only about half a score of local temperance societies among our Catholic population. Now there are probably a thousand, with an aggregate of 200,000 members. The Woman's National Christian Temperance Union, which grew out of the Ohio crusade movement, and was organized in 1874, has spread its network of societies over more than half the United States, and, by its conventions, publications, and earnest labors, is wielding a powerful influence. . The Independent Order of Good Templars, which originated in Central New York in 1851, leads all the other compact temperance organizations in numbers and continued success. It now has about 400,000 members in the United States, and perhaps 300,000 more chiefly in England and her colonies. The friends of temperance are organized, more or less thoroughly, in every state of the Union. Forty-one newspapers, the organs of the various temperance bodies, are disseminating information on all sides.

All the great religious denominations among us have given emphatic utterance to their sentiments, not only endorsing fully the principle of total abstinence, but some of them declaring, as did the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1872, that they "regard the manufacture, sale, or the using of intoxicating drinks morally wrong;" recommend the use of unfermented wine on sacramental occasions; and record their conviction that the traffic in alcoholic beverages should be suppressed by the strong arm of the law. There probably is not in Christendom any other body of people so large, and so free from the use of intoxicants, as the evangelical Protestants of the United States. The agitation among us cannot cease till the right is victorious.

IV. *The Temperance Cause in Foreign Countries.* The first temperance society in the British Isles was formed in New Ross, Ireland, in August, 1829. A society was formed at Greenock, Scotland, in October of the same

year. Early in 1830 a society was organized at Bradford, England. The reform began, as in America, in opposition to the use of distilled spirits only; but in 1833 a society was formed at Preston, England, on the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks. The British Association for the Promotion of Temperance was formed at Manchester in September, 1835, on this basis; and the new pledge in a few years wholly superseded the old. This organization afterwards changed its name to that of "The British Temperance League." It is still laboring, with accumulating power. The United Kingdom Alliance was formed in 1853, and is still in vigorous operation and doing excellent service. Its specific aim is the "total legislative suppression of the traffic in intoxicating beverages." The form of law which the Alliance is laboring to secure is one giving "the rate-payers of each parish and township a power of local veto over the issue of licenses." A bill, drawn up by Sir Wilfred Lawson, in accordance with this aim, has been offered in Parliament every year since 1863 without success, but not without encouraging gains. The Alliance, meanwhile, is spending a hundred thousand dollars annually in advocating the measure. The Scottish Temperance League, formed in 1844, combines both branches of the work—the reform of the victim and the legal suppression of the traffic. The temperance sentiment of the Scottish people found expression, in 1854, in what is called the "Forbes McKenzie Act," a law which closes all public-houses in Scotland during the whole of the Sabbath, and on other days of the week from 11 P.M. to 8 A.M. The League has an income of about \$35,000, maintains a vigorous Publication House, and keeps eight or ten lecturers constantly in the field. The Irish Temperance League was organized in Belfast in 1859, for "the suppression of drunkenness by moral suasion, legislative prohibition, and all other lawful means." It has an income of about \$10,000, publishes a journal, and employs agents to labor throughout the island. The women of Great Britain have also organized a Christian Temperance Association, meeting for that purpose at Newcastle-on-Tyne in April, 1876, and they are engaging heartily in the good work.

In Sweden a temperance society was formed in Stockholm in 1831, and some five hundred more in various parts of the kingdom during the next ten years. King Oscar himself became a member, and also caused tracts and papers to be regularly distributed in the army and the navy. Great benefits have followed among the people, and the reform is still progressing. In Australia, Madagascar, India, and China the reform has begun its work, which, we trust, will never cease, in all its broad field, till the enormous

vice and crime at whose extinction it aims shall be found no more among men.

V. Literature. — Many valuable works have been published which treat of the matters that form the basis of the temperance movement, among them the following: Beecher [Lyman], *Six Sermons on Temperance* (1823); Nott, *Lectures on Temperance* (1857); *Permanent Temperance Documents* (1837-42); *Bacchus* (Lond.); *Anti-Bacchus* (ibid.); Carpenter, *Physiology of Intemperance*; Wilson, *Pathology of Drunkenness*; Pitman, *Alcohol and the State*; Richardson, *Alcohol, and Temperance Lesson Book*; Farrar, *Talks on Temperance*; Lee, *Text-book of Temperance*; Crane, *Arts of Intoxication*; Hargreaves, *Our Wasted Resources*; Lizars, *Alcohol and Tobacco*; *The Prohibitionist's Text-book*; *Bacchus Dethroned*; Hunt, *Alcohol as a Food and Medicine*; Patton, *Bible Wines, oO Laws of Fermentation*; Richardson, *Action of Alcohol on the Body and on the Mind*; Edmunds, *Medical Use of Alcohol*; Richardson, *Medical Profession and Alcohol, and Moderate Drinking*; Storey, *Alcohol, its Nature and Effects*; *The Centennial Temperance Volume*. (J. T. C.)

Temple

a word used to designate a building dedicated to the worship of a deity. In this article we treat only of the series of edifices erected for that purpose at Jerusalem, and in doing so we present the reconstructions hitherto the latest and most approved, with strictures, however, upon their defects.

SEE PALACE.

I. Names. — The usual and appropriate Heb. term for this structure is **l Kyhê**, *heykâl*, which properly denotes a royal residence, and hence the sacred name **hwhyh** *Jehovah*, is frequently added; occasionally it is also qualified by the epithet **vdq**, *kâdesh*, *sanctuary*, to designate its sacredness. Sometimes the simpler phrase **tyBêhwhy** *beyth yehovadh*, *house of Jehovah*, is used; and in lieu of the latter other names of the Deity, especially **yhê**, *elohim*, *God*, are employed. The usual Greek word is **ναός**, which, however, strictly denotes the central building or *fane* itself; while the more general term **ἱερόν** included all the associated structures, i.e. the surrounding courts, etc.

The above leading word **Ἰ Βυῆς** is a participial noun from the root **Ἰ kh**; *to hold* or *receive*, and reminds us strongly of the Roman *templum*, from **τέμενος, τέμνω**, *locus liberatus et effatus*. When an augur had defined a space in which he intended to make his observations, he fixed his tent in it (*tabernaculum capere*), with planks and curtains. In the *arx* this was not necessary, because there was a permanent *auguraculum*. The Sept. usually renders **Ἰ kyh**, “temple,” by **οἶκος** or **ναός**, but in the Apocrypha and the New Test. it is generally called **τὸ ἱερόν**. Rabbinical appellations are **בֵּית מִקְדָּשׁ** *tyBebeyfh ham-Mikdash, the house of the sanctuary*, **בֵּית ה' הַיָּחִיד** *tyBehryj h'hi the chosen house*, **בֵּית הַיָּמֵינִים** *tyBehym b; tyBeh the house of ages*, because the ark was not transferred from it, as it was from Gilgal after 24, from Shiloh after 369, from Nob after 13, and from Gibeon after 50 years. It is also called **מִשְׁכַּן ה'** *h' m; a dwelling, i.e. of God*.

In imitation of this nomenclature, the word *temple* elsewhere in Scripture, in a figurative sense, denotes sometimes the Church of Christ (Revelation 3, 12): “Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God.” Paul says (**2 Thessalonians 2:4**) that Antichrist “as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” Sometimes it imports heaven (**Psalm 11:4**):

“The Lord is in his holy temple; the Lord’s throne is in heaven.” The martyrs in heaven are said to be “before the throne of God, and to serve him day and night in his temple” (**Revelation 7:15**). The soul of a righteous man is the temple of God, because it is inhabited by the Holy Spirit (**1 Corinthians 3:16, 17; 6:19; 2 Corinthians 6:16**).

II. History of the Temple and its Several Successors. — The First Temple. After the Israelites had exchanged their nomadic life for a life in permanent habitations, it was becoming that they should exchange also their movable sanctuary or tabernacle for a temple. There elapsed, however, after the conquest of Palestine, several centuries during which the sanctuary continued movable, although the nation became more and more stationary. It appears that the first who planned the erection of a stone-built sanctuary was David, who, when he was inhabiting his house of cedar, and God had given him rest from all his enemies, meditated the design of building a temple in which the ark of God might be placed, instead of being deposited “within curtains,” or in a tent, as hitherto. This design was at first encouraged by the prophet Nathan; but he was afterwards instructed to tell

David that such a work was less appropriate for him, who had been a warrior from his youth, and had shed much blood, than for his son, who should enjoy in prosperity and peace the rewards of his father's victories. Nevertheless, the design itself was highly approved as a token of proper feelings towards the Divine King (~~1000~~2 Samuel 7:1-12; ~~1370~~1 Chronicles 17:1-14; 10:18). *SEE DAVID*. We learn, moreover, from 1 Kings 5 and 1 Chronicles 22 that David had collected materials which were afterwards employed in the erection of the Temple, which was commenced four years after his death, in the second month (comp. ~~1000~~1 Kings 6:1; 2 Chronicles 3, 2). This corresponds to May, B.C. 1010. We thus learn that the Israelitish sanctuary had remained movable more than four centuries subsequent to the conquest of Canaan. "In the fourth year of Solomon's reign was the foundation of the house of the Lord laid, in the month Siv; and ill the eleventh year, in the month Bul, which is the eighth month, was the house finished throughout all the parts thereof, and according to all the fashion of it. So was he seven years in building it." *SEE SOLOMON*. The workmen and the materials employed in the erection of the Temple were chiefly procured by Solomon from Hiram, king of Tyre, who was rewarded by a liberal importation of wheat. Josephus states (Ant. 8, 2) that duplicates of the letters which passed between Solomon and king Hiram were still extant in his time, both at Jerusalem and among the Tyrian records. He informs us that the persons employed in collecting and arranging the materials for the Temple were ordered to search out the largest stones for the foundation, and to prepare them for use on the mountains where they were procured, and then convey them to Jerusalem. In this part of the business Hiram's men were ordered to assist. Josephus adds that the foundation was sunk to an astonishing depth, and composed of stones of singular magnitude, and very durable. Being closely mortised into the rock with great ingenuity, they formed a basis adequate to the support of the intended structure. Josephus gives to the Temple the same length and breadth as are given in 1 Kings, but mentions sixty cubits as the height. He says that the walls were composed entirely of white stone; that the walls and ceilings were wainscoted with cedar, which was covered with the purest gold; that the stones were put together with such ingenuity that the smallest interstices were not perceptible, and that the timbers were joined with iron cramps. It is remarkable that after the Temple was finished, it was not consecrated by the high-priest, but by a layman, by the king in person, by means of extemporaneous prayers and sacrifices. *SEE SHECHINAH*.

The Temple remained the center of public worship for all the Israelites only till the death of Solomon, after which ten tribes forsook this sanctuary. But even in the kingdom of Judah it was from time to time desecrated by altars erected to idols. For instance, “Manasseh built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. And he caused his son to pass through the fire, and observed times, and used enchantments, and dealt with familiar spirits and wizards; he wrought much wickedness in the sight of the Lord to provoke him to anger. And he set a graven image of the grove that he had made in the house,” etc. Thus we find also that king Josiah commanded Hilkiah, the high-priest, and the priests of the second order to remove the idols of Baal and Asherah from the house of the Lord (~~2239~~2 Kings 23:4, 13): “And the altars that were on the top of the upper chamber of Ahaz which the kings of Judah had made, and the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of the Lord, did the king beat down, and brake them down from thence, and cast the dust of them into the brook Kidron.” In fact, we are informed that, in spite of the better means of public devotion which the sanctuary undoubtedly afforded, the national morals declined so much that the chosen nation became worse than the idolaters whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel (~~2209~~2 Kings 21:9) a clear proof that the possession of external means is not a guarantee for their right use. It appears also that during the times when it was fashionable at court to worship Baal the Temple stood desolate, and that its repairs were neglected (~~2216~~2 Kings 12:6, 7). We further learn that the cost of the repairs was defrayed chiefly by voluntary contribution, by offerings, and by redemption money (~~2214~~2 Kings 12:4, 5). The original cost of the Temple seems to have been defrayed by royal bounty, and in great measure by treasures collected by David for that purpose. There was a treasury in the Temple in which much precious metal was collected for the maintenance of public worship. The gold and silver of the Temple were, however, frequently applied to political purposes (~~1158~~1 Kings 15:18 sq.; ~~2218~~2 Kings 12:18; 16:8; 18:15). The treasury of the temple was repeatedly plundered by foreign invaders: for instance, by Shishak (~~1143~~1 Kings 14:26); by Jehoah, king of Israel (~~2244~~2 Kings 14:14); by Nebuchadnezzar (~~2243~~2 Kings 24:13); and, lastly, again by Nebuchadnezzar, who, having removed the valuable contents, caused the Temple to be burned down (~~2231~~2 Kings 25:9 sq.), summer, B.C. 588. The building had stood since its completion 415 years (Josephus has 470, and Rufinus 370, years). Thus terminated what the later Jews called *ḥarh tyb*, *The first house*. *SEE JERUSALEM.*

2. The Second Temple. — In the year B.C. 536 the Jews obtained permission from Cyrus to colonize their native land. Cyrus commanded also that the sacred utensils which had been pillaged in the first Temple should be restored, and that for the restoration of the Temple assistance should be granted (Ezra 1 and 6; ^{<482>}2 Chronicles 36:22 sq.). The first colony which returned under Zerubbabel and Joshua having collected the necessary means, and having also obtained the assistance of Phoenician workmen, commenced in the second year after their return the rebuilding of the Temple, spring, B.C. 535. The Sidonians brought rafts of cedar-trees from Lebanon to Joppa. The Jews refused the co-operation of the Samaritans, who, being thereby offended, induced the king Artachshashta (probably Smerdis) to prohibit the building. It was only in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (summer, B.C. 520) that the building was resumed. It was completed in the sixth year of this king, winter, B.C. 516 (comp. Ezra 5 and 1; ^{<3015>}Haggai 1:15). According to Josephus (*Ant.* 11:4, 7), the Temple was completed in the ninth year. of the reign of Darius. The old men who had seen the first Temple were moved to tears on beholding the second, which appeared like nothing in comparison with the first (Ezra 3, 12; Haggai 2, 3 sq.). It seems, however, that it was not so much in dimensions that the second Temple was inferior to the first as in splendor, and in being deprived of the ark of the covenant, which had been burned with the Temple of Solomon. *SEE CAPTIVITY.*

After the establishment of the Seleucidse in the kingdom of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes invaded Egypt several times. During his first expedition, B.C. 171, the renegade Menelaus (q.v.) procured the death of the regular high-priest Onias III (q.v.) (2 Macc. 4:27 sq.); during his second campaign, on retiring for winter-quarters to Palestine, Antiochus slew certain other persons, B.C. 170; and, finally, he pillaged and desecrated the Temple, and subdued and plundered Jerusalem, June, B.C. 168. He also ordered the discontinuance of the daily sacrifice. In December of the same year he caused an altar for sacrifice to Jupiter Olympius to be placed on the altar of Jehovah in the Temple (7, 2, 5). This was “the abomination that maketh desolate.” At the same time, he devoted the temple on Mount Gerizim, in allusion to the foreign origin of its worshippers, to Jupiter. Ἐβνιός. The Temple at Jerusalem became so desolate that it was overgrown with vegetation (1 Macc. 4:38; 2 Macc. 6:4). Three years after this profanation (Dec. 25, B.C. 165) Judas Maccabseus, having defeated the Syrian armies in Palestine, cleansed the

Temple, and again commenced sacrificing to Jehovah upon the altar there. He repaired, the building, furnished new utensils, and erected fortifications against future attacks (1 Macc. 4:43-60; 6:7; 13:53; 2 Macc. 1, 18; .10, 3). Forty-five days after cleansing the sanctuary, Antiochus died. Thus were fulfilled the predictions of Daniel: from “the casting down some of the host and stars,” i.e. slaying some of the pious and influential Jews by Antiochus, especially from the death of Onias, B.C. 171, to the cleansing of the sanctuary, B.C. 165, was six years (of 360 days each) and 140 days, or 2300 days (²⁰⁸⁸Daniel 8:8-14); from the reduction of Jerusalem, B.C. 168, to the cleansing of the sanctuary, B.C. 165, was three years and a half, i.e. “a time, times, and a half,” or 1290 days (7, 25; 12:7, 11); and from the reduction of Jerusalem, B.C. 168, to the death of Antiochus, which occurred early in B.C. 164, forty-five days after the purification of the Temple, 1335 days. As to the 140 days, we have no certain date in history to reckon them; but if the *years* are correct, we may well suppose the *days* to be so (ver. 12; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:7, 6; *War*, pref. 7; 1, 1, 1; 1 Macc. 1, 46,47; 4:38-61; 2 Macc. 5, 11-27; 6:1-9). **SEE ANTIOCHUS.** Alexander Jannaeus, about B.C. 106, separated the court of the priests from the external court by a wooden railing (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:13, 5). During the contentions among the later Maccabees, Pompey attacked the temple from the north side, caused a great massacre in its courts, but abstained from plundering the treasury, although he even entered the holy of holies, B.C. 63 (*ibid.* 14,4). Herod the Great, with the assistance of Roman troops, stormed the Temple, B.C. 37; on which occasion some of the surrounding halls were destroyed or damaged. **SEE PALESTINE.**

3. The Third Temple. — Herod, wishing to ingratiate himself with the Church-and-State party, and being fond of architectural display, undertook not merely to repair the second Temple, but to raise a perfectly new structure. As, however, the Temple of Zerubbabel was not actually destroyed, but only removed after the preparations for the new Temple were completed, there has arisen some debate whether the Temple of Herod could properly be called the third Temple. The reason why the Temple of Zerubbabel was not at once taken down in order to make room for the more splendid structure of Herod is explained by Josephus as follows (*Ant.* 15:11, 2): “The Jews were afraid that Herod would pull down the whole edifice and not be able to carry his intentions as to its rebuilding into effect; and this danger appeared to them to be very great, and the vastness of the undertaking to be such as could hardly be

accomplished. But while they were in this disposition the king encouraged them, and told them he would not pull down their Temple till all things were gotten ready for building it up entirely. As Herod promised them this beforehand, so he did not break his word with them, but got ready a thousand wagons that were to bring stones for this building, and chose out ten thousand of the most skilful workmen, and bought a thousand sacerdotal garments for as many of the priests, and had some of them taught the arts of stone-cutters, and others of carpenters, and then began to build; but this not till everything was well prepared for the work.” The work was actually commenced in the nineteenth year of the reign of Herod—that is, the beginning of B.C. 21. Priests and Levites finished the Temple itself in one year and a half. The out-buildings and courts required eight years. However, some building operations were constantly in progress under the successors of Herod, and it is in reference to this we are informed that the Temple was finished only under Albinus, the last procurator but one, not long before the commencement of the Jewish war in which the Temple was again destroyed. It is in-reference also to these protracted building operations that the Jews said to Jesus, “Forty and six years was this Temple in building” (^{<422>}John 2:20). *SEE HEROD*. Under the sons of Herod the Temple remained apparently in good order, and Herod Agrippa, who was appointed by the emperor Claudius its guardian, even planned the repair of the eastern part, which had probably been destroyed during one of the conflicts between the Jews and Romans of which the Temple was repeatedly the scene (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:10). During the final struggle of the Jews against the Romans, A.D. 70, the Temple was the last scene of the tug of war. The Romans rushed from the Tower of Antonia into the sacred precincts, the halls of which were set on fire by the Jews themselves. It was against the will of Titus that a Roman soldier threw a firebrand into the northern out-buildings of the Temple, which caused the conflagration of the whole structure, although Titus himself endeavored to extinguish the fire (*War*, 6:4). Josephus remarks, “One cannot but wonder at the accuracy of this period thereto relating; for the same month and day were now observed, as I said before, wherein the holy house was burned formerly by the Babylonians. Now the number of years that passed from its first foundation, which was laid by king Solomon, till this its destruction, which happened in the second year of the reign of Vespasian, are collected to be one thousand one hundred and thirty, besides seven months and fifteen days; and from the second building of it, which was done by Haggai in the second year of Cyrus the king, till its

destruction under Vespasian there were six hundred and thirty-nine years and forty-five days.” The sacred utensils, the golden table of the shewbread, the book of the law, and the golden candlestick were displayed in the triumph at Rome. Representations of them are still to be seen sculptured in relief on the triumphal arch of Titus (see Fleck, *Wissenschaftliche Reise*, 1, 1, plate 1-4; and Reland, *De Spoliis Templi Hierosolymitani in Arcu Titiano*, ed. E. A. Schulze [Traj. ad Rh. 1775]). The place where the Temple had stood seemed to be a dangerous center for the rebellious population, until, in A.D. 136, the emperor Hadrian founded a Roman colony under the name AElia Capitolina on the ruins of Jerusalem, and dedicated a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus on the ruins of the Temple of Jehovah. Henceforth no Jew was permitted to approach the site of the ancient Temple, although the worshippers of Jehovah were, in derision, compelled to pay a tax for the maintenance of the Temple of Jupiter (see Dion Cassius [Xiphil.], 69, 12; Jerome, *Ad Jes.* 2, 9; 6:11 sq.; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 4:6; *Demonstratio Evangelica*, 8:18). Under the reign of Constantine the Great some Jews were severely punished for having attempted to restore the Temple (see Fabricii *Lux Evangelii*, p. 124).

The emperor Julian undertook, in 363, to rebuild the Temple; but, after considerable preparation and much expense, he was compelled to desist by flames which burst forth from the foundations (see Ammianus Marcellinus, 23:1; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 20; Sozomen, 5, 22; Theodoret, 3, 15; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 6:385 sq.). Repeated attempts have been made to account for these igneous explosions by natural causes; for instance, by the ignition of gases which had long been pent up in subterranean vaults (see Michaelis, *Zerstr. kl. Schrift.* 3, 453 sq.). A similar event is mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 16:7, 1), where we are informed that Herod, while plundering the tombs of David and Solomon, was suddenly frightened by flames which burst out and killed two of his soldiers. Bishop Warburton contends for the miraculousness of the event in his discourse *Concerning the Earthquake and Fiery Eruption which Defeated Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem*. See also Lotter, *Historia Instaurationis Templi Hierosolymitani sub Juliano* (Lips. 1728, 4to); Michaelis (F. Holzfuss), *Diss. de Templi Hierosolymitani Juliani Mandato per Judaeos frustra Tentata Restitutione* (Hal. 1751, 4to); Lardner, *Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, 4:57 sq.; Ernesti, *Theol. Bibl.* 9:604 sq. R. Tourlet's French translation of the works

of Julian (Paris, 1821), 2, 435 sq., contains an examination of the evidence concerning this remarkable event. See also Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten*, 4:211, 254 sq.; and id., *Allgemeine Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, 2, 158. *SEE JULIAN*.

A splendid mosque now stands on the site of the Temple. This mosque was erected by the caliph Omar after the conquest of Jerusalem by the Saracens in 636. Some think that Omar changed a Christian church which stood on the ground of the Temple into the mosque which is now called El Aksa, *the outer*, or *northern*, because it is the third of the most celebrated mosques, two of which, namely, those of Mecca and Medina, are in a more southern latitude. *SEE MOSQUE*.

III. *Situation and Accessories of the Temple.* —

1. The site of the Temple is clearly stated in ^{<400>}2 Chronicles 3:1: "Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem in Mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared unto David, his father, in the place that David had prepared in the threshing-floor of Ornan (or Araunah) the Jebusite." In south-eastern countries the site of the threshing-floors is selected according to the same principles which might guide us in the selection of the site of windmills. 'We find them usually on the tops of hills which are on all sides exposed to the winds, the current 'of which is required in order to separate the grain from the chaff. It seems that the summit of Moriah, although large: enough for the agricultural purposes of Araunah, had no level sufficient for the plans of Solomon. According to Josephus (*War* 5, 5), the foundations of the Temple were laid on a steep eminence, the summit of which was at first insufficient for the Temple and altar. As it was surrounded by precipices, it became necessary to build up walls and buttresses in order to gain more ground by filling up the interval with earth. The hill was also fortified by a threefold wall, the lowest tier of which was in some places more than three hundred cubits high; and the depth of the foundation was not visible, because it had been necessary in some parts to dig deep into the ground in order to obtain sufficient support. The dimensions of the stones of which the walls were composed were enormous; Josephus mentions a length of forty cubits. It is, however, likely that some parts of the fortifications of Moriah were added at a later period. As we shall eventually see, the position and dimensions of the present area of the Haran reasonably correspond to the requirements of the several ancient accounts of the Temple. There can be little doubt, looking

at the natural conformation of the rocky hill itself, that the central building always occupied the summit where the Mosque of Omar now stands. Tile theory of Fergusson (in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, and elsewhere) that it was situated in the extreme south-west corner of the present platform has not met with acceptance among archaeologists. **SEE MORIAH**. The Temple was in ancient warfare almost impregnable, from the ravines at the precipitous edge of which it stood; but it required more artificial fortifications on its western and northern sides, which were surrounded by the city of Jerusalem; for this reason there was erected at its north-western corner the Tower of Antonia, which, although standing on a lower level than the Temple itself, was so high as to overlook the sacred buildings, with which it was connected partly by a large staircase, partly by a subterraneous communication. This tower protected the Temple from sudden incursions from the city of Jerusalem, and from dangerous commotions among the thousands who were frequently assembled within the precincts of the courts; which also were sometimes used for popular meetings. **SEE ANTONIA**.

2. Many savants have adopted a style as if they possessed much information about the archives of the Temple; there are a few indications from which we learn that important documents were deposited in the Tabernacle and Temple. Even in ^{<5326>}Deuteronomy 31:26, we find that the book of the law was deposited in the ark of the covenant; and according to ^{<1228>}2 Kings 22:8, Hilkiah rediscovered the book of the law in the house of Jehovah. In 2 Macc. 2, 13 we find a βιβλιοθήκη mentioned, apparently consisting chiefly of the canonical books, and probably deposited in the Temple. In Josephus (*War*, 5, 5) it is mentioned that a book of the law was found in the Temple. It appears that the sacred writings were kept in the Temple (*Ant.* 5, 1, 17). Copies of political documents seem to have been deposited in the treasury of the Temple (1 Macc. 14:49). This treasury, ὁ ἱερὸς θησαυρός, was managed by an inspector, γαζυφύλαξ, r̄bzj, and it contained the great sums which were annually paid in by the Israelites, each of whom paid a half-shekel, and many of whom sent donations in money and precious vessels, ἀναθήματα. Such costly presents were especially transmitted by rich proselytes, and even sometimes by pagan princes (2 Macc. 3, 3; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:16, 4; 18:3, 5; 19:6, 1; *War*, 2, 17, 3; 5, 13, 6; *Cont. Apion.* 2, 5; Philo, *Opp.* 2, 59 sq., 569). It is said especially that Ptolemy Philadelphus was very liberal to the Temple, in order to prove his gratitude for having been permitted to procure the Sept. translation

(Aristeas, *De Translat. LXX*, p. 109 sq.). The gifts exhibited in the Temple are mentioned in ^{<4215>}Luke 21:5; we find even that the rents of the whole town of Ptolemais were given to the Temple (1 Macc. 10:39). There were also preserved historical curiosities (^{<2110>}2 Kings 11:10), especially the arms of celebrated heroes (Josephus, *Ant.* 19:6, 1); this was also the case in the Tabernacle.

The Temple was of so much political importance that it had its own guards (φύλακες τοῦ ἱεροῦ), which were commanded by a στρατηγός. Twenty men were required for opening and shutting the eastern gate (Josephus, *War*, 6:5, 3; *Cont. Apion.* 2, 9; *Ant.* 6:5,3; 17:2, 2). The στρατηγός had his own secretary (*Ant.* 20, 6, 2; 9, 3), and had to maintain the police in the courts (comp. ^{<4040>}Acts 4:1 and 5:24). He appears to have been of sufficient dignity to be mentioned together with the chief priests. It seems that his Hebrew title was *vyat̄yBhirhi*, *the man of the mountain of the house* (*Middoth*, 1, 2). The priests themselves kept watch on three different posts, and the Levites on twenty-one posts. It was the duty of the police of the Temple to prevent women from entering the inner court, and to take care that no person who was Levitically unclean should enter within the sacred precincts. Gentiles were permitted to pass the first enclosure, which was therefore called the Court of the Gentiles; but persons who were on any account Levitically unclean were not permitted to advance even thus far. Some sorts of uncleanness, for instance that arising from the touch of a corpse, excluded only from the court of the men. If an unclean person had entered by mistake, he was required to offer sacrifices of purification. The high-priest himself was forbidden to enter the holy of holies under penalty of death on any other day than the Day of Atonement (Philo, *Opp.* 2, 591). Nobody was admitted within the precincts of the Temple who carried a stick or a basket, and who wanted to pass merely to shorten his way, or who had dusty shoes (*Middoth*, 2, 2).

IV. General Types of the Temple. — There is perhaps no building of the ancient world which has excited so much attention since the time of its destruction as the Temple which Solomon built at Jerusalem, and its successor as rebuilt by Herod. Its spoils were considered worthy of forming the principal illustration of one of the most beautiful of Roman triumphal arches, and Justinian's highest architectural ambition was that he might surpass it. Throughout the Middle Ages it influenced to a considerable degree the forms of Christian churches, and its peculiarities

were the watchwords and rallying-points of all associations of builders. Since the revival of learning in the 16th century its arrangements have employed the pens of numberless learned antiquarians, and architects of every country have wasted their science in trying to reproduce its forms.

But it is not only to Christians that the Temple of Solomon is so interesting; the whole Mohammedan world look to it as the foundation of all architectural knowledge, and the Jews still recall its glories and sigh over their loss with a constant tenacity, unmatched by that of any other people to any other building of the ancient world.

With all this interest and attention, it might fairly be assumed that there was nothing more to be said on such a subject—that every source of information had been ransacked, and every form of restoration long ago exhausted, and some settlement of the disputed points arrived at which had been generally accepted. This is, however, far from being the case, and few things would be more curious than a collection of the various restorations that have been proposed, as showing what different meanings may be applied to the same set of simple architectural terms.

When the French expedition to Egypt, in the first years of this century, had made the world familiar with the wonderful architectural remains of that country, every one jumped to the conclusion that Solomon's Temple must have been designed after an Egyptian model, forgetting entirely how hateful that land of bondage was to the Israelites, and how completely all the ordinances of their religion were opposed to the idolatries they had escaped from forgetting, too, the centuries which had elapsed since the Exode before the Temple was erected, and how little communication of any sort there had been between the two countries in the interval. Nevertheless, as we shall presently see, the Egyptian monuments remarkably confirm, in many respects, the ancient accounts of the Temple at Jerusalem.

The Assyrian discoveries of Botta and Lavard have within the last twenty years given an entirely new direction to the researches of the restorers, and this time with a very considerable prospect of success, for the analogies are now true, and whatever can be brought to bear on the subject is in the right direction. The original seats of the progenitors of the Jewish races were in Mesopotamia. Their language was practically the same as that spoken on the banks of the, Tigris. Their historical traditions were consentaneous, and, so far as we can judge, almost all the outward symbolism of their

religion was the same, or nearly so. Unfortunately, however, no Assyrian temple has yet been exhumed of a nature to throw much light on this subject, and we are still forced to have recourse to the later buildings at Persepolis, or to general deductions from the style of the nearly contemporary secular buildings at Nineveh and elsewhere, for such illustrations as are available. These, although in a general way illustrative, yet by no means, in our opinion, suffice for all that is required for Solomon's Temple. For some architectural features of that erected by Herod we must doubtless look to Rome. Of the intermediate Temple erected by Zerubbabel we know very little, but, from the circumstance of its having been erected under Persian influences contemporaneously with the buildings at Persepolis, it is perhaps the one of which it would be most easy to restore the details with anything like certainty. Yet we must remember that both these later temples were essentially Jewish, i.e. Phoenician, in their style; and we may there, fore presume that the original type, which we know was copied in plan, was likewise imitated in details to a very great degree. There are, however, two sources of illustration with which the Temple was historically connected in a very direct manner, and to these we therefore devote a brief attention before considering the several edifices in detail.

1. The *Tabernacle* erected by Moses in the desert was unquestionably the pattern, in all its essential features, of its Solomonic successor. In the gradually increasing sanctity of the several divisions, as well as in their strikingly proportionate dimensions, we find the Temple little more than the Tabernacle on an enlarged scale, and of more substantial materials. This is so obvious that we need not dwell upon it. *SEE TABERNACLE.*

2. *The Egyptian Temples*, in their conventional style, evince, notwithstanding their idolatrous uses, a wonderful relation to both the Tabernacle and the Temple. As will be seen from the accompanying plan of the Temple of Denderah, which is one of the simplest and most symmetrical as well as the best preserved of its class, there is a striking agreement in the points of the compass, in the extra width of the porch, in the anterior holy place, in the interior shrine, in the side-rooms, in the columnar halls; and in the grander Egyptian temples, such as the earlier portions of those at Luxor and Karnak, we have the two obelisks at the portal like the pillars Jachin and Boaz. These coincidences cannot have been accidental. Nor is this general adoption of a plan already familiar to

the Hebrews inconsistent with the divine prescription of the details of architecture (^{<0280>}Exodus 25:9; ^{<4382>}1 Chronicles 28:12). *SEE EGYPT.*

Picture for Temple 1

V. Detailed Description of Solomon's Temple. —

1. Ancient Accounts. — The Temple itself and its utensils are described in 1 Kings 6 and 7: and 2 Chronicles 3 and 4. According to these passages, the Temple was 60 cubits long, 20 wide, and 30 high. Josephus, however (*Ant.* 8:3, 2), says, “The Temple was 60 cubits high and 60 cubits in length, and the breadth was 20 cubits; above this was another stage of equal dimensions, so that the height of the whole structure was 120 cubits.” It is difficult to reconcile this statement with that given in 1 Kings, unless we suppose that the words *ἴσος τοῖς μέτροις*, *equal in measures*, do not signify an equality in all dimensions, but only as much as equal in the number of cubits; so that the porch formed a kind of steeple, which projected as much above the roof of the Temple as the roof itself was elevated above its foundations. As the Chronicles agree with Josephus in asserting that the summit of the porch was 120 cubits high, there remains still another apparent contradiction to be solved, namely, how Josephus could assert that the Temple itself was 60 cubits high, while we read in 1 Kings that its height was only 30 cubits. We suppose that in the book of Kings the internal elevation of the sanctuary. is stated, and that Josephus describes its external elevation, which, including the basement and an upper story (which may have existed, consisting of rooms for the accommodation of priests, containing also vestries and treasuries), might be double the internal height of the sanctuary. The internal dimension of the “holy” which was called in preference *ἡ κῆρα* was 40 cubits long, 20 cubits wide, and 30 cubits high. The holy was separated from the “holy of holies” (*ῥυβὰ*) by a partition, a large opening in which was closed by a suspended curtain. The holy of holies was on the western extremity of the entire building, and its internal dimensions formed a cube of 20 cubits. On the eastern extremity of the building stood the porch, *ἡ πύλα, πρὸ ναοῦ*. At the entrance of this pronaos stood the two columns called Jachin and Boaz, which were 35 cubits high.

The Temple was also surrounded by a triple [*ἡ τριπλῆ*] *story of chambers*, each of which stories was five cubits high, so that there remained above ample space for introducing the windows, somewhat in the manner of a clear-

story to the sanctuary. Now the statement of Josephus, who says that each of these stories of chambers (*twϕl []*) was 20 cubits high, cannot be reconciled with the Biblical statements, and may prove that he was no very close reader of his authorities. Perhaps he had a vague kind of information that the chambers reached half-way up the height of the building, and, taking the maximum height of 120 cubits instead of the internal height of the holy, he made each story four times too high. The windows which are mentioned in ~~1004~~ 1 Kings 6:4 consisted probably of latticework. The lowest stair of the chambers was five cubits, the middle six, and the third seven cubits wide. This difference of the width arose from the circumstance that the external walls of the Temple were so thick that they were made to recede one cubit after an elevation of five feet, so that the scarcement in the wall of the Temple gave a firm support to the beams which supported the second story, without being inserted into the wall of the sanctuary; this insertion being perhaps avoided not merely for architectural reasons, but also because it appeared to be irreverent. The third story was supported likewise by a similar scarcement, which afforded a still wider space for the chamber of the third story. These observations will render intelligible the following Biblical statements: “And against the wall of the house he built stories round about, both of the Temple and of the oracle; and he made chambers round about. The nethermost story was five cubits broad, and the middle was six cubits broad, and the third was seven cubits broad; for without in the wall of the house he made narrowed nests (*twϕrgjñæ* narrowings or rebatements) round about, so that the beams should not be fastened in the walls of the house. The house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was building. The door of the middle story was in the right side of the house; and they went up with winding stairs into the middle story, and out of the middle into the third. So he built the house, and finished it; and covered the house with beams and boards of cedar. And then he built chambers against all the house, five cubits high; and they rested on the house with timber of cedar” (1 Kings 6,7). From this description it may be inferred that the entrance to these stories was from without; but some architects have supposed that it was from within; which arrangement seems to be against the general aim of impressing the Israelitish worshippers with sacred awe by the seclusion of their sanctuary.

In reference to the windows, it should be observed that they served chiefly for ventilation; since the light within the Temple was obtained from the sacred candlesticks. It seems, from the descriptions of the Temple, to be certain that the **rybā** oracle, or holy of holies, was an *adytum* without windows. To this fact Solomon appears to refer when he spake, “The Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness” (^{<1082>}1 Kings 8:12).

The **rybā** oracle, had perhaps no other opening than the entrance, which was, as we may infer from the prophetic visions of Ezekiel (which probably correspond with the historic Temple of Solomon), six cubits wide. From ^{<1070>}1 Kings 7:10, we learn that the private dwellings of Solomon were built of massive stone. We hence infer that the framework of the Temple also consisted of the same material. The Temple was, however, wainscoted with cedar wood, which was covered with gold. The boards within the Temple were ornamented by beautiful carvings representing cherubim, palms, and flowers. The ceiling of the Temple was supported by beams of cedar wood (comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 16:69). The wall which separated the holy from the holy of holies probably consisted not of stone, but of beams of cedar. It seems, further, that the partition partly consisted of an *opus reticulatum*, so that the incense could spread from the holy to the most holy. This we infer from ^{<1062>}1 Kings 6:21: “So Solomon overlaid the house within with pure gold; and he made a partition by the chains of gold before the oracle, and he overlaid it with gold.”

The floor of the Temple was throughout of cedar, but boarded over with planks of fir (^{<1065>}1 Kings 6:15). The doors of the oracle were composed of olive-tree; but the doors of the outer temple had posts of olive-tree and leaves of fir (ver. 31 sq.). Both doors, as well that which led into the Temple as that which led from the holy to the holy of holies, had folding-leaves, which, however, seem to have been usually kept open, the aperture being closed by a suspended curtain—a contrivance still seen at the church-doors in Italy, where the church doors usually stand open; but the doorways can be passed only by moving aside a heavy curtain. From 2 Chronicles 3, 5, it appears that the greater house was also ceiled with fir. It is stated in ver. 9 “that the weight of the nails employed in the Temple was fifty shekels of gold;” and also that Solomon “overlaid the upper chambers with gold.”

The lintel and side posts of the oracle seem to have circumscribed a space which contained one fifth of the whole area of the partition; and the posts

of the door of the Temple one fourth of the area of the wall in which they were placed. Thus we understand the passage ^{<1065>}1 Kings 6:31-35, which also states that the door was covered with carved work overlaid with gold.

Within the holy of holies stood only the Ark of the Covenant; but within the holy were ten golden candlesticks and the altar of incense. *SEE ALTAR; SEE CANDLESTICK.*

The Temple was surrounded by an inner court, which in Chronicles is called the court of the priests, and in Jeremiah the higher court. This, again, was surrounded by a wall consisting of cedar beams placed on a stone foundation (^{<1065>}1 Kings 6:36): “And he built the, inner court with three rows of hewed stone, and a row of cedar beams.” This enclosure, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 8:3, 9), was three cubits high. Besides this inner court, there is mentioned a great court (^{<1009>}2 Chronicles 4:9) “Furthermore, he made the court of the priests, and the great court, and doors for the court, and overlaid the doors of them with brass.” It seems that this was also called the outward court (comp. ^{<3017>}Ezekiel 40:17). This court was also more especially called the court of the Lord’s house (^{<2094>}Jeremiah 19:14; 26:2). These courts were surrounded by spacious buildings, which, however, according to Josephus (*War.* 5, 5, 1), seem to have been partly added at a period later than that of Solomon. For instance (^{<1255>}2 Kings 15:35), Jotham is said to have built the higher gate of the house of the Lord. In ^{<2030>}Jeremiah 26:10 and 36:10 there is mentioned a new gate (comp. also ^{<3015>}Ezekiel 40:5-47; 42:1-14). But this prophetic vision is not strictly historical, although it may serve to illustrate history (comp. also Josephus, *Ant.* 8:3, 9). The *third* entry into the house of the Lord mentioned in ^{<2084>}Jeremiah 38:14 does not seem to indicate that there were three courts, but appears to mean that the entry into the outer court was called the first, that into the inner court the second, and the door of the sanctuary the third. It is likely that these courts were quadrilateral. In the visions of Ezekiel they form a square of four hundred cubits. The inner court contained towards the east the altar of burnt-offering, the brazen sea, and ten brazen lavers; and it seems that the sanctuary did not stand in the center of the inner court, but more towards the west. From these descriptions we learn that the Temple of Solomon was not distinguished by magnitude, but by good architectural proportions, beauty of workmanship, and costliness of materials. Many of our churches have an external form not unlike that of the Temple of Solomon. In fact, this Temple seems to have been the pattern of ‘our church buildings, to which the chief addition

has been the Gothic arch. Among others, the Roman Catholic Church at Dresden is supposed to bear much resemblance to the Temple of Solomon.

Picture for Temple 2

2. Modern Reconstructions. — It thus appears that as regards the building itself we have little more than a few fragmentary notices, which are quite insufficient to enable us to make out a correct architectural representation of it, or even to arrive at a very definite idea of many things belonging to its complicated structure and arrangements. All attempts that have been made in this direction have utterly failed, and, for the most part, have proceeded on entirely wrong principles. Such, was remarkably the case with the first great work upon the subject by professedly Christian writers namely, the portion of the commentary on Ezekiel by the Spanish Jesuits Pradus and Villapandus (1596-1604) which treats of the Temple. It was accompanied by elaborate calculations and magnificent drawings; but the whole proceeded on a series of mistakes—first, that the Temple of Ezekiel was a delineation of that which had been erected by Solomon; secondly, that this was again exactly reproduced in Herod's; and, thirdly, that the style of architecture from the first was of the Greco-Roman character—all quite groundless suppositions. Their idea of Solomon's Temple was that both in dimensions and arrangement it was very like the Escorial in Spain. But it is by no means clear whether the Escorial was in process of building while their book was in the press in order to look like the Temple, or whether its authors took their idea of the Temple from the palace. At all events, their design is so much the more beautiful and commodious of the two that we cannot but regret that Herrera was not employed on the book and the Jesuits set to build the palace. Various other writers, chiefly on the Continent, followed in the same line — Haffenreffer, Capellus (*Τρισάγιον*, printed in the *Crit. Sacri*), Lightfoot, Sturm (in Ugolino), Lamy, Semmler, Mela notice of whose treatises, some of them large and ponderous, may be seen in Bahr, *Salomonische Tempel* (§ 3). They are now of comparatively little use' Lightfoot's, as Bahr admits, is the best of the whole, being more clear, learned, and solidly grounded in its representations But it has chiefly to do, as its title indicates (*The Temple, especially as it stood in the Days of Our Savior*), with the Temple of Herod, and but very briefly refers to the Temple of Solomon. An essentially different class of writings on the Temple sprang up after the middle of last century, introduced by J. D. Michaelis, which, in the spirit of the times, made little account of anything but the outward material

structure, this being regarded as a sort of copy-though usually in a very inferior style of art of some of the temples of heathen antiquity. It is only during the present century that any serious efforts have been made to construct an idea of Solomon's Temple on right principles; that is, on the ground simply of the representations made concerning it in Scripture, and with a due regard to the purposes for which it was erected, and the differences as well as the resemblances between it and heathen temples of the same Hera. A succession of works or treatises with this view has appeared, almost exclusively in Germany, several of them by architects and antiquarians, with special reference to the history of the building art. They differ very much in merit; and in one of the latest, as perhaps also the ablest, of the whole, the treatise of Bahr already referred to (published in 1848), a review is given of the aim and characteristics of preceding investigations. As a general result, it has been conclusively established on the negative side, and is now generally acquiesced in, that the means entirely fail us for presenting a full and detailed representation, in an architectural respect, of the Temple and its related buildings. Its being cast in the rectilinear and chest form plainly distinguished it from erections in the Greek and Roman style; and, if the employment of Phoenician artists might naturally suggest some approach in certain parts to Phoenician models, it is, on the other hand, admitted by the most careful investigators in this particular department of antiquarian study that little or nothing is known of the Phoenician style of building (Bahr, p. 46). We here present the delineations of several later antiquaries, which show how variously the historical descriptions are interpreted and applied.

Picture for Temple 3

Picture for Temple 4

Entirely different from the foregoing is Prof., Paine's idea of the Temple, arising from his interpretation of the "enlarging" and winding about still upward" of ^{עֲלִיָּה}Ezekiel 41:7 to mean an over jutting of the upper chambers by galleries (*Temple of Solomon*, p, 38). — A serious objection to such an arrangement is the insecurity of a building thus widening at the top.

Picture for Temple 5

Picture for Temple 6

VI. *Zerubbabel's Temple.* — We have very few particulars regarding the Temple which the Jews erected after their return from the Captivity, and no description that would enable us to realize its appearance. But there are some dimensions given in the Bible and elsewhere which are extremely interesting as affording points of comparison between it and the temples which preceded it or were erected after it.

Picture for Temple 7

The first and most authentic are those given in the book of ^{1518B}Ezra 6:3 when quoting the decree of Cyrus, wherein it is said, “Let the house be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and: let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof threescore cubits; with three rows of, great stones, and a row of new timber.” Josephus quotes this passage almost literally (*Ant.* 11:4, 6), but in doing so enables us to translate “row” (Chald. *ĒBdījæ layer*) as *story* (*δόμος*, so also the Sept.) as, indeed, the sense would lead us to infer-for it could only apply to the three stories of chambers that surrounded Solomon's, and afterwards Herod's, Temple; and with this again we come to the wooden structure which surmounted the Temple and formed a fourth story. It may be remarked, in passing, that this dimension of sixty cubits in height accords perfectly with the words which Josephus puts into the mouth of Herod (*ibid.* 15:11,1) when he makes him say that the Temple built after the Captivity wanted sixty cubits of the height of that of Solomon. For, as he had adopted, as we have seen above, the height of one hundred and twenty cubits, as written in the Chronicles, for that Temple, this one remained only sixty. The other dimension of sixty cubits in breadth is twenty cubits in excess of that of Solomon's Temple; but there is no reason to doubt its correctness, for we find, both from Josephus and the Talmud, that it was the dimension adopted for the Temple when rebuilt, or rather repaired, by Herod. At the same time, we have no authority for assuming that any increase was made in the dimensions of either the holy place or the holy of holies, since we find that these were retained in Ezekiel's description of an ideal Temple, and were afterwards those of Herod's. As this Temple of Zerubbabel was still standing in Herod's time, and was, more strictly speaking, repaired rather than rebuilt

by him, we cannot conceive that any of its dimensions were then diminished. We are left, therefore, with the alternative of assuming that the porch and the chambers all round were twenty cubits in width, including the thickness of the walls, instead of ten cubits, as in the earlier building. This may, perhaps, to some extent, be accounted for by the introduction of a passage between the Temple and the rooms of the priest's lodgings, instead of each being a thoroughfare, as must certainly have been the case in Solomon's Temple. This alteration in the width of the Pteromata made the Temple one hundred cubits in length by sixty in breadth, with a eight it is said, of sixty cubits, including the upper room, or Talar, though we cannot help suspecting that this last dimension is somewhat in excess of the truth.

The only other description of this Temple is found in Hecataeus the Abderite, who wrote shortly after the death of Alexander the Great. As quoted by Josephus (*Cont. Ap.* 1, 22), he says that "in Jerusalem, towards the middle of the city, is a stone-walled enclosure about five hundred feet in length (ὥς πεντάπλεθρος) and one hundred cubits in width, with double gates, in which he describes the Temple as being situated. It may be that at this age it was found necessary to add a court for the women or the Gentiles, a sort of Narthex or Galilee for those who could not enter the Temple. If this, or these together, were one hundred cubits square, it would make up the "nearly five plethora" of our author. Hecateus also mentions that the altar was twenty cubits square and ten high. Although he mentions the Temple itself, he unfortunately does not supply us with any dimensions.

The Temple of Zerubbabel had several courts (αὐλαί) and cloisters or cells (πρόθυρα). Josephus distinguishes an internal and external ἱερόν, and mentions cloisters in the courts. This Temple was connected with the town by means of a bridge (*Ant.* 14:4).

VII. Ezekiel's Temple. — The vision of a temple which the prophet Ezekiel saw while residing on the banks of the Chebar in Babylonia, in the twenty-fifth year of the Captivity, does not add much to our knowledge of the subject. It is not a description of a temple that ever was built or ever could be erected at Jerusalem, and can consequently only be considered as the beau ideal of what a Shemitic temple ought to be. As such it would certainly be interesting if it could be correctly restored; but, unfortunately, the difficulties of making out a complicated plan from a mere verbal

description are very great indeed, and are enhanced in this instance by our imperfect knowledge of the exact meaning of the Hebrew architectural terms, and it may also be from the prophet describing not what he actually knew, but only what he saw in a vision.

Be this as it may, we find that the Temple itself was of the exact dimensions of that built by Solomon, viz. an adytum (³⁵⁰Ezekiel 40:1-4) twenty cubits square, a naos twenty by forty, and surrounded by cells of ten cubits' width, including the thickness of the walls; the whole, with the porch, making up forty cubits by eighty. The height, unfortunately, is not given. Beyond this were various courts and residences for the priests, and places for sacrifice and other ceremonies of the Temple, till he comes to the outer court, which measured five hundred reeds on each of its sides; each reed (ver. 5) was six Babylonian cubits long, viz. of cubits each of one ordinary cubit and a handbreadth, or, at the lowest estimate, twenty-one inches. The reed was therefore at least ten feet six inches, and the side consequently five thousand two hundred and fifty Greek feet, or within a few feet of an English mile, considerably more than the whole area of the city of Jerusalem, Temple included.

It has been attempted to get over this difficulty by saying that the prophet meant cubits, not reeds; but this is quite untenable. Nothing can be more clear than the specification of the length of the reed, and nothing more careful than the mode in which reeds are distinguished from cubits throughout; as, for instance, in the next two verses (6 and 7), where a chamber and a gateway are mentioned each of one reed. If "cubit" were substituted, it would be nonsense. Nevertheless, Prof. Paine has given a reconstruction of this as well as the actual Temple, for the description and dimensions in the vision are consistent with themselves and capable of being plotted down.

Notwithstanding its ideal character, the whole is extremely curious, as showing what were the aspirations of the Jews in this direction, and how different they were from those of other nations; and it is interesting here, inasmuch as there can be little doubt but that the arrangements of Herod's Temple were in some measure influenced by the description here given. The outer court, for instance, with its porticos measuring five hundred cubits each way, is an exact counterpart, on a smaller scale, of the outer court of Ezekiel's Temple, and is not found in either Solomon's or

Zerubbabel's; arid so: too, evidently, are several of the internal arrangements. *SEE EZEKIEL.*

VIII. *Herod's Temple.* — The most full, explicit, and trustworthy information on this subject is contained in that tract of the Jewish Talmud entitled *Middoth* (i.e. "measures"), which is almost as minute in its descriptions and dimensions (no doubt by parties who had seen, and, as priests been familiar with, the edifice) as a modern architect's specifications. Besides this, the two descriptions of the temple, incidentally given by Josephus (*ut sup.*) are three consecutive accounts of the ancient structure. Our principal attempt will therefore be to follow these where they agree, and to reconcile their seeming discrepancies going at the same time all important allusions in the Bible and uninspired historians of antiquity, and constantly comparing the whole with the indications on the modern site. Occasional use, for verification, may be made of the measures in the spiritual temple of Ezekiel 40-42, but: with great caution, as but few of them seem to have been borrowed from the actual type which, moreover, was Solomon's Temple, and not Herod's

Picture for Temple 8

(I.) The OUTER CIRCUIT OF THE TEMPLE. We assume that the present enclosure of the Haram corresponds to the areas of the Temple and of the Tower Antonia taken together; and the most convenient mode of considering the general contour of the outer wall will be after presenting the following arrangements:

Picture for Temple 9

1. Remains of cyclopean masonry are still found at intervals on all the sides of the present enclosure of the peculiar beveled character which marks their antiquity. The English engineers engaged in the late Ordinance survey traced all these along the southern end, and found them resting on the native rock, some of them still retaining the marks of the original Tyrian workmen (see *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 108). Now Josephus informs us (*Ant.* 15, 11, 3; *War.* 5, 5, 1) that the area of Moriah was enlarged by building up enormous walls from the valleys and filling them in with earth. The lower courses of these seem to have been buried under the rubbish that fell upon them from the demolition of the upper part of the walls, and have thus escaped. It is difficult to suppose that such masonry could have been the work of later times, or that the area would have been altered after such

prodigious bounds had been set to it. Particular coincidences of ruins on the eastern, southern, and western sides will be noted in giving the circuit of the wall in detail. The “Jews Wailing-place” along the western wall is agreed upon all hands to be a veritable mark of antiquity, going back at least as far as the time of Herod.

2. The enormous vaulted substructions found under the southern end of the Haram are evidently the same which would be left between these embankments and the native rock; and it was apparently among these that the tyrant Simon subsisted till after the destruction of the city (Josephus, *War*, 7:2, 4). But especially does Maimonides speak expressly of the arches supporting the ground on this part in order to prevent graves and other pollution beneath (Lightfoot, *Prospects of the Temple*, ch. 1).

3. That the platform (not the mere *building*) of the Tower Antonia occupied the whole northern end of this enclosure we think is nearly certain from the following facts:

a. The scarped rock and wall on this side can be no other than the precipice, rendered more inaccessible by art, above which Josephus states that this tower, as ‘well as those at the other corners of its courts, was reared (*War*, 5, 5, 8). No such ridge can be found to the north of this.

b. The presence of the fosse (found in the modern “Pool of Bethesda”) on this part seems ‘to limit its site. This ditch is not only referred to in the several notices of Antonia by Josephus above cited, but in *Ant.* 14:4,1, 2 he speaks of it as being “broad and deep,” “of immense depth;” so that it could hardly, have failed to remain as a landmark in all ages.

c. The projecting bastions at the north-west and northeast angles appear to be the relics of the towers at these corners, and the projection at the Golden Gate may have been connected with the tower at the south-east corner.

d. The present barracks of the Turkish troops are on the traditional site of the Tower of Antonia at the northwest corner of the Haram.

4. The actual size of the present enclosure agrees remarkably with the dimensions of the Temple and Antonia’s areas. According to the Talmud (*Middoth*, 2, 1), the outer court of the Temple was 500 cubits square, which, taking the most approved estimate of the Jewish or Egyptian cubit at 1.824 feet, *SEE CUBIT*, would give 912 feet as the length of each side.

Now the total length of the southern wall of the Haram is 922 feet, which will allow 5 feet for the thickness (at the surface) of each wall, a coincidence that cannot be accidental. Again, Josephus gives the distance around the whole enclosure of the Temple and Antonia together as being six stadia (*War*, 5, 5, 2); and if we subtract from this his estimate of four stadia for the circuit of the Temple (*Ant.* 15:11, 3), we have one stadium, or about 606 feet, for the additional length of the court of Antonia northward on each side. Now this added to the square whose base has just been found will give about 1521 feet for the sides of the entire enclosure on the east and west; and it is a remarkable fact that the length of the Haram in this direction, according to the *Ordnance Survey*, averages 1540 feet, leaving again 5 feet for the thickness of each of the three walls. We are not sure, however, but that a somewhat greater thickness should be allowed the outer wall, which (on the west side, at least) Josephus says was “broad” (*War*, 6:3, 1), and on all sides “very strong” (*Ant.* 14:4, 1).

On this point, however, there are some considerations that at first seem to be powerful objections:

(a) Josephus, in the passage last referred to, makes the Temple area only a stadium square. But this is evidently nothing more than a round number from mere recollection, measured only by the eye; whereas the Talmud is so minute in its interior specification that there can be little doubt which to follow. The 500 *reefs* in the measurement of the spiritual temple by Ezekiel (³⁵⁰¹⁶Ezekiel 42:16-20) seem to have been taken from these 500 *cubits*.

(b) The modern area is not rectangular, nor are its opposite sides parallel or of equal length; the south-west corner is the only one that has been positively settled as being a right angle, and the north side is certainly longer than that on the south. We do not conceive, therefore, that the term “square” in the Mishna and Josephus need be so strictly taken, but only to mean that the area was a quadrilateral, apparently rectangular to the eye, and of equal dimensions on the east, south, and west sides, which are exposed to view. This mode of reconciliation, we think, is better than to suppose the line on either of these sides to have been shifted in the face of every possible evidence of identity. By running the dividing line between the Temple and the court of Antonia immediately south of the Golden Gate (so as to make this latter, which is evidently ancient, the entrance to Antonia, and not to the Temple, which had but one eastern gate), we

obtain another right angle, and make the four sides of the Temple area nearly equal.

Having thus settled the general line of the outer wall of the Temple, it remains to trace the objects of interest lying along it, both on the inner and outer sides, in which endeavor we will begin. On the south-west corner. Here was the famous *bridge* of which Josephus so often speaks (*Ant.* 14:4, 2, twice; *War*, 1, 7, 2; 2, 16, 3; 6:6, 2; 8, 1). Accordingly, in the foundation-stones on the western side of the present wall, 39 feet from the south corner, may still be seen the three lower courses (50 feet long) of the first arch, evidently, of this bridge, which spanned the Tyropoeon. A measurement of the curve indicates that the span of the entire arch was about 45 feet (see these details in the *Ordnance Survey*, p. 27), so that *seven* such arches would conveniently extend across the valley (350 feet, the remaining 125 feet. to the wall being embankment) and allow suitable piers between them. This was evidently the “passage over the intermediate valley,” through which

Picture for Temple 10

2. The first *gate* (from the south) on the western side of the Temple “led to the king’s palace” on Zion (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 5). This passage seems to have been originally built by Solomon (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:5; ^{<1106>}2 Chronicles 9:4). The arches, however, may belong to the time of the reconstruction of the bridge, perhaps by Herod. Here, We think, must be located “the gate *Shallecheth* (literally, a “casting down,” perhaps with reference to the steepness of the valley), by the causeway of the going up” to Zion (^{<1336>}1 Chronicles 26:16; comp. ver. 18); although Lightfoot places them both at the northern end of the Temple wall, reading Josephus’s four gates in a southward order (*Works*, 9:226). There exists still, in fact, a sort of embankment not far north of this spot, across which the “upper level” aqueduct from Bethlehem is probably carried to Moriah. This is apparently the same with the gate anciently named *Sur* (^{<1216>}2 Kings 11:6), otherwise called the *Gate of the Foundation* (^{<1215>}2 Chronicles 23:5)., The reason of the name “Sur” (literally, “removed”) is quite uncertain. The “foundation” may refer to the high base of the wall supporting the- bridge adjoining. It seems to have been this passage between the abode of the usurping Athaliah on Zion and the refuge of the young king in the Temple proper that was specially guarded; the guards were three and the same in each, but differently named: one section was at the Horse Gate (at “the king’s

house”), another at the other end of the bridge (at this “gate of Sur,” or “of the foundation”), and the third at the gates of the inner enclosure (“the doors” generally, “the gate behind the [former] guard”); so that if any enemy passed the first two among “the people in the [outer] courts,” he should still be intercepted by the last before reaching the prince. Lightfoot interprets differently (*Works*, 9:326). In the Talmud it is explicitly said that there was (apparently but) one *gate* in the western Temple wall, and in the same connection the gates are repeatedly referred to as being five in number, of which **פ**four are assigned to the other sides (*Middoth*, 1, 1, 3). This single western one is there called *Kipbnus* (*ibid.* 1, 3). That this was the same with the gate in question, we think to be probable, from the consideration that this being the principal entrance on this side—as is evident not only from its position and the points connected, but also from the slighting manner in which the rest are referred to and their destination mentioned—will account for the silence in the Talmud respecting the others. From the name itself little can be safely argued; see Lightfoot’s attempts to define it (*Works*, 9:226). Each of the gates in the outer wall of the Temple (as well as those in the inner wall) was 20 cubits high and 10 wide (*Middoth*, 2, 3), which Josephus, apparently including side and cap ornaments, extends (in the case of the inner, and therefore probably also the outer, wall) to 30 cubits high and 15 wide (*War*, 5, 5, 3).

3. The second gate northward seems to have been that anciently called *Parbar*, from a comparison of the following facts:

a. In ^{<1378>}1 Chronicles 26:18, it is mentioned in connection with “the causeway,” as if next to Shallecheth.

b. In ^{<1271>}2 Kings 23:11 is made mention of a gate leading from “the suburbs” into the Temple, apparently not far from the palaces and this precisely agrees with the southern one of the two middle gates which Josephus states led to “the suburbs” (*Ant.* 15:11, 5). The word “Iparbar” (which only occurs in these two Biblical passages, and in ^{<3778>}Ezekiel 27:28) is used by the rabbins as meaning “suburb,” although its radical sense would appear to be an *open building or space* (see Gesenius and Buxtorf, *Lex. s.v.*)

c. At a point 265 feet north of the south-west corner of the Haram there still-exists a gate (Bab el-Mugaribeh, “the gate of the Western Africans”) in the modern wall, leading into the Haram, and in the nature of the case there must always have been a gate near this spot.

d. Beyond this point, as we shall presently see, there is no opportunity for a gate south of the point where the north wall of Zion would have joined the Temple; but that wall must have included one of these “gates to the suburbs,” both for the sake of convenience and to prevent an undue crowding of three gates in the western Temple wall north of its junction with the Zion wall. Here, however, there is just convenient space for a gate, and a suitable locality about half-way between the bridge and the Zion wall.

e. These views are confirmed by the following point:

4. Josephus mentions (*War*, 6:3, 2) as lying along this wall “*John’s Tower*, which he built in the war he made against Simon, over the gates that led to the Xystus,” by which gate we understand this of Parbar, and that the tower was constructed over an enlargement of its gateway lying opposite Simon’s or the Lying-out Tower.

5. The next object of interest is “the *Council-house*” mentioned by Josephus as the termination of the old wall at the Temple (*War*, 5, 4, 2), which plainly implies that it lay in the corner where the city and Temple walls met, and immediately joined them both. This building we therefore locate on that part of the Haram which adjoins the termination of the present Street of David, for the reasons following:

a. The courses of old foundation-stones forming “the Jews Wailing-place” show that there was no structure anciently adjoining them, and therefore the Council house must be located north of this spot.

b. The space here unappropriated (about 100 feet, between the Jews Wailing-place and David Street) would be a suitable one for a public building with its interior court and connected offices:

c. The Mukhama, or “town-hall,” of the modern city is exactly on this spot, and “some of it has more the appearance of being *in situ* than many of the other remains in the city” (*Ordnance Survey*, p. 28).

6. Just north of the Zion wall thus located, we would place one of the *gates of Asuppim*, referred to in ^{<1397>}1 Chronicles 26:17 as lying on the western side of the Temple, identical with Josephus’s other gate leading to the suburbs, at a convenient place, and uniformly situated with respect to the gate above and that below, and just at the present Bab es-Silsileh, or “Gate

of the Chain,” at the head of the modern “Street of David,” which is the principal entrance to the Haram.

7. Adjoining this on the inside must have been the *House of Asuppim*, or “collections” (¹³⁶⁵1 Chronicles 26:15), occupying (part of) the cloister between the two gates of the same name. It probably was the place of deposit for the Temple offerings (see Lightfoot, *Works*, 9:230). This is apparently “that northern edifice which was between the two gates” mentioned by Josephus (*War*, 6:2, 7), for that these were the two gates of Asuppim is evident from several considerations:

a. The Romans, although then assaulting the outer Temple wall, evidently attacked its north-west corner, where the Temple proper was nearest to them, and therefore would not have reared their engines south of the junction of the old wall with the Temple, which leaves but these two gates for the sphere of their operations on the west.

b. That this building was on the west side of the Temple is clear from the fact that of the four engines the first was opposite the north-west angle of the inner court [from a northerly point of attack], and the last one farther along the north side; if, then, this second one be opposite the same north-west corner of the inner court from a westerly direction, the third will be farther south on the west side, between the south gate of Asuppim and the old wall — a natural and consistent arrangement. The Tower of Antonia proper prevented any being reared nearer the extreme north-west corner of the *outer* wall.

8. The other *Gate of Asuppim* we therefore place at a corresponding distance northward, opposite where a gate enters the Haram from the modern “Cotton Mart,” and hence called Bab el-Kattanin. Lightfoot asserts that this gate (which, however, he calls Shallecheth) was diametrically opposite the eastern gate (*Works*, 9:226), but apparently without any authority. This is evidently also Josephus’s “last [gate on this side that] led to the other city,” i.e. Acra (*Ant.* 15:11,5).

9. In this last passage, also, Josephus states that on passing out of this gate “the road descended down into the valley [the he Tyropoeon] by a great number of *steps*, and thence again by the ascent,” which agrees with the fact that the detritus adjoining the wall is here 72 feet’ deep (*Ordnance Survey*, p. 29).

10. We next arrive at the north-west corner of the Temple enclosure, about 1000 feet from the east as well as the south side. Near this corner were private passages for the Roman guard from Antonia to the galleries within the wall (Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 8).

11. On the north side there was but one gate (the “two gates” of Josephus [*War*, 6:2, 7] have been shown above not to belong to the north side), which the Talmud calls *Tedi* (*Middoth*, 1, 3), a word of uncertain signification, but apparently indicative of “privacy” from its being less used, and therefore less ornamented, than the other gates (so Lightfoot from the Talmud), which the obstruction of Antonia would naturally occasion. We place it in the middle of the wall, nearly opposite both the Gate of Song and the present “Gate el-Hitta,” on the north side of the Haram.

12. The north-east corner of the square would thus fall just south of the Golden Gate, considered as representing the tower at that angle of the enclosure of Antonia, possibly the old tower of Meah (^{<400>}Nehemiah 3:1; 12:39).

13. On the east side there was but one gate, that of *Shushan* (*Middoth*, 1, 3), so called from a representation of that city on the walls of one of its chambers. It was opposite the entrance of the porch of the Temple, in order that the priest, when he burned the red heifer on the Mount of Olives, might exactly face the altar; on which account the tower over the gate was lower than those surmounting the other gates, so as not to intercept his view. So infers Lightfoot from the Talmud and Maimonides (*Works*, 9:218, 219); which location, however, Mr. Williams finds it necessary to dispute (*Holy City*, 2, 355, note 5). This position shows that this gate and the altar were in a range with the other gates between them. By an inspection of the sectional view of the Temple on the map, it will appear that at a certain height on the Mount of Olives the fire on the altar might be seen through the inner gates and over this gate. We find no traces of this gate mentioned by travelers.

14. At the south-east corner Josephus says there was a *tremendous precipice* (*Ant.* 15:11, 3, 5), apparently “the pinnacle of the Temple” on which the tempter placed Christ (^{<400>}Luke 4:9), still to be recognized in the steep descent at this point, and proved to have been anciently more profound by the vaulted substructions beneath the inside of the Haram, raising this angle of its platform above the old bed of the valley. The wall is here about 60 feet high, and about 50 feet deep from the present surface of

the ground outside. From Josephus's language in *War*, 6:3, 3, it is evident that the precipice at the northeast angle was also very considerable.

15. On the south side, according, to the Talmud; 'were two gates, both named *Huldah* (*Middoth*, 1, 3), perhaps from the prophetess of that name. These are evidently the "gates in the middle" of this side mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 15:11, 5). We conclude that they lay very near together, and (with Dr. Robinson) identify them with the double gateway still found in the south Haram wall at the point where the modern city wall joins it. Its entire breadth is 42 feet (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 1, 450) and it is reached by a sloping passage from the platform of the Haram, as the embankment here could never have otherwise admitted an exit, nor even then without exterior steps. Lightfoot, however, makes these gates divide the wall into three equal parts (*Works*, 9:224), apparently merely arguing from the statement of Josephus. It is worthy of note that in ~~1394~~ 1 Chronicles 26:14-18 but one set of guards is constantly assigned to the south side, in like terms as to the single gates on the north and east, whereas four sets are, in both enumerations, assigned to the west side. The other modern vestiges of portals on this side are of inferior size and antiquity.

16. On the several sides of the *Court of the Gentiles* that lay within the outer wall (called also the Outer Court, Lower Court, and by the rabbins usually "Mountain of the Lord's House") there were several objects worthy of special note:

(1.) On the north and west sides were double interior porticos or *cloisters*, each 15 cubits wide, supported by columns and sustaining a roof on cedar beams (Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 2).

(2.) On the east side was *Solomon's Porch* (~~1392~~ John 10:23; Acts 3, 11), of the same size and style with those on the north and west (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 3; 20:9, 7).

(3.) On the south side was the *Royal Portico* (apparently so called after Herod, who rebuilt it; Josephus, *War*, 1, 21, 1), which differed- from the rest in being triple, the two side aisles being 30 feet broad, and the middle one once and a half as broad (*Ant.* 15:11, 5). Lightfoot has strangely set these down as being respectively 15 and 42J cubits broad (Pitman's edition of his *Works*, 9:239, with which his own map agrees; the English folio edition, 1, 1061, has the same numbers; but the Latin edition in Ugolino, *Thesaurus*, 9:596, has for the middle aisle *forty-one* cubits), in which we

suspect some oversight (perhaps from thinking of the dimensions of the other cloisters), as all editions of Josephus here read alike, and the *Middoth* does not particularize on this point. The hypothesis of Williams (*Holy City*, 2, 401) that would throw the Royal Portico outside the Temple area is opposed to all ancient authority; so much so that even his coadjutor Prof. Willis is constrained to dissent from him (*ibid.* 1, 103).

(4.) These cloisters were adorned with Corinthian *columns* of solid marble, 162 in number (of such size that three men could just span them with their outstretched arms, making about a diameter of six feet), which separated the aisles, besides another row half imbedded in the outer wall (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 5). We understand this to be the number of all the columns that stood alone in all the circuit of this court, and not those of the Royal Portico merely; for they would then be unduly crowded, and the average space between them which we have made (about 45 feet) is no greater span for the roof timbers than across the middle aisle of the south cloister. The harmony with which the several gates fall in between them when thus distributed is no little corroboration of the entire scheme. In the substructed vaults the rows of piers are 15 feet apart, and thus certain rows of them would fall exactly under these pillars, these piers also averaging about half the distance apart of the columns above. (See Prof. Willis's remarks in Williams's *Holy City*, appendix, 1, 125-128; although we cannot see why he should think that a column stood over-each pier one way when they could have been only over every other, or every third one, the other way.) These columns were 25 cubits high on three sides, which determines the height of the roof on those sides (Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 2); but on the south side the (shafts of the) two exterior rows were 27 feet high, the capitals and double-bases raising the roof to 50 feet, and the middle aisle was twice as high, probably by another series of columns of the same size surmounting the first (*Ant.* 15:11, 5). Balustrades doubtless guarded the edges of the flat roofs, and the gates were probably capped with turrets, for ornament as well as defense.

(5.) There were *porters' lodges* adjoining at least five of the gates (*Middoth*, 1, 1), and probably similar structures for the accommodation of the Levites guarding each of the gates (^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 26:12,13).

(6.) The Talmud also speaks of *shops* in this court, where articles used in sacrifice were kept for sale, as well as of a room in which the Jewish "Council of Twenty-three," and afterwards the Sanhedrim, sat; these

Lightfoot locates near the Shushan Gate, the former on the ground floor and the latter overhead (*Works*, 9:241-244). It was probably an abuse of this privilege of sale that led to the introduction of cattle, sheep, and pigeons by the traders whom Christ expelled.

(II.) THE SACRED ENCLOSURE. Brevity will require that in the consideration of the details of the interior portions of the Temple the simple dimensions and statements should be exhibited, together with their authority, with as little discussion as possible.

- 1.** A lattice-wall all around, 1 cubit broad, 3 cubits high, with equidistant *pillars* containing notices of non-admission (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 5; *War*, 5, 5, 2); called *chil* (~~218~~Lamentations 2:8).
- 2.** This stood 12 steps, each one half cubit high and broad, above the Gentiles' Court [on the north and south sides] (*Middoth*, 2, 3), but 14 [on the east side] (*War*, 5, 5, 2).
- 3.** Adjoining was a *platform*, 10 cubits wide (*War*, 5, 5, 2).

(III.) THE COURT OF THE WOMEN.

- 1.** This court (called also New Court, ~~405~~2 Chronicles 20:5; Outer Court, ~~342~~Ezekiel 46:21; Treasury, ~~408~~John 8:20) was 135 cubits square [internally] (*Middoth*, 2, 5); "foursquare" (*War*, 5, 5, 2).
- 2.** A *gate* on each side (*War*, 5, 5, 2). These were 30 cubits wide [including ornaments], supported by pillars at the side, and having rooms above (*War*, 5, 5, 3).
- 3.** The east gate (called "Beautiful," Acts 3, 2) was 40 cubits wide [including side ornaments of 5 cubits] (*War*, V, 5), 3
- 4.** There were 5 *steps* from the platform [i.e. the difference between the floors of this court and that of the Israelites] (*War*, 5, 5, 2, 3).
- 5.** There were 15 *steps* to: the Court of the Israelites (*War*, 5, 5, 3); circular for the "Psalms of degrees" (*Middoth*, 2).
- 6.** *Corner courts* of the Women's Court, each 40 cubits from east to west [and 30 broad], with interior open spaces, 20 cubits by 14, for boiling sacrifices; the covered rooms around that in the north-east corner for performing the ceremony of release from a Nazarite's vow, in the southeast for a wood repository, in the south-west for cleansing lepers, in the north-

west chambers for wine and oil for offerings (*Middoth*, 2, 5; ^{<3621>}Ezekiel 46:21-24). Lightfoot, however, makes the Nazarites' room in the south-east, the wood-room in the north-east, the lepers' room in the north-west, and the wine and oil rooms in the south-west (*Works*, 9:307), correcting Surenhusius's mistranslation.

7. Single galleries of two stories [men below, women above] between the corner courts [on the north, east, and west sides] (*Middoth*, 2, 5); supported by columns similar to those of the Gen tiles' Court (*War*, 5, 5, 2).

8. There were eleven *treasure-chests* distributed in front of the columns in this court, besides- the two at the gate Shushan for the half-shekel tax (Lightfoot, from the rabbins, *Works*, 9:315).

9. Underground rooms for musical instruments on each side of the gate between this and the Israelites' Court (*Middoth*, 2, 6).

10. There was a *tower* over the east [Beautiful] gate with an occult [subterranean] *passage* from the Tower Antonia for the Roman guard (*Ant.* 15:11, 7)

(IV.) THE COURT OF THE ISRAELITES.

1. This was 187 cubits from east to west, 135 from north to south, 8 cubits wide on the north and south, and 11 on the east and west (*Middoth*, 2-6).

2. Surrounded by a portico similar to those of the Gentiles' Court, but single (*War*, 5, 5. 2).

3. Had three gates on the north and south, none on the west (*Middoth*, 1, 4; *War*, 5, 5, 2). Those on the north and south equidistant (*Ant.* 16:11, 5; *Middoth*, 5, 3).

4. East gate called Higher Gate (^{<2155>}2 Kings 15:35; ^{<4278>}2 Chronicles 27:3), New Gate (^{<2850>}Jeremiah 26:10; 36:10), Gate of Entrance (^{<3505>}Ezekiel 40:15), *Gate of Nicanor* (*Middoth*, 1, 4).

5. Gates and rooms in the wall adjoining as follows, beginning at the south-west corner (for the authority of most of these points it is sufficient to refer to Lightfoot's citations [*Works*, 9:333-380], as there can be no dispute respecting them. We have not in all cases arranged the rooms precisely like

Lightfoot, but have made a few slight changes where they seemed requisite):

- (1) *Sentinel's Hall*, west of the first gate.
- (2) *Gate of Kindling*.
- (3) *Guard-room*, adjoining east.
- (4) *Gate of Firstlings*, in the middle.
- (5) *Guard-room* adjoining it.
- (6) *Wood-room* for the use of the altar, adjoining the
- (7) *Water-gate*, the last on this side.
- (8) *Well-room*, with its draw-well connected with a reservoir [the aqueduct from Bethlehem?] deriving its waters from a westerly direction, and-an engine for forcing it into the priests' laver.
- (9) *House Gazith*, at the south-east corner, consisting of two parts:

[1.] The *Session-room of the Sanhedrim*, with its triple semicircles for seating the members, and its desks. From a comparison of the number of members with the size of the room, we find that the space in the wall could by no means contain them, and have therefore enlarged it outwardly.

[2.] A room for the priests to pray and cast their lots in.

(10.) On the south side of the Gate of Nicanor, the *Pastry-mail's Chamber*, for baking the salt cakes burned with the daily sacrifice.

(11.) On the north side of the same gate, the *Priests' Wardrobe*, for the pontifical dresses.

(12.) In the north-east corner, the *Earthenware-room*, for the sacred pottery.

(13.) A *Guard-room*, adjoining on the east.

(14.) The *Gate of Song*.

(15.) Adjoining this, a *Wash-room* for cleansing the entrails, etc., of sacrifices.

(16.) A *Room for Hides* of victims, and

(17.) The *Salt-rooeri*, for the salt used in preserving them, both in order, adjoining

(18.) The *Gate of Women*. Adjoining this,

(19.) A *Treasure-room*, for the more permanent deposit of the money from the House of Asuppim.

(20.) A *Guard-room*, and next,

(21.) The other *Treasure-room*, for the same purpose as the former. These adjoined

(22.) The *Gate of Burning*, the last of the six.

(23.) The interval between this gate and the western wall was called the *House of Burning*, and was divided into three equal parts. This building projected inwardly into the Court of the Israelites, like one portion of the House Gazith. These two buildings alone had entrances from the sacred enclosure, all the other rooms being entered only from the court within:

[1.] Adjoining the gate, the *House of the Consecrated Stones* of the former altar (removed after the rededication under the Maccabees, as having been desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes), in the northern subdivision; and on the south the *Shew-bread Bakery*.

[2.] In the middle the *Priests' Hall*, where was a fire for the use of the guards at night.

[3.] The western portion is occupied, on the north for a *Priests' Bathing-room*, and on the south for keeping the *Lambs* selected for the daily sacrifice.

6. The principal difficulty connected with this court is the number of *steps*, and their height, leading into it on the north and south, and arises from a confusion in the terms by which Josephus mentions them. He says (*War*, 5, 5, 2) that between the sacred platform and the interior court “were other steps, *each of 5 cubits apiece*,” which we understand to mean that the Court of the Israelites was entered by [two flights of] steps, each [flight] rising 5 cubits, thus making 20 steps, in two sets of half-cubit steps. Again he says (*ibid.* § 4) that “there were 15 steps [those of the “degrees”] which led away [i.e. eastward] from the [west] wall of the Court of the Women to [i.e. towards] this greater gate [the Beautiful Gate], *whereas those that led thither* [i.e. to the platform down to which the Beautiful Gate led] *from the other gates* [opening towards this platform] *were five steps shorter*,” by

which we can only understand (according to the above interpolations) that the number of the steps leading out of the Court of the Israelites on the east exceeded by 5 the number [in each flight] of those on the north and south; for if these latter were but 10 in all, each must have been *one cubit in the rise* (7 cubits at the Nicanor Gate 2 at the Beautiful Gate = 10), an impracticable ascent. Finally, he says (*ibid.* § 2) that “the height of its buildings [those of the Women’s Court], although it were on the outside 40 cubits, was hidden by the steps, and on the inside that height was but 25 cubits,” which we take to denote that the top of the wall enclosing the Court of the Israelites (which was continuous with that of the Court of the Women) was 40 cubits from the level of the floor of the Court of the Gentiles, the intervening steps making the difference (15 cubits) of its internal altitude—as would be true within a single cubit (121 10). The gate-turrets were still higher than this. The steps mentioned by Josephus (*War*, 5, 1, 5) as preventing the erection of John’s engines on any other spot than “behind the inner court over against the west end of the cloister” seem to be those that ran around the three sides of the Priests’ Court, at the railing separating it from the cloistered Court of the Israelites.

7. The *thickness* of this wall is nowhere stated in the Mishna, but is given by Josephus as being 8 cubits (*War*, 6:5, 1, at the close); and the numerous rooms contained within it would seem to justify a greater thickness than in any of the other walls.

(V.) THE COURT OF THE PRIESTS, THE GREAT ALTAR, AND THE TEMPLE PROPER.

These are treated of in the Mishna in the fullest detail, and the minutest points to the thickness of the walls and partitions, the number, size, and position of the doors, the dimensions, order, and situation of the rooms and passages, with all their peculiarities and contents — are given with the precise explicitness of specifications for a builder’s contract; so that as to everything, great or small, contained within these bounds there is such full and trustworthy authority that all one has to do is to collect and plot them down on the plan. This the reader will find so carefully and completely done to his hand by Lightfoot, in his *Prospects of the Temple*, so often referred to, that to detail it here would be but to repeat his statements: we have examined his authorities and conclusions in detail, and believe that no accurate description can do much more than follow his digest on this subject. We have embodied the results in our accompanying this volume.

The points in which we have varied from his plan are too few and unimportant to be worth enumerating. One particular, however, requires special consideration, because its settlement involves the discussion of the few points that have not been determined above; and to this we add such other remarks as will convey a sufficiently definite idea of the main edifice.

1. *The Position of the Great Altar.* — Its distance from the northern boundary of the Court of the Israelites is given in the Mishna in the following words: “From north to south [the Israelites’ Court was] 135 cubits [wide], as follows: from the ascent to the extremity of the altar [i.e. the whole length of the altar including its inclined ascent] were 62 cubits [i.e. *horizontal* measure, for the altar is elsewhere given as 32 cubits square, and the slope of the ascent as another 32 cubits, which would give 64 instead of 62 cubits, measured superficially (see Lightfoot, *Works*, 9:413)], from the altar to the rings 8 cubits; the place of the rings was 24 cubits, thence from the rings to the tables were 4 cubits, from the tables to the columns 4, from the columns to the wall of the court 8 cubits [making thus 110 cubits] ; *the rest* [25 cubits] *were as well the space between the ascent and wall as a place of columns*” (*Middoth*, 5, 1). This last clause is somewhat ambiguous, but is generally understood as meaning that there was a space of 25 cubits between the south wall and the foot of the “ascent,” which contained some extra posts (like those on the north side) for sacrificing on crowded occasions an interpretation from which we do not see any good reason for dissenting. So L’Empereur (in his separate commentary on the *Middoth*, p. 173) explains, “*Partly* for an [open] space and partly for the place of [extra] columns,” assigning 12N cubits to each portion, which amounts to the same thing as to the point in question. So also Lightfoot (*Works*, 9:413). The position of the altar from east to west is fixed with regard to the court in which it lay in terms which are free from any ambiguity.

In common with most antiquarians, *awe* are disposed to find the native rock, on which the altar is assumed to have been reared, in the remarkable *Sacred Rock* under the dome of the central mosque of the Haram. This is 50 or 60 feet broad, occupying nearly the whole space immediately under the dome, and rising about 5 feet above the floor of the building, which is 12 feet higher than the rest of the enclosure. The center of the rock is about 785 feet from the southern and 610 from the eastern wall of the Haram. The frequent supposition that it stood within the most holy place, or at least within the Temple proper, is negative by the relative distances

presently to be noticed from the Talmud. The positive reasons for making the altar coincide with the Sacred Rock may be stated as follows:

- (a.) Tradition, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem favors it (see Williams, *Holy City*, 2, 340-343).
- (b.) This rock is prominent above all other spots, and we know that the great altar was higher than even the floor of the Temple itself.
- (c.) The upper platform of the Haram thus most nearly coincides with that of the sacred enclosure of the Temple.
- (d.) The cave and sewer at the south-east corner of the present rock would thus be identical with the ancient cesspool and drain for the blood sprinkled around the altar.

This site of the great altar fixes the general position of the Temple and sacred enclosure generally within the great area, and agrees with the only definite statement in the Mishna on the subject, namely, that “the greatest space between the Temple and the wall of the outer court was on the south side, the next greatest on the east, the next on the north, and the least on the west” (*Middoth*, 2, 1). According to our arrangement, the spaces (at the nearest point) between the *chêl*, or sacred fence, and the inner surface of the outmost wall are respectively on the west about 78 feet, on the north about 80 feet, on the east about 239 feet, on the south about 643 feet. Lightfoot’s plan has nearly the same. Dr. Wm. Brown (of Scotland), in his work on the *Antiquities of the Jews* (1, 70), lays them down in cubits, as follows: south, 259; east, 90; north, 72; west, 49. Fergusson arbitrarily refers these measurements to the *inner* court of the Temple (*Temples of the Jews*, p. 118), on the ground that the Talmud states that “in the place largest in measurement was held most service” (*Middoth*, 2, 1); but the text obviously means the space in the outer court, as that-alone is the subject there treated of.

The position of the altar also fixes the line of the *boundary* between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which at this date cut off one cubit from the south-east corner of the altar a circumstance of which the rabbins take frequent notice (see Lightfoot, *Works*, 9:395). This boundary originally ran entirely south of the holy city (^{<0650>}Joshua 15:7-9; 18:15-17), but the conquest of Jebus by David appears to have annexed Mount Zion permanently to Judah (^{<1001>}2 Samuel 4:1). The subsequent purchase of the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite by David (^{<1024>}2 Samuel 24:24; ^{<1215>}1

Chronicles 21:25) as the; site of his altar, and eventually of the Temple (~~2~~ 2 Chronicles 3:1), does not seem to have removed it entirely out of the tribe of Benjamin.

General Description of the Temple Proper. — This we find well summarized in Winer (*Realwörterb.* 2, 583 sq.), from the combined statements of the Talmud and Josephus (the latter, however, although a priest by birth, and therefore entitled to admission to the building, so constantly mixes the description of Herod's with that of Solomon's Temple that we must often distrust his details).

This edifice was constructed upon new foundations (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 3), and of white marble, the blocks being in some instances 45 cubits long, 6 broad and 5 high (*War.* 5, 5, 6; *comp. Ant.* 15:11,3). The entire width (from north to south) of the porch was (exteriorly) 100 cubits; but the remainder (rear part) of the building was only 60 cubits (according to the Talmudists 70, including the side chamber of 5 cubits, the wall of 6 cubits, etc.), so that the porch projected 20 (or 15) cubits on each side beyond the rest of the structure. Its length was also 100 cubits, and its height the same; but Josephus says (*Anc.* 15:11, 3) that eventually it sank 20 cubits (the original height being 120), a statement which Hirt (p. 10) regards (probably with justice) as a mere legend. The interior space was, according to Josephus, so divided that the porch had a length (from north to south) of 50 cubits, a breadth of 20, and a height of 90 (*comp. War.* 5, 5, 5); the holy place a length of 40 cubits, a breadth of 20, and a height of 60; and the most holy place a length and breadth of 20 cubits, and a height of 60; but the Talmud (*Middoth*, 4:6) makes the height of both the latter rooms to have been only 40 cubits, by which we suspect it means the extra height above the ceiling of the most holy place, since this last was a perfect cube. The entire building also seems to have been 100 cubits in each dimension, as Josephus in the main indicates, although his numbers in several passages appear to be confused or corrupt. This: likewise is the statement of the Talmud (*ibid.* 4:7), according to which the length (from east to west) of the porch was only 11 cubits, that of the sanctuary 40 cubits, and that of the shrine 20 cubits; while on the west, below the holy of holies, was a space (for a chamber) of 6 cubits (*comp. also ibid.* 4:3), besides 23 cubits: for the thickness of the walls and partitions. If, as Josephus and the Talmud both state, the porch was 100 cubits high, but (as the latter states) only 90 high on the inside, the difference of 10 cubits may have been that of the peaked roof, if a gable; but the difference in their numbers as to the height

of the rear portion of the building gives probability to the statement of the Talmud (*ibid.* 4:6) that there was an upper room (הַיִּל ~~הַי~~) over the holy and most holy places, containing trap-doors in the floor, through which workmen were let down into the most holy place to make repairs' (*ibid.* 4:5), Josephus calls this part of the building τὸ ὑπερφῶν μέρος, and the Talmud gives it a height of 40 cubits, which apparently refers only to the intermediate space left by the difference between the holy and the most holy place. As to the style of the roof (whether flat or peaked) Josephus says nothing; he only remarks (*War*, 5, 5, 6) that it was surmounted (κατὰ κορυφήν) by golden spikes (ὄβελοι), probably of gilded iron, fastened with lead, for scaring away the birds; the same are mentioned in the Talmud (brw[hl wk, *Middoth*, 4:6), where they are said to have been one cubit in height. The roof itself appears, according to the Mishna, to have been a low gable (see L'Empereur, *ad Middoth*, 4:6), with a balustrade (hp[m) three cubits high. The space above the הַיִּל ~~הַי~~ is thus divided (*Middoth*, 4:6): 1 cubit rwyk (? ceiling); 2 cubits hpl d tyb (place of rain-water); 1 cubit hrqm (timber); 1 cubit hbyz [m (flooring); 3 cubits railing; 1 cubit scarecrows. On both sides of the interior apartments was a space of 20 cubits devoted to a suite of rooms (οὐλοκολ ῥπιX-ρεψο), which, however, extended only 60 cubits high (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 3; *War*, 5, 5,5). According to the Talmud (*Middoth*, 4:3), these (μυαἶ) were in all 38; namely, 15 on the north and south side each, and 8 on the west or rear (comp the "many mansions," μοναὶ πολλαί, of ~~414~~John 14:2). The shoulder or projecting space (north and south) on each side of the porch (40 cubits in Josephus, 30 in the Talmud) was used as a depository of the sacrificial implements (twpl yj h tyb, *locus secespitarumi*, *Middoth*, 4, 7).

Picture for Temple 11

The most holy place, which was entirely empty (ἔκειτο οὐδὲν ὄλ:ως ἐν αὐτῷ, Josephus, *War*, 5, 5,5), except the stone (yhtv `ba) which occupied the place of the ark (Mishn a, *Yoa*, 5, 2), and on which the high-priest set the censer (the rabbins relate many marvels concerning it), was separated at the doorway from the holy place (Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 5) by a veil καταπέτασμα), which was torn by the earthquake at Jesus' death (~~475~~Matthew 27:51). The rabbins speak of a double veil: according to the Talmud these occupied a space of 1 cubit between the apartments

(*ysqr f*, *Middoth*, 4:7). The holy place had an entrance with two gold-plated door-leaves, which, according to Josephus (*War*, 5, 5, 4), were 55 cubits high and 16 broad; but, according to the Mishlia (*Middoth*, 4:1), 20 cubits high and 10 broad — a difference which Lightfoot reconciles by supposing that Josephus includes the decorations (cornice, entablature, etc.). The Talmudists also speak of a *double* door at this passage, which the thickness of the walls renders probable. The sanctuary stood open, or was closed only by a screen of embroidered Babylonian tapestry of byssus. See VAIL. As furniture of the holy place Josephus mentions only the seven-armed candelabrum, the table of shew-bread, and the altar of incense. The porch had a doorway 70 cubits high and 25 broad (Mishna, 40 high and 20 broad, *Middoth*, 3, 7: probably to be reconciled as above). The porch contained two tables, one of marble, the other of gold, on which the priests daily set respectively the old and the fresh shew-bread taken from and carried into the Temple (Mishna, *Shekel*. 6:4).

In front of the porch, within the priests' court, stood in close proximity (but somewhat to the south, *Middoth*, 3, 6) the laver (*r/YKæ*) and there (22 cubits from the porch) stood the great altar, *SEE BURNT-OFFERING*, the intervening space being regarded as especially holy (Mishna, *Cluelim*, 1, 9). North of this were 6 rows of rings (in the pavement.), to which the animals to be slaughtered were fastened; a little beyond were low pillars with cedar beams across them, from which the sacrifices were suspended: and between these pillars stood marble tables (*twnj l ç çyç l ç*), on which their flesh and entrails were laid (*Middoth*, 3, 5; 5, 2; *Tamid*, 3, 5; *Shekalim*, 6:4). West of the altar stood two tables; one of marble, on which the fat of the victims was deposited; the other of silver (?), upon which were kept the implements for this service. *SEE SACRIFICIAL OFFERING*.

3. Magnificence of the Central Building. — The vast sums which Herod laid out in adorning this structure gave it the most magnificent and imposing appearance. "Its appearance," says Josephus "had everything that could strike the mind and astonish the sight. For it was on every side covered with solid plates of gold so that when the sun rose upon it, it reflected such a strong and dazzling effulgence that the eye of the beholder was obliged to turn away from it, being no more able to sustain its radiance than the splendor of the sun" (*War*, 5, 5, 4). To strangers who approached the capital, it appeared, at a distance, like a huge mountain covered with

snow. For where it was not decorated with plates of gold, it was extremely white and glistening. The historian, indeed, says that the Temple of Herod was the most astonishing structure he had ever seen or heard of, as well on account of its architecture as its magnitude, and likewise the richness and magnificence of its various parts, and the fame and reputation of its sacred appurtenances. Tacitus calls it *imensce opulencie templum* (*Hist.* 5, 12).. Its external glory, indeed, consisted not only in the opulence and magnificence of the building, but also in the rich gifts with which it was adorned, and which excited the admiration of those who beheld them (⁽⁴²¹⁵⁾Luke 21:5). In the portico the various votive offerings made both by Jews and foreigners were deposited (see Richter, *Ανθήματα Templi Hierosol.* [Lips. 1764]). Among these treasures (2 Mac. 3, 2; 9:16; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:16, 4: 18:3' 5; 19:6,1 1; *War.* 2, 17, 3; 5, 13, 6; *Apion.* 2, 2; Philo, *Opp.* 2, 569, 591) we find specially mentioned a large golden table, presented by Pompey the Great, and several golden vines of exquisite workmanship and immense size; for Josephus assures us that some of the clusters of golden grapes were as tall as a man (*War.* 5, 5, 4). One such golden vine (*bhz l ç ^pg*, *Middoth*, 3,:8) especially seems to have been trained up over the entire front of the building (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 3; comp. Tacit. *Hist.* 5, 5). See the monographs *De Vite Aurea in Templo* by J;inus [Lips. 1706], Green [ibid. 1737], and Huldrich [Zür. 1782]j). Herod, in imitation of the Greeks and Romans, suspended in the porch several of the rich spoils and trophies which he had taken from the Arabs and other barbarous tribes of the East. This was a common custom among the heathen nations; Virgil introduces Eneas boasting of having suspended the spoils which he took from the Greeks, oil the portals of a Grecian temple- (*En.* 3). **SEE GAMMADIM.**

IX. *The Apocalyptic Temple.* — In the vision of Johnon Patmos he expressly- tells us respecting the New Jerusalem, “I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof” (⁽⁴²¹²⁾Revelation 21:22). The celestial city itself, in other words, is to be one vast temple filled with the perpetual Shechinah. We here give Paine’s sketch of the ideal city on the mountain, the length of which was equal to its breadth, and this again was equal to the height of the city above the plain (ver. 16).

Picture for Temple 12

X. *Sacred Observances Connected with the Temple.*

1. *The Daily Service.* — The following is an outline of the regular duties of the priesthood:

(1.) *The morning service.* After having enjoyed their repose, the priests bathed themselves in the rooms provided for that purpose and waited the arrival of the president of the lots. This officer having arrived, they divided themselves into two companies, each of which was provided with lamps or torches, and made a circuit of the Temple, going in different directions, and meeting at, the pastryman's chamber on the south-side of the gate Nicanor. Having summoned him to prepare the cakes for the high-priest's meat offering, they retired with the president to the south-east corner of the court and cast lots for the duties connected with the altar. The priest being chosen to remove the ashes from the altar, he again wash-ed his feet at the laver, and then with the silver shovel proceeded to his work. As soon as he had removed one shovel full of the ashes, the other priests retired to wash their hands and feet, and then joined him in cleansing the altar and *renewing* the fires. The next act was to cast lots for the thirteen particular duties connected with offering the sacrifice; which being settled, the president ordered one of them to fetch the lamb for the morning sacrifice. While the priests on this duty were engaged in fetching and examining the victim, those who carried the keys were opening the seven gates of the Court of Israel and the two doors that separated between the porch and the holy place; When the last of the seven gates was opened, the silver trumpets gave a flourish to call the Lesites to their deks for the music, and the stationary men to their places as the representatives of the people. The opening of the folding-doors of the Temple was the established signal for killing the sacrifice, which was cut in pieces and carried to the top of the altar, where it was salted and left while the priests once more retired to the room Gazithi to join in prayer. While the sacrifice was lain in the court of the priests, the two priests appointed to trim the lamps and cleanse the altar of incense were attending to their duties in the holy place. After the conclusion of their prayer and a rehearsal of the ten commandments and their phylacteries, the priests again cast lots to choose two to offer incense on the golden altar, and another to lay the pieces of the sacrifice on the fire of the brazen altar. The lot being determind, the two who were to offer the incense proceeded to discharge their duty, the time for which was between the sprinkling of the blood and the laying the pieces upon the altar, in the morning, and in the evening, between the laying the pieces upon the altar and the drink offering. As they proceeded to the Temple

they rang the *megemphita*, or great bell, to warn the absent priests to come to worship, the absent Levites to come to sing, and the stationary men to bring to the gate Nicanor those whose purification was not perfected. The priest who carried the censer of coals which had been taken from one of the three fires on the great altar, after kindling the fire on the incense altar, worshipped and came out into the porch, heaving the priest who had the incense alone in the holy place. As soon as the signal was given by the president, the incense was kindled, the holy place was filled with perfume, and the congregation without joined in the prayers (~~QUB~~ Luke 1:9). These being ended, the priest whose lot it was to lay the pieces of the sacrifice upon the altar threw them into the fire, and then, taking the tongs, disposed them in somewhat of their natural order. The four priests who had been in the holy place now appeared upon the steps that led to the porch, and, extending their arms so as to raise their hands higher than their heads, one of them pronounced the solemn blessing (~~QUB~~ Numbers 6:24-26). After this benediction, the daily meat offering was offered; then the meat-offering of the high priest; and last of all the drink-offering; at the conclusion of which the Levites began the song of praise, and at every pause in the music the trumpets sounded and the people worshipped. This was the termination of the morning service. It should be stated that the morning service of the priests began with the dawn of day, except in the great festivals, when it began much earlier; the sacrifice was offered immediately after sunrise.

(2.) During the *middle of the day*, the priests held themselves in readiness to offer the sacrifices which might be presented by any of the Israelites either of a voluntary or an expiatory nature. Their duties would therefore vary according to the number and nature of the offerings they might have to present.

(3.) The *evening service* varied in a very trifling measure from that of the morning; and the same priests ministered, except when there was one in the house of their Father who had never burned incense, in which case that office was assigned to him, or, if there were more than one, they cast lots who should be employed. *SEE DAILY OFFERING.*

2. *Holiness of the Place.* — The injunction of ~~QUB~~ Leviticus 19:3, “Ye shall reverence my sanctuary,” laid the people under an obligation to maintain a solemn and holy behavior when they came to worship in the Temple. We have already seen that such as were ceremonially unclean were forbidden to enter the sacred court on pain of death; but in the course of time there

were several prohibitions enforced by the Sanhedrim which the law had not named. The following have been collected by Lightfoot out of the Rabbinical writings (*Temple Service*, ch.10) 10.

- (1.) “No man might enter the mountain of the house with his staff.”
- (2.) “None might enter in thither with his shoes on his feet? though he might with his sandals.
- (3.) “Nor might any man enter the mountain of the house with his scrip on.”
- (4.) “Nor might he come in with the dust on his feet,” but he must wash or wipe them, “and look to his feet when he entered into the house of God,” to remind him, perhaps, that he should than shake off all worldly thoughts and affections.
- (5.) “Nor with money in his purse.” He, might bring it in his *hand*, however; and in this way it was brought in for various purposes. If this had not been the case, it would seem strange that the cripple should have been placed at the gate of the Temple to ask *alms* of those who **p**entered therein (see ~~HRD~~ Acts 3:2).
- (6.) None might spit in the Temple; if he were necessitated to spit, it must be done in some corner of his garment.”
- (7.) “He might not use any irreverent gesture, especially before the gate of Nicanor,” that being exactly in front of the Temple.
- (8.) “He might not make the mountain of the house a thoroughfare,” for the purpose of reaching the place by a nearer way; for it was devoted to the purposes of religion.
- (9.) “He that went into the court must go leisurely and “gravely into his place; and there he must demean himself, as in the presence of the Lord God, in all reverence and fear.”
- (10.) “He must worship standing, with his feet close to each other, his eyes directed to the ground, his hands upon his breast, with the right one above the left” (see ~~DRIC~~ Luke 18:13).
- (11.) “No one, however weary, might sit down in the court.” The only exception was in favor of the kings of the house of David.

(12.) “None might pray with his head uncovered. And the wise men and their scholars never prayed without a veil.” This custom is alluded to in 1. Corinthians 11:4, where the apostle directs the men .to reverse the practice adopted in the Jewish Temple.

(13.) Their bodily gesture in bowing before the Lord was either “bending of the knees,” “bowing the head,” or “falling prostrate on the ground.”

(14.) Having performed the service, and being about to retire, “they might not ‘turn their backs upon the altar.” They therefore went backwards till they were out of the court.

Concerning the high veneration which the Jews cherished for their Temple, Dr. Harwood has collected some interesting particulars from Philo, Josephus, and the writings of Luke. Their reverence for the sacred edifice was such that rather than witness its defilement they would cheerfully submit to death. They could not bear the least disrespectful or dishonorable thing to be said of it. The least injurious slight of it, real or apprehended, instantly awakened all the choler of a Jew, and was an affront never to be forgiven. Our Savior, in the course of his public instructions, happening to say, “Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up again” (⁽⁴¹²⁹⁾John 2:19) it was construed into a contemptuous disrespect, designedly thrown out against the Temple-his words instantly descended into the heart of a Jew and kept rankling there for several years; for, upon his trial, this declaration, which it was impossible for a Jew ever to forget or to forgive, was alleged against him as big with the most atrocious guilt and impiety (⁽⁴¹⁶¹⁾Matthew 26:61). Nor was the rancor and virulence which this expression had occasioned at all softened—by all the affecting circumstances of that excruciating and’ wretched death they saw him die; even as he hung upon the cross, with infinite triumph, scorn, and exultation, they upbraided him with it, contemptuously shaking their heads and saying, “O thou who couldst demolish our Temple and rear it up again in all its splendor in the space of three days, now save thyself, and descend from the cross” (⁽⁴¹⁷⁴⁾Matthew 27:40). Their superstitious veneration for the Temple further appears from the account of Stephen. When his adversaries were baffled and confounded by that superior wisdom and those distinguished gifts he possessed, they were so exasperated at the victory he had gained over them that they went aid suborned persons to swear that they had-heard him speak blasphemy against Moses and against God. These inflaming the populace, the magistrates, and the Jewish clergy, he

was seized, dragged away, and brought before the Sanhedrim. Here the false witnesses whom they had procured stood up and said, "This person before you is continually uttering the most reproachful expressions against this sacred place" (~~4013~~ Acts 6:13), meaning the Temple. This was blasphemy not to-be pardoned. A judicature composed of high-priests and scribes would never forgive such impiety. We witness the same thing in the case of Paul when they imagined that he had taken Trophimus, an Ephesian, with him into the Temple; for which insult they had determined to imbrue their hands' in his blood (21, 28, etc.).

XI. Literature. — As we have said above, the two classical authorities on the Temple are the general description of Josephus (*Ant.* 15:11, and *War.* 5, 5) and the minute account of the Herodian building in the Talmudic tract *Middoth* (Mishna, 5, 10), which has been edited and commented upon by L'Empereur of Oppyck (Lugd. Bat. 1630, 4to). Among the older works on the 'subject we especially name vols. 8 and 9 of *Antiquitates Hebraicae*, by Ugolino, which contain, in addition to other dissertations, Moses Maimonides, *Constitutiones de Domo Electa*; Abraham ben- David, *De Templo*; see also Schulze, *De Variis Judceorum Erroribus in Descriptione Templi Secundi* (F. ad M. 1756; also prefixed to his edition of Reland, *De Spoliis Templi Hierosolymitani* [Ultraj. 1775]), Hafenrefer, *Templum Ezech.* (Tubing. 1613); Villalpando and Prado, *In Ezechiel*; Jud. Leo, *Libri Quatuor de Templo Hieros. tam Priori quam Poster. ex Hebr. Lat. Vers.* a J. Sanbert (Helmst. 1665, 4to); Cappellus, *Τρισάγιον, sive Triplex Templi Delineatio* (Amst. 1643, 4to; also inserted in the *Critici Anglicani*, vol. 8; and in vol. 1 of Walton's Polyglot); Harenberg, *In d. Brem. u. Verdisch. Biblioth.* 4:1 sq., 573 sq., 879 sq.; Lamy, *De Tabern. Faed., Urbe Hieros. et de Templo* (Par. 1720 sq.); Cremer, *De Salom. Templo* (Harderov. 1748) Ernesti, *De Templo Herod.* (Lips. 1752); Grulick, *De Divino in Templo Ezech. Consilio* (Vitemb. 1775). Monographs on the Temple in Hebrew have been written by C. Altschul (Amst. 1724), J. M. Altschul (ibid. 1782), W. Altschul (Sklov, 1794; Warsaw, 1814), Leone (Amst. 1660; Middelb. 1642; in Latin by Saubert [Helmst. 1665]), Heller (Prague, 1602; F. ad M. 1714), Chefez (Ven. 1696), Wilna (Sklov, 1802), Snizler (Lond. 1825). The principal later works on the subject are those of Lightfoot, *Descriptio Templi Hierosolymitani*, in *Opp.* 1, 533 sq.; Hirt, *Der Tempel Salomons* (Berlin, 1809, 4to); Stieglitz, *Gesch. der Baukunst* (Nuremb. 1827), p. 125 sq.; Less, *Beitrdge zur Geschich. d. ausbild. Baukunst* (Leips. 1834), i, 63 sq.; Meyer, *Der Tempel Salom.* (Berlin,

1830; inserted also in *Blatterf. höhere Wahrheit*, 1); Grilneisen, in the *Kunstblatt z. Morgenbl.* 1831, No. 73-75, 77-80. Other works are mentioned by Meusel, *Biblioth. Histor.* 1; 2, 113 sq.; and Winer, *Realwörterb. s.v. Tempel.*" See also Bennett, *The Temple of Ezekiel* (Lond. 1824); Isreels, *Ezekiel's Temple* (ibid. 1827); Kirchner, *Der Tempel zu Jerus.* (Neu-Ebers. 1834); El-Sinti, *Hist. of the Temple* (from the Arabic by Reynolds, Lond. 1837); Keil, *Der Tempel Salomo's* (Dorp. 1839); Kopp, *id.* (Stuttgart, 1839); the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1844, 2, 320, 361; Thenius, *Erklar. d. Konige*, in the *Kurzgef. exeq. Handb.* 9. Anhang, p. 25 sq.; Bahr, *Der Salom. Tempel* (Carlsru. 1848); Balmer-Rinck, *Gesch. d. Tempel-Architectur* (Ludwigsb. 1858). The latest works are those of Bannister, *The Temples of the Hebrews* (Lond. 1861); Paine, *Solomon's Temple*, etc. (Bost. 1861); Unruh, *D. alte Jerus. u. s. Bauwerke* (Lagensatz, 1861); Rosen, *Der Tempel-Platz des Moria* (Gotha, 1866); Fergusson, *The Temples of the Jews* (Lond. 1878). This last and most pretentious effort at reconstructing the Jewish Temple is thoroughly vitiated by two favorite preconceptions of the author—namely, a false location of the structure at the south-west angle of the Haram, and an overweening estimate of modern architectural taste as a guide on so ancient a subject. Thus he flippantly dismisses the explicit—and repeated Rabbinical statement of the dimensions of the Court of the Women as “absurd” (p. 98) and “impossible” (p. 117), because it cannot be got within his imaginary “rectangle 600 feet square” (Josephus's round number for the entire Temple area). He falsely asserts that this Rabbinical account “is borrowed avowedly; but unintelligently, from Ezekiel” (p. 117), ignoring the fact that the Mishna, which contains these measurements, has come down, traditionally if not in writing, from contemporaries of Herod's Temple itself. What a pity that these authorities, or even Herod himself, did not have the benefit of such learned criticism on their work!

Temple

This name was scarcely ever used in the first three ages by any Christian writer for a church, but only for the heathen temples; but when idolatry was destroyed, and temples were purged and consecrated as Christian churches, then the writers of the following ages freely gave them the name of temples. At first no idol temples were made use of as churches, but were generally tolerated until the twenty-fifth year of Constantine. A.D. 333. In that year he published his laws commanding the destruction of temples, altars, and images. This policy was continued until the reign of Theodosius,

when another method was adopted, and we find the emperor turning the famous temple of Heliopolis, called Balanium, into a Christian church. Honorius (A.D. 408) published two laws forbidding the destruction of temples in the cities, because, being purged, they might serve for ornament or public use. Bede (lib. i. c. 30) tells us “that Gregory the Great gave Austin the monk instructions about the temples among the Saxons in Britain, that if they were well built they should not be destroyed, but only converted to the service of the true God.” Sometimes the temples were pulled down, and the materials were given to the Church, out of which new edifices were erected for the service of religion.’ Sometimes additions were made to the emoluments of the clergy by the donation of heathen temples and the revenues that were settled upon them, although the latter were usually appropriated by the emperors themselves. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 5, ch. 4:§ 10; bk. 8:ch. 1, § 6; ch. 2, § 4.

Temple, Daniel

a Congregational minister, was born at Reading, Mass., Dec. 23, 1789. He was employed in mechanical labors until he was twenty-one years old. In 1810 he was converted, and joined the Church. His attention was called to the missionary field by reading Buchanan’s *Researches*, and he commenced the work of preparation by entering Phillips Academy at Andover. He subsequently entered Dart-mouth College, from which he graduated in 1817. His influence for good in college was great. He spent three years at the Andover Theological Seminary, and was licensed to preach at Billerica by the Andover association in August, 1820. After being employed one year in Massachusetts by the American board, he was ordained at the same time with the Rev. Isaac Bird at North Bridgewater, Oct. 3, 1821. After his marriage with Miss Rachel B. Dix, he ‘sailed from Boston for Malta, Jan. 2, 1822 carrying with him the first printing-press, which has since proved such a blessing to the people of the Orient. His wife died in Malta in 1827. Two of his four children survive, and are now preaching the Gospel. He returned to America in 1830, and after remaining a short time, during which he married again, he went back to Malta, where he remained until 1833 when he left for Smyrna, taking with him the whole printing establishment. Though he first set up the press in Malta, its productions were for regions beyond. The authorities ordered the press away from Smyrna, yet he retained it until he left the coast. He established schools there among the Greeks, but whoever would see what he accomplished must go to Constantinople, Aintab, and elsewhere in that land. He

continued his connection with the press until he left the mission, in 1844, and returned to America. After his return, he commenced preaching at Phelps. Ontario Co., N. Y., where: his labors were greatly blessed. His acquaintance with the Scriptures was wonderful, being familiar with every part of them. For some time before his end he was not able to preach; but in sickness and in health, in suffering as in labors, he glorified his Master until his death, which took place at Reading, Mass., Aug. 11, 1851. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 677 sq. (W.V.S.) Temporal, a term often used for *secular*, in a distinction from spiritual or ecclesiastical; likewise for anything belonging to time in contrast with eternity.

Temporal Power of the Pope

is a phrase susceptible of two meanings which are very distinct from each other, and the confusion of which has led to frequent and serious misunderstanding.

I. In one of these senses it means the sovereign power possessed by the pope as ruler of the Papal States, or STATES OF THE CHURCH *SEE STATES OF THE CHURCH* (q.v.), where the history of its origin, progress, and downfall is briefly detailed. The question as to the necessity or utility of such power vested in the hands of a spiritual ruler, and even its lawfulness and its compatibility with his spiritual duties, has been warmly debated. This controversy is not of entirely recent origin, for many of the medieval sectaries urged the incompatibility of the spiritual with the temporal power in the same person, not only in relation to the pope, but also to the baron-bishops. Such were the doctrines of the Vaudois, of Pierre de Bruis, and especially of Arnold of Brescia. In the centuries following, the antipapal controversies turned so entirely upon doctrine that there was little attention paid to this question. It did not enter in any way into the conflict of Gallican and Ultramontane principles. Even Bossuet not only admitted the lawfulness of the pope's temporal sovereignty, but contended that it was in some sense necessary to the free exercise of his spiritual power. The controversy only assumed any practical interest during the conflict between Pius VII and Napoleon I, the design of the latter of annexing papal territory to France being one of the main causes of dispute. No formal and authoritative judgment of the Roman Church has been pronounced regarding the question of temporal power, but a strong and almost unanimous expression of opinion was tendered to the late pope, Pius IX, in the form of letters and addresses from bishops and others in

every part of Catholic Christendom. They profess that the possession of temporal power is no essential part of the privileges of the successor of Peter, but they regard it as the means providentially established for the protection of the spiritual independence of the pope and the free exercise of his functions as spiritual ruler of the Church.

II. By the second signification of the phrase “temporal power of the pope” is understood what would more properly be called the claim of the pope, in virtue of his office, to a power over the temporalities of other kings and states. This power may be of two kinds:

1. *Directive*, or the power, as supreme moral teacher, to instruct all members of his Church, whether subjects or sovereigns, in the moral duties of their several states.

2. *Coercive*. If the power be regarded as coercive, it is necessary to distinguish the nature of the coercion which may be employed. Coercion may either consist in the threat or infliction of *purely spiritual censures*, or it may involve temporal consequences, such as suspension or deprivation from office, forfeiture of the allegiance of subjects, and even liability to the punishment of death. In the former sense it may be regarded as the natural consequence of the spiritual headship of the Church, which is acknowledged by all Catholics. But the claim to authority over the temporalities of kings has gone far beyond these limits. From the 10th century popes have claimed and repeatedly exercised a power of coercing kings, and have punished them when refractory by suspension, by deprivation, and by the transfer of the allegiance of their subjects. This claim has been a subject of controversy between the Gallican and Ultramontane schools, and in the latter two theories have been devised for its explanation. The first and most extreme supposes that this power was given directly by God to Peter and his successors; that the two powers are foreshown by the “two swords” (~~4228~~ Luke 22:38); and that the temporal power is a privilege of the primacy by divine law equally with the spiritual sovereignty itself. The second, or *indirect*, theory holds that the temporal power is not directly of divine institution, but is an indirect though necessary consequence of the spiritual supremacy, and is only given as a means of completing and, in a corrupt and disorganized state, rendering more efficacious the work which the spiritual supremacy is directly instituted to accomplish. In this latter form the theory of the temporal

power was defended by cardinal Bellarmine, and the celebrated declaration of the Gallican clergy in 1862 was directed against it.

A third view of the temporal power was propounded by Fenelon, and is generally described as the “historical theory of the temporal power.” According to this, the pope does not possess, whether by direct divine appointment or in virtue of the necessities of his spiritual office, any temporal power whatsoever; but he possesses the plenitude of spiritual power which is required for the government of the Church, and is empowered to enforce it by spiritual penalties, and especially by excommunication. Although these penalties are purely spiritual, yet the religious sentiment and awe with which the Church is regarded by many invest them with certain temporal effects. In several countries, as England (A.D. 859), France, Spain (A.D. 638), and Germany, the forfeiture of certain civil rights was attached, in the case of private persons, to the spiritual censure of excommunication. The same spirit of the age is seen in the form of the oath taken at the coronation of the sovereign in many countries, by which the monarch swore to be the protector and defender of the sovereign pontiff and the holy Catholic Church thus making their kingdoms feudatory to the see of Rome. From these and similar indications of the public feeling of the medieval time, the advocates of this theory of the temporal power infer that orthodoxy and obedience to the pope were accepted as a condition of the tenure of supreme civil authority. On the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile this theory with the language used by the popes in enforcing their claims to temporal authority, and with the fact that such power continued to be claimed and exercised until very recent times. See Barnum, *Romanism As It Is*; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*; and the articles PAPACY *SEE PAPACY* and *SEE STATES OF THE CHURCH*.

Temporalities of Bishops

as, in law, are the lay revenues, lands, tenements, and fees belonging to the sees of bishops or archbishops, as they are barons and lords of Parliament, including their baronies. They are defined as all things which a bishop hath by livery from the king, as manors, lands, tithes. From the time of Edward I to the Reformation, it was customary, when bishops received their temporalities from the king, to renounce in writing all right to the same by virtue of any provision from the pope, and to admit that they received them from the king alone. The custody of these temporalities is said by

Blackstone to form part of the king's ordinary revenue, and thus, a vacancy in the bishopric occurring, is a right of the crown, originating in its prerogative in Church matters, the king being, in intendment of law, preserver of all episcopal sees. For the same reason, before the dissolution of religious houses, the sovereign had the custody of the temporalities of all such abbeys and priories as were of royal foundation. There is another reason in virtue of which the king possesses this right, which is, that as the successor is not known, the property of the see would be liable to spoil and devastation. The law, therefore, has wisely given to the king the custody of these temporalities until a new election, with power to take to himself all intermediate profits, and to present to all preferments falling vacant during the vacancy of the see. This revenue cannot be granted to a subject; but the 14 Edward III, stat. 4 ch. 4:5, empowers the king, on a vacancy occurring, to lease the temporalities to the dean and chapter, with a reservation of all advowsons, escheats, and the like. To remedy the wrongs to the Church perpetrated by former sovereigns, who sometimes kept bishoprics vacant in order to enjoy the possession of their temporalities, and when *they* did supply the vacancy compelled the new bishop to purchase back his temporalities at an exorbitant price, Henry I, by charter, agreed neither to sell, let to farm, nor take anything from the domains of the Church until the successor was installed. By Magna Charta provision was made that no waste should be committed in the temporalities of the bishoprics, and that neither should the custody of them be sold. At present this revenue of the crown is of very small account; for as soon as the new bishop is consecrated and confirmed, he usually receives, restitution of his temporalities entire and untouched from his sovereign, to whom he at the same time does homage, and then possesses, which he did not before, a fee simple in his bishopric, and may maintain an action for the profits.

Tempt

is used in the Bible in the Latin sense of *prove*, as a rendering especially of ׀ j B; *bachdn*, and πειράζω, which both signify to *test* or *try*. It is applied to various beings in different senses, not always involving an evil purpose wherein the temptation is presented to the mind as an inducement to sin.

SEE TEMPTATION.

1. God is said to have tempted Abraham by commanding him to offer up his son Isaac (^{<0120>}Genesis 22:1), intending to prove his obedience and faith, to confirm and strengthen him by this trial, and to furnish in his person an

example and pattern of perfect obedience for all succeeding ages. God does not tempt or try men in order to ascertain their tempers and dispositions, as if he were ignorant of them, but to exercise their virtue, to purify it, to render it conspicuous to others, to give them an opportunity of receiving favors from his hands. When we read in Scripture that God proved his people, whether they would walk in his law or not (^{<1004>}Exodus 16:4), and that he permitted false prophets to arise among them, who prophesied vain things to try them whether they ^ϕ would seek the Lord with their whole hearts, we should interpret these expressions by that of James (1, 13-14), “Let no man say when he is tempted, ‘I am tempted of God,’ for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed.”

2. The devil tempts us to evil of every kind, and lays snares for us, even in our best actions. Satan, having access to the sensorium, lays inducements before the minds of men to solicit them to sin (^{<4005>}1 Corinthians 7:5; ^{<5105>}1 Thessalonians 3:5; ^{<5013>}James 1:13, 14). Hence Satan is called that old serpent, the devil, and “the tempter” (^{<6120>}Revelation 12:9; ^{<4005>}Matthew 4:3), and the temptation of our first parents to sin is expressly recognized as the work of the devil (^{<0001>}Genesis 3:1-15; ^{<8044>}John 8:44; ^{<7105>}2 Corinthians 11:3; ^{<6005>}1 John 3:8). He tempted our Savior in the wilderness, and endeavored to infuse into him sentiments of pride, ambition, and distrust (^{<0001>}Matthew 4:1; ^{<0013>}Mark 1:13; ^{<0002>}Luke 4:2). He tempted Ananias and Sapphira to lie to the Holy Ghost (^{<4005>}Acts 5:3). In the prayer that Christ himself has taught us, we pray God “to lead us not into temptation” (^{<0013>}Matthew 6:13); and a little before his death, our Savior exhorted his disciples to “watch and pray, that they might not enter into temptation” (26:41). Paul says, “God will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able to bear” (^{<6005>}1 Corinthians 10:13).

3. Men are said to tempt the Lord when they unseasonably require proofs of the divine presence, power, or goodness. Without doubt, we are allowed to seek the Lord for his assistance, and to pray him to give us what we need; but it is not allowed us to tempt him, nor to expose ourselves to dangers from which we cannot escape unless by miraculous interposition of his omnipotence.. God is not obliged to work miracles in our favor; he requires of us only the performance of such actions as are within the ordinary measures of our strength. The Israelites in the desert repeatedly tempted the Lord, as if they had reason to doubt his presence among them,

or his goodness, or his power, after all his appearances in their favor (~~<0142>~~Exodus 16:2, 7, 17; ~~<0412>~~Numbers 20:12; ~~<4788>~~Psalms 78:18, 41, etc.).

4. Men tempt or try one another when they would know whether things are really what they seem to be, whether men are such as they are thought or desired to be. The queen of Sheba came to prove the wisdom of Solomon by proposing riddles for him to explain (~~<1110>~~1 Kings 11:1; ~~<4401>~~2 Chronicles 9:1). Daniel desired of him who had the care of feeding him and his companions to prove them for some days whether abstinence from food of certain kinds would make them leaner (~~<2012>~~Daniel 1:12,14). The scribes and Pharisees often tempted our Savior, and endeavored to decoy him into their snares (~~<0101>~~Matthew 16:1; 19:3; 22:18).

Temptation

((hSmj πειρασμός, both meaning *trial*) in the modern usage of the term, is the enticement of a person to commit sin by offering some seeming advantage. There are four things, says one, in temptation (1) deception, (2) infection, (3) seduction, (4) perdition. The sources of temptation are Satan, the world, and the flesh. We are exposed to them in every state, in every place, and in every time of life. They may be wisely permitted to show us our weakness, to try our faith, to promote our humility, and to teach us to place our dependence on a superior Power; yet we must not run into them, but watch and pray; avoid sinful company; consider the love, sufferings, and constancy of Christ, and the awful consequences of falling a victim to temptation. The following rules have been laid down, by which we may in some measure know when a temptation comes from Satan:

- 1.** When the temptation is unnatural, or contrary to the general bias or temper of our minds;
- 2.** When it is opposite to the present frame of the mind;
- 3.** When the temptation itself is irrational, being contrary to whatever we could imagine our own minds would suggest to us;
- 4.** When a temptation is detested in its first rising and appearance;
- 5.** Lastly, when it is violent. See Brooks, Owen, Gilpin, Capel, and Gillespie on Temptation; South, *Seven Sermons on Temptation*, in vol. 6 of his *Sermons*; Pike and Hayward, *Cases of Conscience*; and Bishop Porteus, *Sermons*, vol. 1, ser. 3 and 4.

Temptation Of Christ.

Immediately after the inauguration of his ministry, Jesus was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil; and after enduring for forty days the general assault of Satan, he suffered three' special solicitations, which are recited in detail (^{<4001>}Matthew 4:1-11; ^{<4012>}Mark 1:12, 13; ^{<4003>}Luke 4:1-13). *SEE JESUS CHRIST.*

I. *Particulars and Drift of the Trial.* — In the first temptation the Redeemer is hungered, and when the devil bids him, if he be the Son of God, command that the stones may be made bread, there would seem to be no great sin in this use of divine power to overcome the pressing human want. Our Lord's answer is required to show us where the essence of the temptation lay. He takes the words of Moses to the children of Israel (^{<4003>}Deuteronomy 8:3), which mean, not that men must dispense with bread and feed only on the study of the Divine Word, but that our meat and drink, our food and raiment, are all the work of the creating hand of God, and that a sense of *dependence on God* is the duty of man. He tells the tempter that as the sons of Israel standing in the wilderness were forced to humble themselves and to wait upon the hand of God for the bread from heaven which he gave them, so the Son of man, fainting in the wilderness from hunger, will be humble and will wait upon his Father in heaven for the Word that shall bring him food, and will not be hasty to deliver himself from that dependent state, but will wait patiently for the gifts of his goodness.

In the second temptation, it is not probable that they left the wilderness, but that Satan was allowed to suggest to our Lord's mind the place and the marvel that could be wrought there. They stood, it has been suggested, on the lofty porch that overhung the valley of Kedron, where the steep side of the valley was added to the height of the Temple (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 5), and made a depth that the eye could scarcely have borne to look down upon. "Cast thyself down" perform in the holy city, in a public place, a wonder that will at once make all men confess that none but the Son of God could perform it. A passage from Psalm 91 is quoted to give a color to the argument. Our Lord replies by an allusion to another text that carries us back again to the Israelites wandering in the wilderness: "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah" (^{<4006>}Deuteronomy 6:16). Their conduct is more fully described by the psalmist as a tempting of God: They tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust; yea,

they spake against God: they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness? Behold he smote the rock that the waters gushed out and the streams overflowed. Can he give bread also? Can he provide flesh for his people?" (Psalm 78). Just parallel was the temptation here. God has protected thee so far, brought thee up, put his seal upon thee by manifest proofs of his favor. Can he do this also? Can he send the angels to buoy thee up in thy descent? Can he make the air thick to sustain and the earth soft to receive thee? The appropriate answer is, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

In the third temptation it is not asserted that there is any mountain from which the eyes of common men can see the world and its kingdoms at once displayed; it was with the mental vision of One who knew all things that these kingdoms and their glory were seen. Satan has now begun to discover, if he knew not from the beginning, that One is here who can become the King over them all. He says, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." In Luke the words are fuller: "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it;" but these words are the lie of the tempter, which he uses to mislead. "Thou art come to be great to be a King on the earth; but I am strong, and will resist thee. Thy followers shall be imprisoned and slain; some of them shall fall away through fear; others shall forsake thy cause, loving this present world. Cast in thy lot with me; let thy kingdom be an earthly kingdom, only the greatest of all a kingdom such as the Jews seek to see established on the throne of David. Worship me by living as the children of this world live, and so honoring me in thy life then all shall be thine." The Lord knows that the tempter is right in foretelling such trials to him; but though clouds and darkness hang over the path of his ministry he must work the work of him that sent him, and not another work: he must worship God, and none other. "Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." As regards the order of the temptations, there are internal marks that the account of Matthew assigns them their historical order. Luke transposes the last two, for which various reasons are suggested by commentators (~~400E~~ Matthew 4:1-11; ~~401D~~ Mark 1:12, 13; ~~401E~~ Luke 4:1-13).

The three temptations are addressed to the three forms in Which the disease of sin makes its appearance on the soul-to the solace of sense, and the love of praise, and the desire of gain (~~402E~~ 1 John 2:16); But there is one

element common to them all—they are attempts to call up a willful and wayward spirit, in contrast to a patient self-denying one. *SEE TEMPT.* The author of *Ecce Homo*, although he takes too subjective a view of the last temptation scene, has admirably developed the thought, as lying at the foundation of Christ's whole public demeanor, that he was constantly on his guard against the prevailing notion of an establishment of the Messiah's kingdom *by force* instead of the influence of love; and he well observes that the temptation to this course was one that must have presented itself at some time to the Redeemer's mind.

II. *Credibility and Design of the Narrative.* — That when our Lord retired to the interior part of the wilderness the enemy of mankind should present the most plausible temptation to our Redeemer, under these trying circumstances, is perfectly consistent with the malevolence of his character. The grand question is, Why was Satan suffered thus to insult the Son of God? Wherefore did the Redeemer suffer his state of retirement to be thus disturbed with the malicious suggestions of the fiend? It may be answered that herein (1) he gave an instance of his own condescension and humiliation, (2) he hereby proved his power over the tempter, (3) he set an example of firmness and virtue to his followers, and (4) he here affords consolation to his suffering people by showing *not* only that he himself was tempted, but is able to succor those who are tempted (^{<8023>} Hebrews 2:13; 4:15).

III. *Historical Character of the Scene.* — As the baptism of our Lord cannot have been for him the token of repentance and intended reformation which it was for sinful men, so does our Lord's sinlessness affect the nature of his temptation, for it was the trial of one who could not possibly have fallen. This makes a complete conception of the temptation impossible for minds wherein temptation is always associated with the possibility of sin. But while we must be content with an incomplete conception, we must avoid the wrong conceptions that are often substituted for it. The popular view of this undoubted portion of our Savior's history is that it is a narrative of outward transactions; that our Savior, immediately after his baptism, was conducted by the Spirit into the wilderness—either the desolate and mountainous region now called Quarantania by the people of Palestine (Kitto, *Phys. Hist.* p. 39, 40), or the great desert of Arabia, mentioned in ^{<8025>} Deuteronomy 8:15; 32:10; ^{<8026>} Hosea 13:5; Jeremiah 2, 6, etc. — where the devil tempted him in person, appeared to him in a visible form, spoke to

him in an audible voice, removed him to the summit “of an exceeding high mountain,” and to the top of “a pinnacle of the Temple at Jerusalem;” whereas the view taken by many learned commentators, ancient and modern, is that it is the narrative of a *vision*, which was designed to “supply that ideal experience of temptation, or trial, which it was provided in the divine counsels for our Lord to receive previously to entering upon the actual trials and difficulties of his ministry” (Bishop Maltby, *Sermons* [Lond. 1822], 2, 276). Farmer also considers it a “*divine vision*,” and endeavors with much learning and ingenuity to “illustrate the wise and benevolent intention of its various scenes as symbolical predictions and representations of the principal trials attending Christ’s public ministry” (*Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ’s Temptation* [Lond. 1776, 8vo], preface).

On behalf of the popular interpretation, it is urged that the accounts given by the evangelists convey no intimation that they refer to a vision; that the feeling of hunger could not have been merely ideal; that a vision of forty days’ continuance is incredible; that Moses, who was a type of, Christ, saw no “visions,” and that hence it may be concluded Christ did not; that it is highly probable there would be a personal conflict between Christ and Satan when the former entered on his ministry. Satan had ruined the first Adam, and might hope to prevail with the second (*Trollope, Analecta* [Lond. 1830], 1, 46). Why, too, say others, was our Lord taken up into a mountain to see a vision? As reasonably might Paul have taken the Corinthians into a mountain to “show them the more excellent way of charity” (~~4123~~ 1 Corinthians 12:31).

On the contrary side, it is rejoined that the evangelists do really describe the temptation as a vision. Matthew says, ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος; Mark, τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει; and Luke, ἦγετο ἐν τ πνεύματι. Do these phrases mean no more than that Jesus went by the guidance or impulse of the Spirit to a particular locality.? Do they not rather import that Christ was brought into the wilderness under the full influence of the prophetic spirit making suitable revelations to his mind? With regard to the hunger, the prophets are represented as experiencing bodily sensations in their visions (~~3488~~ Ezekiel 3:3; ~~6600~~ Revelation 10:10). Further arguments, derived from an unauthorized application of types, are precarious that the first Adam really had *no personal* encounter with Satan; that all the purposes of our Lord’s temptation might be answered by a vision, for, whatever might be the *mode*, the *effect* was intended to be

produced upon his mind and moral feelings, like Peter's vision concerning Cornelius, etc. (^{<4001>}Acts 10:11-17); that commentators least given to speculate allow that the temptation during the first forty days was carried on by mental suggestion only, and that the visible part of the temptation began "when the tempter *came* to him" (^{<4003>}Matthew 4:3; ^{<4003>}Luke 4:3; Scott, *ad loc.*); that with regard to Christ's being "taken up into an exceeding high mountain," Ezekiel says (^{<3402>}Ezekiel 40:2), "in the visions of God brought he me into the land of Israel, and set me upon a very high mountain," etc.; and that John says, "he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and *showed* me that great city, the holy Jerusalem" (^{<6210>}Revelation 21:10). But certain *direct arguments* are also urged on the same side. Thus, 'is it consistent with the sagacity and policy of the evil spirit to suppose that he appeared in his own proper person to our Lord uttering solicitations to evil? Was not this the readiest mode to frustrate his own intentions? Archbishop Seeker says, "certainly he did not appear what he was, for that would have entirely frustrated his intent" (*Sermons*, 2, 114). Chandler says, "The devil appeared not as himself, for that would have frustrated the effect of his temptation" (*Serm.* 3, 178). Seeker supposes that "Satan transformed himself into an angel of light;" but was it likely that he would put on this form in order to tempt our Lord to idolatry? (^{<4009>}Matthew 4:9). Chandler thinks he appeared as "a good man;" but would it have served his purpose to appear as a good man promising universal dominion? The supposition that the devil disguised himself in any form might indeed constitute the temptation a trial of our Lord's understanding, but not of his heart. Besides, Christ is represented as addressing him as "Satan" (ver. 10). It is further urged that the literal interpretation does but little honor to the Savior, whom it represents as carried or conducted "by the devil at his will," and therefore as accessory to his own temptation and danger; nor does it promote the consolation of his followers, none of whom could ever be similarly tempted. Our Lord indeed submitted to all the liabilities of the human condition; but do these involve the dominion of Satan over the body to the extent thus represented? The literal interpretation also attributes miraculous powers to the devil, who, though a spiritual being, is represented as becoming visible at pleasure, speaking in an audible voice, and conveying mankind where he pleases—miracles not inferior to what our Lord's preservation would have been had he cast himself headlong from the Temple. Suppose we even give up the old notion that "the devil hurried Christ through the air, and carried him from the wilderness to the Temple" (Benson, *Life of Christ*, p. 35),

and say, with-Doddridge and others, that “the devil took our Lord about with him as one person takes another to different places,” yet how without a miracle shall we account for our Savior’s admission to the exterior of the Temple, unless he first, indeed, obtained permission of the authorities, which is not recorded (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11; 3, 5; *War*, 5, 5). The difficulty is solved by the supposition simply of a change in our Lord’s perceptions. How can we further understand, except by the aid of a vision or a miracle, that the devil “showed our Lord all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them in a moment of time” (ἐν στιγμήν χρόνου), a phrase referring to the mathematical point, and meaning the most minute and indivisible portion of duration, that is, instantaneously; yet in this space of time, according to the literal interpretation, “the devil showed our Lord all the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them,” i.e. whatever relates to their magnificence, as imperial robes, crowns, thrones, palaces, courts, guards, armies, etc. Scott and Poddridge resort to the supposition of an “illusory show;” but it may be asked, if one of the temptations was conducted by such means, why not the other two? Macknight endeavors to explain “all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them” as relating only to the land of promise (*Harmony of the Gospels* [Lond. 1822], p. 350, note). Farmer conceives that no mountain in Palestine commands so extensive a prospect. It is a further difficulty attending the literal interpretation that Satan represents all the kingdoms of the world and their glory to be at his disposal; an assertion denied by our Lord, who simply rejects the offer. It may readily be conceived that it would answer all purposes that Jesus should *seem* to have the proposal in question made to him. It is next observed that many things are spoken of in Scripture as being done which were only done in vision. See the numerous instances collected by bishop Law (*Considerations of the Theory of Religion* [Lond. 1820], p. 85,86). The reader may refer to ^{<4133>}Genesis 32:30; ^{<3008>}Hosea 1:3; ^{<3435>}Jeremiah 13:25, 27; Ezekiel 3, 4:5. Paul calls his being “caught up into the third heaven and into Paradise” a vision and revelation of the Lord (^{<4722>}2 Corinthians 12:1-4). It is plain from this instance in the case of Paul, and from that of Peter (^{<4427>}Acts 12:7-9), who had already experienced visions (^{<4400>}Acts 10:10, etc.), that neither of the apostles could at first distinguish visions-from impressions made on the senses. In further illustration it is urged that the prophets are often said to be *carried about* in visions (^{<2808>}Ezekiel 8:1-10; 11:24, 25; 37:1; 40:1, 2). The phrase “by the spirit,” etc., is said to be equivalent to “the hand of God,” etc., among the prophets (^{<1186>}1 Kings 18:46; ^{<2208>}2 Kings 3:15; ^{<2808>}Ezekiel 1:3). A

comparison of the parallel phrases in the Sept. of Ezekiel and in the evangelists, in regard to Christ's temptation, is thought to cast much light upon the subject; the phrase "the devil leaveth him" being equivalent to the phrase "the vision I had seen went up from me" (³¹²Ezekiel 11:24).

Another form of the above theory is that the presence of the tempter, the words spoken, etc., were merely conceptual, i.e. mental phenomena or impressions upon the Savior, similar to the suggestions ordinarily experienced by saints in temptations of peculiar vividness or pungency. This view is confuted by the following considerations:

1. The language ("came," "said," "taketh him," etc.) implies, if not a physical, certainly at least a visional presentation as distinct as if actual. Such expressions as "The word of the Lord came," urged as parallel, are not in point; for in these the subject presented being necessarily immaterial of itself, defines the presentation as being merely mental.
2. The comparison of our Savior's psychology in this case with that of common mortals is inapposite, since they, being fallen, are always, in some sense at least, tempted *ab intra* (³¹⁴James 1:14), whereas Jesus, being immaculate, could have no evil thoughts of his own surmising; nor could they arise in his mind except as directly suggested from some absolutely external source. And even supposing they could have occurred as an intellectual proposition to his mental perception, they must have instantly passed away without any of that vividness and pertinacity which the whole narration implies, unless they had been enforced and sustained by the personal solicitation of a palpable being and a formal conversation.
3. The parallel with the temptation of Adam in Paradise requires more than an imaginary scene. Some, indeed, have by a like process of interpretation taken the record of the Fall in Eden likewise out of the province of actual history; and it is difficult to see why one event is not as fit a subject for this eviscerating rationalism in hermeneutics as the other (see Townsend, *Chronological Arrangement* [Lond. 1828], 1, 92). In short, there must have been a substantial basis of *fact* in the case of our Savior to justify the marked character of the transaction as recorded by the evangelists.

We conclude, therefore, that all these suppositions set aside the historical testimony of the gospels; the temptation as there described arose not from the sinless mind of the Son of God, where, indeed, thoughts of evil could not have harbored, but from Satan, the enemy of the human race. Nor can

it be supposed that this account is a mere parable, unless we assume that Matthew and Luke have wholly misunderstood their Master's meaning. The story is that of a fact, hard indeed to be understood, but not to be made easier by explanations such as would invalidate the only testimony on which it rests (Heubner, *Practical Commentary on Matthew*).

IV. Literature. — See, besides the works cited above, *Bagot, -Temptation in the Wilderness* (Lond. 1840); Hall, *Sermons on Our Lord's Temptation* (ibid. 1845); Dallas, *Christ's Temptation* (ibid. 1848); Krummacher, *Christ in the Wilderness* (from the Germr., 3d ed. ibid. 1852); Smith [T. T.], *Temptation of Our Saviour* (ibid. 1852); Monod, *Temptation of Christ* (from the French, ibid. 1854); Macleod, *Temptation of Our Lord* (ibid. 1872); and the *Am. Theol. Rev. July*, 1861; *Bost. Rev. March*, 1863; also the monographs cited by Wolf, *Curse in N.T.* 1, 66; by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 23; by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 89; and by Mever, *Commentary on Matthew 4* (Edinb. ed.), 1, 129.

Tempus Clausum

(FERIATUM, SACRATUM), a *closed time*, is the period during which noisy festivities are prohibited in the Church of Rome, particularly such as are common in connection with the celebration of a marriage. The origin of such prohibitions is to be found in the ideas which exercised, in some degree at least, a determining influence over the regulation of fasts. **SEE FASTING.** Prayer and continence were employed as a preparation for the worthy observance of feasts among the Israelites (^{<D94>}Exodus 19:14 sq.; ^{<D204>}1 Samuel 21:4), and the custom is endorsed by Paul in ^{<D105>}1 Corinthians 7:5. The most ancient ecclesiastical regulations upon this subject date back to the middle of the 4th century (e.g. *Conic. Laodicen. c.* 51, 52). The civil authorities confirmed the prohibitions imposed by the Church (e.g. *Cod. De Feriis, c.* 11, 3, 12 of Leo, and Anthemius 469), and thereupon the *Tempus Clausum* was generally made to apply to the Lenten period, and its extension over the Advent and other festal periods recommended. No general and inflexible rule for the *dies' observabiles* existed during the Middle Ages, and none has since been established. The usual time is contained between the first Sunday in Advent *aid* the octave of Epiphany, Septuagesima and Easter, Rogation and Trinity Sundays. Quiet weddings, as they are termed, are permitted to be celebrated during those periods, but never without a dispensation from the local bishop.

The *tempus clausum* was adopted by the Protestant churches of Germany (see Goschen, *Doctr. de Matrimon. ex Ordin. Eccl. Evang.* etc. [Halis, 1848, 4to], p. 38, 39; art. 133-140), and the subject received careful consideration so late as 1857 in the conference of Eiseaiach (see Moser, *Allgem. Kirchenbl. f. d. evangel. Deutschl.* 1857, p. 325 sq., 343; 1858, p. — 197 sq.). The *Tempus Clausum Quadragesimae* in such churches commonly extends over the period between Ash-Wednesday and Easter-Sunday, though it includes only the Passion week in some regions, and in others is not recognized at all. Its observance also varies greatly. Public amusements are prohibited, and marriages are sometimes wholly forbidden or are compelled to be quietly celebrated. Where such legal prohibitions are in force, dispensations from their operation may usually be obtained, except in Altenburg and the principality of Lubeck and Reuss. On the subject, see Hartzheim, *Concilia Gernmanie*, 3, 56; *Conc. Trident.* sess. 24:10, *De Reform. Matrimon.*; Bihmnir, *Jus Eccles. Prot.* lib. 3, tit. 46, § 45; lib. 4 tit. 16:§ 2 sq.; Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, i, 55 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. **SEE LENT**.

Temurah

SEE CABALA; SEE TALMUD.

Ten

(**rc̣ḷ**, *ser*, or some modification of it; **δέκα**; the Heb. plur. **יָרְעָא** *æsrim*, means “twenty;” the root **rc̣ḷ**; *asár*, is thought by Fürst and Mihlau to signify *heaping*, but Gesenius regards it as primitive), the number which lies at the basis of modern numeration, having its natural origin in the twice five fingers used *for* counting, and largely employed as such even by the Hebrews, notwithstanding their peculiar regard for *seven as* containing the notion of completeness. **SEE NUMBER.**

In the civil and ecclesiastical usages of the Israelites this numerical idea especially appears in their word for “tithe” (**רְעִמִי** ^(רצו) Leviticus 27:30, 31, 32, etc.; Sept. **δεκάτη**, scil. **μοῖρα**, “a part;” Vulg. *decimal*), plainly derived from **rc̣ḷ**, “ten,” which also (in the form **rc̣ḷ**) means “to be rich;” hence ten is the *rich* number, perhaps because including all the units under it. The same idea has been rather hastily conceived as being retained in the Greek; thus, **δέκω**, **δέχομαι**, “to receive,” “hold,” etc., **δέκα**, “ten,” because the ten fingers hold everything; and in the Latin, *teneo*;

French, *contenir*; English, *contain, ten*. Pythagoras speaks of the Decade, which is the sum of all the preceding numbers 1+2+3+4, as comprehending all musical and arithmetical proportions. For a view of his doctrine of numbers and the probability of its Egyptian origin, see Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, 4:193-200. For Aristotle's similar ideas of the number ten, see *Probl.* 3, 15. This number seems significant of completeness or abundance in many passages of Scripture. Jacob said unto Laban, "Thou hast changed my wages these ten times" (⁽⁻⁰¹³⁴⁾Genesis 31:41); "Am not I better to thee than ten sons?" (⁽⁻⁰¹⁰⁸⁾1 Samuel 1:8); "These ten times have ye reproached me" (⁽⁻⁰¹⁹¹⁾Job 19:3); "Thy pound hath gained ten pounds" (⁽⁻⁰¹⁹⁶⁾Luke 19:16), etc. This number, as the end of less numbers and beginning of greater, and as thus signifying perfection, sufficiency, etc., may have been selected for its suitableness to those eucharistic donations to religion, etc., which mankind were required to make, probably, in primeval times. Abraham gave to Melchisedek, "priest of the Most High God," a tenth of all the spoils he had taken from Chedorlaomer (⁽⁻⁰¹⁴⁰⁾Genesis 14:20; ⁽⁻⁰¹⁰⁴⁾Hebrews 7:4). The incidental way in which this fact is stated seems to indicate an established custom. Why should Abraham give tithes of the spoils of war and not of other things? For instances of the heathen dedicating to their gods the tenth of warlike spoils, see Wettstein, *On* ⁽⁻⁰¹⁰⁴⁾Hebrews 7:4. Jacob's vow (⁽⁻⁰¹⁸²⁾Genesis 28:22) seems simply to relate to compliance with an established custom; his words are, literally, "And all that thou shalt give me I will assuredly tithe it unto thee," **rc [I wnrç[a**. On the practice of the heathen, in various and distant countries, to dedicate tithes to their gods, see Spelman, *On Tithes*, ch. 26; Selden, ch. 3; Lesley, *Divine Right of Tithes*, § 7; Wettstein, *On* ⁽⁻⁰¹⁰²⁾Hebrews 7:2. The Mosaic Law, therefore, in this respect, as well as in others, was simply a reconstitution of the patriarchal religion. Thus the tenth of military spoils is commanded (⁽⁻⁰¹³¹⁾Numbers 31:31). For the law concerning tithes generally, see ⁽⁻⁰¹⁷¹⁾Leviticus 27:30, etc., where they are first spoken of as things already known. These tithes consisted of a tenth of all that remained after payment of the first-fruits of seeds and fruits, and of calves, lambs, and kids. This was called the first tithe, and belonged to God as the sovereign.

SEE TITHE.

Ten Articles

In the year 1536 convocation under Henry VIII gave sanction to the "Ten Articles," entitled "Articles devised by the king's highness majesty to

establish Christian quietness and unity among us.” These were probably compiled by Cranmer, though ostensibly emanating from the crown. Five of the articles related to doctrines and five to ceremonies. The former were:

1. That Holy Scriptures and the three Creeds are the basis and summary of a true Christian faith.
2. That baptism conveys remission of sins and the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit, and is absolutely necessary as well for children as adults.
3. That penance consists of contrition, confession, and reformation, and is necessary to salvation.
4. That the body and blood of Christ are really present in the elements of the Eucharist.
5. That justification is remission of sin and reconciliation to God by the merits of Christ; but good works are necessary.

The latter were:

1. That images are useful as remembrancers, but are not objects of worship.
2. That saints are to-be honored as examples of life, and as furthering our prayers.
3. That saints may be invoked as intercessors, and their holydays observed.
4. That ceremonies are to be observed for the sake of their mystical signification, and as conducive to devotion.
5. That prayers for the dead are good and useful, but the efficacy of papal pardon, and of soul-masses offered at certain localities, is negatived. Upon these articles was founded the work entitled *Institution of a Christian Man* (q.v.), commonly known as “The Bishop’s Book” (q.v.). **SEE ARTICLES.**

Ten Commandments, the

the common designation of the *Decalogue*, or that portion of the law of Moses which contains the moral law. See LAW OF MOSES.

I. Title. — The popular name in this, as in so many instances, is not that of Scripture. There we have the “ten words” ($\mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\iota\tau\rho\varsigma$ [] *asereth haddebarim*, *the decade of the words*; Sept. τὰ δέκα ῥήματα; Vulg. *verba decean*), not the ten commandments ($\langle 1238 \rangle$ Exodus 34:28; $\langle 1843 \rangle$ Deuteronomy 4:13; 10:4, Hebrews). The difference is not altogether an unmeaning one. The *word* of God, the “word of the Lord,” tie constantly recurring term for the fullest revelation, was higher than any phrase expressing merely a command, and carried with it more the idea of a self-fulfilling power. If, on the one side, there was the special contrast to which our Lord refers between the commandments of God and the traditions of men ($\langle 4138 \rangle$ Matthew 15:3), the arrogance of the rabbins showed itself, on the other, in placing the *words* of the scribes on the same level as the *words* of God. **SEE SCRIBE.** Nowhere in the later books of the Old Test. is any direct reference made to their number. The treatise of Philo, however, $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\omega\nu$, shows that it had fixed itself on the Jewish mind, and, later still, it gave occasion to the formation of a new word (the “Decalogue,” ἡ δεκάλογος, first in Clem. *Al.*, *Paed.* 3, 12), which has perpetuated itself in modern languages. Other names are even more significant. These, and these alone, are “the words of the covenant,” the unchanging ground of the ‘union between Jehovah and his people, all else’ being as a superstructure, accessory and subordinate ($\langle 1238 \rangle$ Exodus 34:28). They are also the tables of testimony, sometimes simply “The testimony,” the witness to men of the divine will, righteous itself, demanding righteousness, in man- ($\langle 1256 \rangle$ Exodus 25:16; 31:18, etc.). It is by virtue of their presence in it that the ark becomes, in its turn, the ark of the covenant ($\langle 1413 \rangle$ Numbers 10:33, etc.), that the sacred tent became the tabernacle of witness, of testimony ($\langle 1282 \rangle$ Exodus 38:21, etc.). **SEE TABERNACLE.** They remain there, throughout the glory of the kingdom, the primeval relics of a hoar antiquity ($\langle 1009 \rangle$ 1 Kings 8:9), their material, the writing on them, the sharp incisive character of the laws themselves, presenting a striking contrast to the more expanded teaching of a later time. Not less did the commandments themselves speak of the earlier age when not the silver and the gold, but the ox and the ass, were the great representatives of wealth (comp. $\langle 1912 \rangle$ 1 Samuel 12:3).

Ewald is disposed to think that even in the form in which we have the commandments there are some additions made at a later period, and that the second and the fourth commandment were originally as briefly imperative as the sixth or seventh (*Gesch. Isr.* 2, 206). The difference

between the reason given in ^{<Q211>}Exodus 20:11 for the fourth commandment and that stated to have been given in ^{<R515>}Deuteronomy 5:15 makes, perhaps, such a conjecture possible. *Scholia*, which modern annotators put into the margin, are, in the existing state of the Old Test., incorporated into the text. Obviously both forms could not have appeared written on the two tables of stone, yet ^{<R515>}Deuteronomy 5:15, 22 not only states a different reason, but affirms that “all these words” were thus written. Keil (*Comment. on Exod, 20*) seems on this point disposed to agree with Ewald.

II. Double Record. — The Decalogue is found in two passages, first in ^{<Q211>}Exodus 20:2-17, again in ^{<R515>}Deuteronomy 5:6-21 and there are certain differences between the two forms, which have been taken advantage of by rationalistic interpreters, sometimes for the purpose of disparaging the historical correctness of either form, and sometimes as a conclusive argument against the doctrine of inspiration. The differences are of three kinds:

(1.) Simply verbal, consisting in the insertion or omission of the Hebrew letter ^ו which signifies *and*; in Exodus it is only omitted once where it is found in Deuteronomy, namely, between *graven image* and *any likeness*, in the second commandment; but in Deuteronomy it occurs altogether *six* times where it is wanting in Exodus; and of these four are at the commencement of the last four commandments, which are severally introduced with an *and*, joining them to what precedes.

(2.) Differences in form, where still the sense remains essentially the same: under the fourth commandment, it is in Exodus “nor thy cattle,” while in Deuteronomy it is “nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle” a mere amplification of the former by one or two leading particulars; and in the tenth commandment, as given in Exodus, “thy neighbor’s house” comes first, while in Deuteronomy it is “thy neighbor’s wife;” and here also after “thy neighbor’s house,” is added “his field” another slight amplification.

(3.) Differences in respect to matter these are altogether four. The fourth commandment is introduced in Exodus with *remember*, in Deuteronomy with *keep*; the reason also assigned for its observance in Exodus is derived from God’s original act and procedure at creation, while in Deuteronomy this is omitted, and the deliverance of Israel from the land of Egypt is put

in its stead; in Deuteronomy the fifth commandment runs, “Honor thy father and thy mother, *as the Lord thy God commanded thee*,” the latter words having no place in Exodus; and in the tenth commandment, instead of “Thou shalt not *covet* thy neighbor’s wife,” it stands in Deuteronomy “Thou shalt not *desire* thy neighbor’s wife” differing only, however, in this, that the one (covet) fixes attention more upon the improper desire to possess, and the other upon the improper desire itself.

It is obvious that these differences leave the main body or substance of the Decalogue, as a revelation of law, entirely untouched; not one of them affects the import and bearing of a single precept; nor, if viewed in their historical relation, can they be regarded as involving in any doubt or uncertainty the verbal accuracy of the form presented in Exodus. We have no reason to doubt that the words there recorded are precisely those which were uttered from Sinai, and written upon the tables of stone.’ In Deuteronomy Moses gives a revised account of the transactions, using throughout certain freedoms, as speaking in a hortative manner, and from a more: distant point of view; and, while he repeats the commandments as those which the Lord had spoken from the midst of the fire and written on tables of stone (^(REF2)Deuteronomy 5:22), he yet shows in his very mode of doing it that he did not aim at an exact reproduction of the past, but wished to preserve to some extent the form of a free rehearsal. This especially appears in the addition to the fifth commandment, “as the Lord thy, God commanded thee,” which distinctly pointed back to a prior original, and even recognized that as the permanently existing form. The introducing also of so many of the later commands with the copulative *and* tends to the same result; as it is precisely what would be natural in a rehearsal, though not in the original announcements, and came from combining with the legislative something of the narrative style. Such being plainly the character of this later edition, its other and: more noticeable deviations the occasional amplifications admitted to it, the substitution of *desire* for *covet*, with respect to a neighbor’s wife, in the tenth command; and of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, for the divine order of procedure at the creation, in the fourth must be regarded as slightly varied and explanatory statements, which it was perfectly competent for the authorized mediator of the covenant to introduce, and which, in nature and design, do not materially differ from the alterations sometimes made by inspired writers of the New Test. on the passages they quote from the Old (see Fairbairn, *Hermen. Manual*, p. 354 sq.). They are not without use in an exegetical

respect; and in the present case have also a distinct historical value, from the important evidence they yield in favor of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy; since it is inconceivable that any later author, fictitiously personating Moses, would have ventured on making such alterations on what had been so expressly ascribed by Moses to God himself, and which seemed to bear on it such peculiar marks of sacredness and inviolability (Havernick, *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, § 25).

III. Source. —The circumstances in which the ten great *words* were first given to the people surrounded them with an awe which attached to no other precept. In the midst of the cloud, and the darkness, and the flashing lightning, and the fiery smoke, and the thunder, like the voice of a trumpet, Moses was called to receive the law without which the people would cease to be a holy nation. Here, as elsewhere, Scripture unites two facts which men separate. God, and not man, was speaking to the Israelites in those terrors, and yet in the language of later inspired teachers, other instrumentality was not excluded. Buxtorf, it is true, asserts that Jewish interpreters, with hardly an exception, maintain that “Deus verba Decalogiper se immediate locutus est” (*Diss. de Decal.*). The language of Josephus, however (*Ant.* 15:5, 3), not less than that of the New Test., shows that at one time the traditions of the Jewish schools pointed to the opposite conclusion. The law was “ordained by angels” (~~4075~~ Galatians 3:9) “spoken by angels” (~~8007~~ Hebrews 2:2), received as the ordinance of angels (~~4075~~ Acts 7:53). The agency of those whom the thoughts of the Psalmist connected with the winds and the flaming fire (~~4940~~ Psalm 104:4; ~~8007~~ Hebrews 1:7) was present also on Sinai. The part of Moses himself was, as the language of Paul (~~4075~~ Galatians 3:19) affirms, that of “a mediator.” He stood “between” the people and the Lord “to show them the word of the Lord? (Deuteronomy 5), while they stood afar off to give form and distinctness to what would else have been terrible and overwhelming. — The *voice* of the Lord” which they heard in the thunderings and the sound of the trumpet, “full of majesty,” “dividing the flames of fire” (~~4075~~ Psalm 29:3-9), was for him a divine *word*, the testimony of an eternal will, just as in the parallel instance of ~~4075~~ John 12:29, a like testimony led some to say “it thundered,” while others received the witness. No other words were proclaimed in like manner. The people shrank even from this nearness to the awful presence, even from the very echoes of the divine voice. The record was as exceptional as the original revelation. Of no other words could it be said that they were written as these were written,

engraved on the tables of stone, not as originating in man's contrivance or sagacity, but by the power of the Eternal Spirit, by the finger of God (^{<1918>}Exodus 31:18; 32:16). *SEE BATH-KOL.*

IV. *The number ten* was, we can hardly doubt, itself significant to Moses and the Israelites. The received symbol, then and at all times, of completeness (Bahr, *Symbolik*, 1,175-183), it taught the people that the law, of Jehovah was perfect (^{<1917>}Psalm 19:7), The fact that they were written, not on one, but on two tables, probably in two groups of five each (*infra*), taught men (though with some variations from the classification of later ethics) the great division of duties towards God and duties towards our neighbor, which we recognize as the groundwork of every true moral system. It taught them also, five being the symbol of imperfection (Bath, 1, 183-187), how incomplete each set of duties would be when divorced from its companion. The recurrence of these numbers in the Pentateuch is at once frequent and striking. Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* 2, 212-217) has shown by a large induction how continually laws and precepts meet us in groups of five or ten. The numbers, it, will be remembered, meet us again as the basis of all the proportions of the tabernacle (q.v.) and temple. It would show an ignorance of all modes of Hebrew thought to exclude this symbolic aspect. We need not, however, shut out altogether that which some writers (e.g. Grotius, *De Decal.* p. 36) have substituted for it, the connection of the ten words with a decimal system of numeration through the ten fingers on which a man counts. Words which were to be the rule of life for the poor as well as the learned, the groundwork of education for all children, might well be connected with the simplest facts and processes in man's mental growth, and thus stamped more indelibly on the memory. Bahr, absorbed in symbolism, has nothing for this natural suggestion but two notes of admiration (!!). The analogy of ten great commandments in the moral law of Buddhism might have shown him how naturally men crave a number that thus helps them. A true system was as little likely to ignore the natural craving as a false. (see note in Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 2, 207). *SEE TEN.*

V. *Tables.* — In what way the Ten Commandments were to be divided has, however, been a matter of much controversy. At least four distinct arrangements present themselves.

1. In the received teaching of the Latin Church resting on that of Augustine (Qu. in *Ex.* 71; *Ep. ad January* c. 11; *De Decal.* etc.), the first table contained three commandments, the second the other seven. Partly on

mystical grounds, because the tables thus symbolized the trinity of divine persons and the eternal Sabbath, partly as seeing in it a true ethical division, he adopted this classification. It involved, however, and in part proceeded from, an alteration in the received arrangement. What we know as the first and second were united; and consequently the Sabbath law appeared at the close of the first table as the third, not as the fourth, commandment. The completeness of the number was restored in the second table by making a separate (the ninth) command of the precept, "Thou shalt not covet; thy neighbor's wife," which with us forms part of the tenth; It is an almost fatal objection to this order that in the first table it confounds, where it ought to distinguish, the two sins of polytheism and idolatry; and that in the second it introduces an arbitrary and meaningless distinction. The later theology of the Church of Rome apparently adopted it as seeming to prohibit image-worship only so far as it accompanied the acknowledgment of another God (*Catech. Trident.* 3, 2,20).

2. The familiar division-referring the first four to our duty towards God, and the six remaining to our duty towards man-is, on ethical grounds, simple and natural enough. If it is not altogether satisfying, it is because it fails to recognize the symmetry which gives to the number five so great a prominence; and perhaps, also, because it looks on the duty of the fifth commandment from the point of view of modern ethics rather than from that of the ancient Israelites and the first disciples of Christ (*infra*).

3. A modification of 1 has been adopted by later Jewish writers (Jonathan ben-Uzziel, Abed-Ezra, Moses ben Nachman, in Suicer, *Thesaur.* s.v. [Δεκάλογος](#)). Retaining the combination of the first and second commandments of the common order, they have made a new "word" of the opening declaration, "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," and so have avoided the necessity of the subdivision of the tenth. The objection to this division is (1), that it rests on no adequate authority, and (2) that it turns into a single precept what is evidently given as the groundwork of the whole body of laws.

4. Rejecting these three, there remains that recognized by the older Jewish writers-Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 6, 6) and Philo. (*De Decal.* 1), and supported ably and thoughtfully by Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* 2, 208), which places, five commandments in each table, and thus preserves the *pentad* and *decad* grouping which pervades the whole code. A modern jurist would perhaps.

object that this places the fifth commandment in a wrong position; that a duty to parents is a duty towards our neighbor. From the Jewish point of view, it is believed, the place thus given to that commandment was essentially the right one. Instead of duties towards God, and duties towards our neighbors, we must think of the first table as containing all that belonged to the *Εὐσέβεια* of the Greeks, to the *Pietas* of the Romans—duties, i.e., with no corresponding rights; while the second deals with duties which involve rights, and come, therefore, under the head of *Justitia*. The duty of honoring, i.e. supporting, parents came under the former head. As soon as the son was capable of it, and the parents required it, it was an absolute, unconditional duty. His right to any maintenance from them had ceased. He owed them reverence as he owed it to his Father in heaven (^{<812>}Hebrews 12:9). He was to show piety (*εὐσεβεῖν*) to them (1 Tim. 5, 4). What made the “*Corban*” casuistry of the Scribes so specially evil was that it was, in this way, a sin against the piety of the first table, not merely against the lower obligations of the second (^{<471>}Mark 7:11). It at least harmonizes with this division that the second, third, fourth, and fifth commandments all stand on the same footing as having special sanctions attaching to them, while the others that follow are left in their simplicity by themselves, as if the parity of rights were in itself a sufficient ground for obedience. A further confirmation of the truth of this division is found in ^{<519>}Romans 13:9. Paul, summing up the duties “briefly comprehended” in the one great law, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” enumerates the last five commandments, but makes no mention of the fifth.

VI. Addition. — To these Ten Commandments we find in the Samaritan Pentateuch an eleventh added:

“But when the Lord thy God shall have brought thee into the land of Canaan, whither thou goest to possess it, thou shalt set thee up two great stones, and shalt plaster them with plaster, and shalt write upon these stones all the words of this law. Moreover, after thou shalt have passed over Jordan thou shalt set up those stones, which I command thee this day, on Mount Gerizim, and thou shalt build there an altar to the Lord thy God, an altar of stones; thou shalt not lift up any iron thereon. Of unhewn stones shalt thou build that altar to the Lord thy God, and thou shalt offer on it burnt-offerings to the Lord thy God, and thou shalt sacrifice peace-offerings, and shalt eat them there; and thou shalt rejoice, before the Lord thy God in that mountain beyond Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth

down, the laud of the Canaanite that dwelleth in the plain country over against Gilgal, by the oak of Moreh, towards Sichem (Walton, *Bibl. Polyglot.*). In the absence of any direct evidence, we can only guess as to the history of this remarkable addition.

- (1.) It will be seen that the whole passage is made up of two which are found in the Hebrew text of ^(HEB)Deuteronomy 27:2-7 and 11:30, with the substitution, in the former, of Gerizim for Ebal.
- (2.) In the absence of confirmation from any other version, Ebal must, so far as textual criticism is concerned, be looked upon as the true reading; Gerizim as a falsification, casual or deliberate, of the text.
- (3.) Probably the choice of Gerizim as the site of the Samaritan temple was determined by the fact that it had been- the Mount of Blessings, Ebal that of Curses. Possibly, as Walton suggests (*Proleg.* c. 11), the difficulty of understanding how the latter should have been chosen instead of the former as a place for sacrifice and offering may have led them to look on the reading Ebal as erroneous. They were unwilling to expose themselves to the taunts of their Judean enemies by building a temple on the Hill of Curses. They would claim the inheritance of the blessings; they would set the authority of their text against that of the scribes of the Great Synagogue. One was as likely to be accepted as the other. The "Hebrew verity" was not then acknowledged as it has been since.
- (4.) In other repetitions or transfers in the Samaritan Pentateuch we may perhaps admit the plea which Walton makes in its behalf (*loc. cit.*) that, in the first formation of the Pentateuch as a Codex, the transcribers had a large number of separate documents to copy, and that consequently much was left to the discretion of the individual scribe. Here, however, that excuse is hardly admissible. The interpolation has every mark of being a bold attempt to claim for the schismatic worship on Gerizim the solemn sanction of the voice on Sinai, to place it on the same footing as the ten great words of God. The guilt of the interpolation belonged, of course, only to the first contrivers of it. The later Samaritans might easily come to look on their text as the true one; on that of the Jews as corrupted by a fraudulent omission. It is to the credit of the Jewish scribes that they were not tempted to retaliate, and that their reverence for the sacred records prevented them from suppressing the history which connected the rival sanctuary with the blessings of Gerizim. *SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.*

VII. Taryum. — The treatment of the Ten Commandments in the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel is not without interest. There, as noticed above, the first and second commandments are united to make up the second, and the words “I am the Lord thy God,” etc., are given as the first. More remarkable is the addition of a distinct reason for the last five commandments no less than for the first five. “Thou shalt commit no murder, for because of the sins of murderers the sword goeth forth upon the world.” So, in like manner and with the same formula, “death goeth forth upon the world” as the punishment of adultery; famine as that of theft; drought as that of false witness; invasion, plunder, captivity, as those of covetousness (Walton, *Bib. Polyglott.*). *SEE TARGUM.*

VIII. Talmud. — The absence of any distinct reference to the ten commandments as such in the *Pirke Aboth* (=Maxims of the Fathers) is both strange and significant. One chapter (ch. v) is expressly given to an enumeration of all the scriptural facts which may be grouped in decades the ten words of Creation, the ten generations from Adam to Noah and from Noah to Abraham, the ten trials of Abraham, the ten plagues of Egypt, and the like; but the ten divine words find no place in the list. With all their ostentation of profound reverence for the law, the teaching of the rabbins turned on other points than the great laws of duty. In this way, as in others, they made void the commandments of God that they might keep their own traditions. Comp. Stanley, *Jewish Church*, lect. 7 in illustration of many of the points here noticed. *SEE TALMUD.*

Picture for Ten Commandments

IX. Economical Importance. — The giving of the Ten Commandments marks an era in the history of God’s dispensations. Of the whole law this was both the first portion to be communicated, and the basis of all that followed. Various things attested this superiority. It was spoken directly by the Lord himself not communicated, like other parts of the old economy, through the ministration of Moses and spoken amid the most impressive signs of his glorious presence and majesty. Not only were the Ten Commandments thus spoken by God, but the further mark of relative importance was put upon them of being written on tables of stone-written by the very finger of God. They were thus elevated to a place above all the statutes and ordinances that were made known through the mediator of the old covenant; and the place then given them they were also destined to hold in the future; for the rocky tablets on which they were engraved

undoubtedly imaged an abiding validity and importance. It was an emblem of relative perpetuity. The very number of words, or utterances; in which they were comprised, *ten*, bespoke the same thing; for in the significancy that in ancient times was ascribed to certain numbers, ten was universally regarded as the symbol of completeness (Spencer, *De Leg. Hebrews* 1, 3; Bahr, *Symbolik*, 1, 175). *SEE DECALOGUE.*

Tenebree

(*darkness*), an office for the Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of Holy Week, commemorating the sufferings and death of our Blessed Savior. The name of the office has been traced to the fact that it was formerly celebrated at midnight, as an allusion to Christ walking no more openly with the Jews, as Cranmer says. Others suggest that it is derived from the gradual extinction of lights, which originally were put out one by one as the morning began to grow clear; or in symbol of grief and mourning; or, as Beleth suggests, of the eclipse of three hours at the Passion. The number of lights varied. In some churches there was a candle corresponding to each psalm and lesson of the office. Thus we find seven, nine, twelve, fifteen, twenty-four, twenty-five at York, thirty, seventy-two, or even as many as each person thought fit to bring. These were extinguished sometimes at once, or at two or three intervals. In some places they were quenched with a moist sponge, and in others with a hand of wax to represent Judas. St. Gregory of Tours says that on the night of Good-Friday the watchings were kept in darkness until the third hour, when a small light appeared above the altar. Cranmer explains that the Lamentations of Jeremiah were read in memory of the Jews seeking our Lord's life at this time. The Reproaches and Trisagion were not sung until the 14th century on Good-Friday.

Tenison, Thomas

a learned English prelate, was born at Cottenham, Cambridgeshire, Sept. 29, 1636; and receiving his primary education at the free school at Norwich, entered Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he graduated in Lent term, 1656-7. He began to study medicine, but on the eve of the Restoration decided upon the theological profession, and was ordained privately at Richmond in Surrey by the bishop of Salisbury. Being admitted fellow of his college March 24, 1662, he became tutor, *and* in 1665 was chosen one of the university preachers, and about the same time was

presented to the cure of St. Andrew the Great in Cambridge. In 1667 he received the rectory of Holywell and Nedingworth, Huntingdonshire, from the earl of Manchester, and in 1674 was chosen principal minister to the Church of St. Pete's Mancroft, Norwich. In 1680 he took the degree of D.D., and in October of the same year was presented by Charles II, being then a royal chaplain, to the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London. Immediately after the Revolution he was promoted to be archdeacon of London; was consecrated bishop of Lincoln, Jan. 10, 1692; and was raised to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1694. In 1700 he was appointed one of a committee to recommend to the king proper persons for all ecclesiastical preferments in his gift above the value of £20 per annum. He attended his majesty during his last illness, and crowned queen Anne. He was, in April, 1706, made first commissioner in the treaty of union between England and Scotland; and afterwards crowned George I. His death occurred at Lambeth Palace Dec. 14, 1715. By his will he bequeathed large sums to charitable purposes, and proved a liberal benefactor to Benedict College, Cambridge, the library of St. Paul's Cathedral, the Society for the Promotion of the Gospel, Bromley College, etc. He published, *The Creed of Mr. (Thomas) Hobbes Examined* (Lond. 1670, 18mo): — *Idolatry: a Discourse* (1678, 4to): — *Baconiana; or Certain Genuine Remains of Lord Bacon* (1679, 8vo; 1674, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Tennent, Gilbert

an eloquent Presbyterian divine, and .eldest son of the Rev. William Tennent, Sen., was born in the County of Armagh, Ireland, Feb. 5, 1703; emigrated with his father to America in 1718; received his education under the paternal roof; had the honorary degree of master of arts conferred upon him by Yale College in 1725; studied theology privately; was licensed to preach in May, 1725; and was ordained and installed minister of a Presbyterian congregation at New Brunswick, N. J., in 1726. In 1740 he was prevailed on by Whitefield to accompany him on a preaching tour to Boston; and this tour constituted one of the great events of his life. The effect of his-preaching in Boston is thus described by the Rev. Mr. Prince, minister of the Old South Church: "It was both terrible and searching... By his arousing and spiritual preaching, deep and pungent convictions were wrought in the minds of many-hundreds of persons in that town; and the same effect was produced on several scores in the neighboring congregations. And now was such a time as we never knew. The Rev. Mr.

Cooper was wont to say that more came to him in one week in deep concern than in the whole twenty-four years of his preceding ministry. I can say also the same as to the numbers who repaired to me." He had much to do in bringing about the division of the Presbyterian Church in 1741; indeed, it was owing, in a great measure, to one sermon called the "Nottingham Sermon," which Dr. Alexander declares to be "one of the most severely abusive sermons that were ever penned," that that schism occurred. It is to his honor, however, that, seventeen years after, he was a principal instrument in a reunion of the two parties. In 1743 he became pastor of a Presbyterian congregation (disciples of Whitefield) in Philadelphia, where he continued the residue of his ministry and life, which was about twenty years. He died July 23, 1764. Mr. Tennent, as a preacher, had few equals in his vigorous days. "His reasoning powers were strong; his thoughts nervous and often sublime; his style flowery and diffusive; his manner of address warm and pathetic — such as must convince his audience that he was in earnest." Henry B. Smith, D.D., says of him, "Gilbert Tennent, that soul of fire." He was of a truly public spirit, needing no other motive to exert himself than only to be persuaded that the matter in question was an important public good. He published *Sermons* (Phila. 1744, 8vo): — *Discourses* (1745, 12mo): — *Sermons* (1758, 12mo). He also published many occasional sermons, some pamphlets, etc. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 35-41; *Serm. on his Death*, by S. Finley, D.D. (1764, 8vo); Alexander, *Hist. of the Log College*, p. 91-94; *Sermons and Essays by the Tennents and their Contemporaries* (1855, 12mo); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Gillies, *Hist. Coll.* (J. L.S.).

Tennent, John

a Presbyterian minister, and third son of the Rev. William Tennent, Sen., was born in the County of Antrim, Ireland, Nov. 12, 1706. His parents emigrated to America when he was twelve years old. He was educated at the Log College, and licensed to preach Sept. 18, 1729. On Nov. 19, 1730, he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Freehold, Monmouth Co., N.J. He had but a brief ministry, his death occurring April 23, 1732. He was distinguished for a clear, discriminating mind and earnest manner. One of his sermons, on regeneration, was published, with a short memoir of his life, by his brother Gilbert Tennent. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 41.

Tennent, William (1)

a Presbyterian minister and educator, and the father of Gilbert, John, and William Tennent, was born in Ireland in 1673. He received a liberal education in his native country, and was probably a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. He entered the ministry originally in the Episcopal Church, and was ordained deacon by the bishop of Down, July 1, 1704; and priest, Sept. 22, 1706. He emigrated to America in 1718, and immediately changed his ecclesiastical relations, being received into the Presbyterian Church September 17 of the same year. He supplied East Chester and Bedford, N.Y.; Bensalem and Smithfield, Bucks Co., Pa.; and in 1726 accepted a call from the Church at Neshaminy, in the same county, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was but fully settled when he was impressed with the conviction that there were other duties than those of a pastor demanding his attention. The country was in a forming state, and he felt that it was all-important that it should have a right direction. His four sons followed in the footsteps of their godly father, and were consistent Christians. His attention was early directed to the young men who were growing up around him, and who he saw must be educated to become useful members of society. As there were no schools or colleges in that region, he determined to erect a building for educational purposes. His means were limited, and consequently the building must correspond with them. In process of time a log house was erected of humble proportions about a mile from Neshaminy Creek, near to the church. This building was afterwards designated the "Log College," and was the first literary and theological institution of the Presbyterian Church in this country. It was the immediate parent of Princeton College and Theological Seminary, and of all other institutions of a similar character in the Church. The site of the Log College was in every way desirable, commanding as it did an extensive prospect of level, fertile country, bounded by distant hills. The distinguished Whitefield, who visited it in 1739, says of it:

"The place wherein the young men study is a log house about twenty feet long and nearly as many broad, and to me it seemed to resemble the school of the old prophets, for their habitations were mean; and that they sought not great things for themselves is plain from those passages of Scripture wherein we are told that 'each of them took a beam to build them a house; and that at a feast of the sons of the prophets one of them put on the pot, while the others went to fetch some herbs out of the field,' "All we can say of most of our universities is, that they are glorious without. From this

despised place seven or eight worthy ministers of Jesus have lately been sent forth; more are almost ready to be sent, and the foundation is now laying for the instruction of many others.” Of Mr. Tennent, the founder of this college, but little is known outside of his connection with the institution. Whitefield’s journal refers to him thus: “At my return home was much comforted by the coming of one Mr. Tennent, an old gray-headed disciple and soldier of Jesus Christ. He keeps an academy about twenty miles from Philadelphia; and has been blessed with four gracious sons, three of which have been, and still continue to be useful in the Church of Christ. He is a great friend of Mr. Erskine of Scotland, and he and his sons are secretly despised by the synod generally, as Mr. Erskine and his friends are hated by the judicatories of Scotland, and as the Methodist preachers are by the brethren in England.” Whitefield further says:

“Set out for Neshaminy, where old Mr. Tennent lives, and where I was to preach to-day according to appointment. About twelve o’clock we came together and found 3000 people assembled in the meeting house yard. Mr. Wm. Tennent, Jr., as we stayed beyond the time, was preaching to them. When I came up he soon stopped, gave out a psalm, which was sung, and then I began to speak as the Lord gave me utterance. At first the people seemed unaffected, but in the midst of my discourse the power of the Lord Jesus came upon me, and I felt such a struggling within myself for the people as I scarce ever felt before; the hearers began to be melted down immediately and to cry much, and we had good reason to hope the Lord intended good for many. After I had finished, Mr. Gilbert Tennent gave a word of exhortation to confirm what had been delivered. After our exercises were over, we went to old Mr. Tennent’s, who entertained us like one of the ancient patriarchs. His wife to me seemed like Elizabeth, and he like Zachary. Both, as far as I can learn, walk in the command of the Lord blameless. Though God was pleased to humble my soul so that I was obliged to retire for a while, yet we had sweet communion with each other, and spent the evening in concerting what measures had best be taken for promoting our dear Lord’s kingdom. It happened very providentially that Mr. Tennent and his brethren are appointed to be a presbytery by the synod, so that they intend bringing up gracious youths and sending them out from time to time into the Lord’s vineyard.” Among the ministers sent out from Log College to preach the Gospel were his four sons, Gilbert, William, John, and Charles; Rev. Messrs. Samuel Blair, Samuel J. Finley (afterwards D.D. and president of Princeton College), W. Robinson, John

Rowland, and Charles Beatty. In 1742 this venerable man became unable to perform his duties as pastor, and his pulpit was supplied by the presbytery. In 1743 Mr. Beatty was ordained as his successor. His work was nearly done, and of him it may be said, in the language of Dr. Alexander, "The Presbyterian Church is probably not more indebted for her prosperity, and for the evangelical spirit which has generally pervaded her body, to any individual than to the elder Tennent." He died at his loved home in Neshaminy, May 6, 1746. His published works consist mostly of sermons, twenty-three of which appear in one volume, 8vo. Two other discourses were also published. Many occasional sermons and pamphlets were published in Philadelphia in 1758. Rev. Samuel Finley, D.D., his former pupil, preached his funeral discourse, which was also published. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 23; *Genesis Assemb. Miss. Mag. or Evangel. Intell.* 2; Alexander, *Hist. of Log College; Tennent's Family Record.* (W.P.S.)

Tennent, William (2)

a Presbyterian minister, and brother of Gilbert Tennent, was born in the County of Antrim, Ireland, Jan. 3, 1705. He emigrated with his father, the Rev. William Tennent, Sen., to America in 1718, where he received his education under the instruction of his father, and studied theology by the aid of his brother. He was licensed by the Philadelphia Presbytery, and ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Freehold, N.J., Oct. 25, 1733, where he remained until his death, March 8, 1777. About the time that Mr. Tennent completed his theological course, he was the subject of a remarkable trance, which has perhaps given him his greatest celebrity. A full account of this extraordinary incident was published by Elias Boudinot. Mr. Tennent contributed sermons to *Sermons on Sacramental Occasions* (1739), and a *Sermon upon* ⁴¹⁸³ *Matthew 5:23-24* (1769). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 52; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Steel, *Burning and Shining Lights* (1864); *Genesis Assemb. Miss. Mag.* vol. 2; Alexander, *Hist. Log College*; Prince, *Christ. Hist.*; *Life of William Tennent, with an Account of his being Three Days in a Trance* (N. Y. 1847, 18mo); *Sermons and Essays by the Tennents and their Contemporaries* (1855; 12mo); *Blackwood's Mag.* 4:693; Storr, *Constitution of the Human Soul* (1857), p. 317. (J.L.S.)

Tennent, William (3)

a Presbyterian minister, and son of the Rev. William Tennent (2), was born in Freehold, N.J., in 1740. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1758, was licensed to preach by the presbytery of New Brunswick in 1762, ordained by the same presbytery in 1763, and installed as junior pastor of the Church in Norwalk, Conn., in 1765. — In 1772 he became pastor of an Independent Church in Charleston, S. C. He died Aug. 11, 1777. Mr. Tennent was an eloquent preacher. Elegance of style, majesty of thought, and clearness of judgment characterized all his discourses. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 242; Hall, *Hist. of Norwalk*; Ramsey, *Hist. of South Carolina*, vol. 2; *Hist. of the Church of Charleston*; Alison, *Funeral Sermon*. (J.L.S.)

Tenney, Asa Peaslee

a Congregational minister, was born in Corinth, Vt., Feb. 14, 1801. He worked at an anvil in Haverhill, N.H.; studied theology with Rev. Grant Powers and President Tyler of Dartmouth College; preached his first sermon in father Goddard's meeting-house in Norwich, Vt.; and when twenty-seven years old took a five years commission under the New Hampshire Missionary Society, laboring in Hebron and Groton. In March, 1833, he became first pastor of the Congregational Church in Concord (West), N. H., where he died, March 1, 1867. Mr. Tenney was original, eloquent, and a mighty revivalist. He had wonderful knowledge of the Bible and human nature, and was a prodigious worker, his sermons for over thirty-four years averaging more than four a week. See *A Blacksmith in the Pulpit and in the Parish*, in the *Congregational Quarterly*, 1867, p. 359 sq., 380.

Tenney, Caleb Jewett, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born at Hollis, N. H., May 3, 1780. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1801, entered the ministry Aug. 20, 1802, and was ordained Sept. 12, 1804, pastor at Newport, R. I., where he remained until May, 1814, when he resigned and became co-pastor in Wethersfield, March 27, 1816, but, on account of his voice failing, was dismissed in 1840, and removed to Northampton, Mass., where he died, Sept. 28, 1847. He acted as agent for both the American and the Massachusetts Colonization Society. His publications were *Two*

Discourses on Baptism (1816) and a few *Occasional Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 472.

Tenney, Ephraim

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Dummerston, *Vt.*, Nov. 12, 1813. He graduated at Wheaton College, *Ill.*, in 1841, and entered the Union Theological Seminary the same year, and in the year following he died in Brooklyn, *N. Y.*, March 8. (W.P.S.)

Tenney, Roswell

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Hanover, *N. H.*, in 1796. He was educated at Dartmouth College, studied theology in the Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edward Co., *Va.*, was licensed by the Hanover Presbytery April 26, 1828, and ordained by the same Nov. 28, 1829. His first preaching was as a home missionary; after that he preached successively at Salem, Unity, Somerset, and New Lexington, *Va.*; three points in Perry County, *O.* Logan, Belpre, and Warren; two points in Washington County, *O.*; Dover, *Mass.*; Hanover Center, *N. H.*; again in Salem and Fearing, *O.*; and finally at Amesville, in Athens County. He died Aug. 6, 1866. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 321.

Tenney, Samuel Gilman

a Congregational minister, was born at Rowley, *Mass.*, April 12, 1793. He sought an education with a view of entering the ministry, being impressed that it was his duty to preach. He was fitted for college at Meriden, *N. H.*, after which he entered Dartmouth College, from which he graduated in 1823. He studied theology under the Rev. Dr. Chapin at Woodstock, *Vt.* He was ordained June 29, 1825, and installed pastor of the London Church, *Vt.* Here he labored for six years with success. He was subsequently pastor in the following places Bakersville, *Vt.*, four years; Waitsfield, *Vt.*, two years; Hillsborough, *N.H.*, five years; Wordsborough, *Vt.*, seven years; and Alstead, *N.H.*, seven years, when he retired, after an unbroken ministry of forty-nine years, in the sixty-fourth year of his age. His labors *were* blessed in many places by special and powerful revivals. He died in Springfield, *Vt.*, Dec. 5, 1874. (W. P. S.)

Tent

(usually and properly **l haq̄ohel**, so called from *glittering* [Gesenius] or being *round* [Fürst], **σκηνή**; both occasionally “tabernacle;” elsewhere **~Kv̄jnān** *anishkcn, a. dwelling* [^{<2108>}Song of Solomon 1:8], the regular term for “tabernacle;” **hks̄** *sukkah* [^{<1011>}2 Samuel 11:11], a “booth;” or **hbq̄u** *kubbdh*, a dome like pavilion, only in [^{<1018>}Numbers 2:8], a movable habitation, made of curtains extended upon poles. **SEE TABERNACLE.**

Among the leading characteristics of the nomad races, those two have always been numbered whose origin has been ascribed to Jabal the son of Lamech (^{<1011>}Genesis 4:20), viz. to be tent-dwellers (**l haq̄ov̄g**, comp. [^{<127>}Genesis 25:27; **σκηνίτης**, Pliny, 6:32, 35) and keepers of cattle. Accordingly the patriarchal fathers of the Israelites were dwellers in tents, and their descendants proceeded at once from tents to houses. We therefore read but little of *huts*, among them, and never as the fixed habitations of any people with whom they were conversant. By huts we understand small dwellings, made of the green or dry branches of trees intertwined, and sometimes plastered with mud. In Scripture they are called *booths*. Such were made by Jacob to shelter his cattle during the first winter of his return from Mesopotamia (^{<1317>}Genesis 33:17). In after-times we more frequently read of them as being erected in vine-yards and orchards to shelter the man who guarded the ripened produce (^{<1378>}Job 27:18; Isaiah 1, 8; 24:20). It was one of the Mosaic institutions that during the Feast of Tabernacles the people should live for a week in huts made of green boughs (^{<1232>}Leviticus 23:42). In observing the directions of the law respecting the Feast of Tabernacles, the Rabbinical writers laid down as a distinction between the ordinary tent and the booth, *sukkah*, that the latter must in no case be covered by a cloth, but be restricted to boughs of trees as its shelter (*Sukkah*, 1, 3). In hot weather the Arabs of Mesopotamia often strike their tents and betake themselves to sheds of reeds and grass on the bank of the river (Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 215; Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* 1, 37, 46; Volney, *Travels*, 1, 398).

In Egypt the Hebrews, for the most part, left off tent life, and lived in houses during their bondage; but on their deliverance, and during their protracted sojourn in the wilderness, tent life was again resumed by the nation (^{<1216>}Exodus 16:16; [^{<1174>}Joshua 7:24], and continued for some time even after their settlement in the Holy Land (22, 8). Hence the phraseology

of tent life remained among the people long after it had ceased to be their normal condition (^{<11216>}1 Kings 12:16). Here we may observe that tent life is not peculiar to nomads only, for we find settled clans, occupied in agricultural pursuits, still dwell in tents, and such, probably, was the case in Palestine in all ages. The family of Heber the Kenite was apparently of this class (^{<0041>}Judges 4:11-22), and even the patriarchs seem partly to have adopted that mode of life. Isaac not only “had possession of flocks ‘and possession of herds,” but also he “sowed in the land, and received in the same year a hundredfold” (^{<01312>}Genesis 26:12). It was not until the return into Canaan from Egypt that the Hebrews became inhabitants of cities, and it may be remarked that the tradition of tent-usage survived for many years later in the tabernacle of Shiloh, which consisted, as many Arab tents still consist, of a walled enclosure covered with curtains (Mishna, *Zebachim*, 14:6; Stanley, *Sinai and Palest.* p. 233).

The Midianites, the Philistines, the Syrians, the descendants of Ham, the Hagarites, and Cushanites are mentioned in Scripture as living in tents. But the people most remarkable for this unsettled and wandering mode of life are the Arabs, who, from the time of Ishmael to the present day, have continued the custom of dwelling in tents. Amid the revolutions which have transferred kingdoms from one possessor to another, these wandering tribes still dwell, unsubdued and wild as was their progenitor. This kind of dwelling is not, however, confined to the Arabs, but is used throughout the continent of Asia. In one of the tents shown in Assyrian sculptures a man is represented arranging a couch for sleeping on, in another persons are sitting conversing, and in others *cooking* utensils and the process of cooking are shown. In the smaller one (on next page), a man is watching a caldron on what appears to be a fire between some stones. Among tent-dwellers of the present day must be reckoned

(1) the great Mongol and Tartar hordes of Central Asia, whose tent-dwellings are sometimes of gigantic dimensions, and who exhibit more contrivance both in the dwellings themselves and in their method of transporting them from place to place than is the case with the Arab races (Horace, *Carm.* 3, 24, 10; Marco Polo, *Trav.* [ed. Bohn], p. 128, 135, 211; Gibbon, ch. 26 [vol. 3, p. 298, ed. Smith]);

(2) as above observed, the Bedawin Arab tribes, who inhabit tents which are probably constructed on the same plan as those which were the dwelling-places of Abraham and of Jacob (^{<8109>}Hebrews 11:9).

Picture for Tent 1

The first tents were undoubtedly covered with skins, of which there are traces in the Pentateuch (⁽¹²³⁴⁾Exodus 26:14); but nearly all the tents mentioned in Scripture were doubtless of goats'-hair, spun and woven by the women (⁽¹²³⁵⁾Exodus 35:26; 36:14), such as are now, in Western Asia, used by all who dwell in tents. Tents of linen were, and still are, only used occasionally for holiday or traveling purposes by those who do not habitually live in them. Some modern tents are constructed, of most costly materials, and are very beautiful. Chardin mentions that a late king of Persia had one made which cost upwards of two millions sterling. It was called the "golden house," because gold glittered everywhere about it (see *Pict. Bible*, note on ⁽²¹⁸⁾Song of Solomon 5:1). A tent or pavilion on a magnificent scale, constructed for Ptolemy Philadelphus at Alexandria, is described by Athenaeus (Exodus 5, 196 sq.). This class of tents is furnished with Turkey carpets for the floor and cushions to recline upon, according to the wealth of the owner, though the inside arrangements vary among different clans and tribes. Those who are too poor to afford themselves a proper tent merely hang a piece of cloth from a tree to give them shelter.

Picture for Tent 2

An Arab tent is called *beit*, "house;" its covering consists of stuff, about three quarters of a yard broad, made of black goats'-hair (Song of Solomon i, 5; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 220), laid parallel with the tent's length. This is sufficient to resist the heaviest rain. The tent-poles, called *amud*, or columns, are usually nine in number placed in three groups, but many tents have only one pole, others two or three. The ropes which hold the tent in its place are fastened, not to the tent-cover itself, but to loops consisting of a leathern thong tied to the ends of a stick, round which is twisted a piece of old cloth, which is itself sewed to the tent-cover. The ends of the tent-ropes are fastened to short sticks or pins, called *wed* or *watedy* which are driven into the ground with a *chakij*, or mallet. Of the same kind was the **dtg**; *nail* (q.v.), and the **tbQmi**; *hammer* (q.v.), which Jael used (⁽¹⁰⁰²⁾Judges 4:21). Round the back and sides of the tents runs a piece of stuff removable at pleasure to admit air. The tent is divided into two apartments, separated by a carpet partition drawn across the middle of the tent and fastened to the three middle posts. The men's apartment is usually on the right side on entering, and the women's on the left; but this usage varies in different tribes, and in the Mesopotamian tribes the contrary is the

rule. Of the three side posts on the men's side, the first and third are called *yed* (hand), and the one in the middle is rather higher than the other two. Hooks are attached to these posts for hanging various articles (^{<0180>}Genesis 18:10; ^{<0736>}Judges 13:6; Niebuhr, *Voyage*, 1, 187; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 261). **SEE PILLAR.** In the men's apartment the ground is usually covered with carpets or mats, and the wheat sacks and camel bags are heaped up in it around the middle post like a pyramid, at the base of which, or towards the back of the tent, are arranged the camel pack-saddles, against which the men recline as they sit on the ground. The women's apartment is less neat, being encumbered with all the lumber of the tent, the water and butter skins, and the culinary utensils. The part of the tent appropriated to the women is called *harem*; and no stranger is permitted to enter it, unless introduced. Hence, perhaps, Sisera's hope of greater security in the harem of Jael, **SEE HOSPITALITY.** "The tents are arranged in a sort of square; they are made of black hair-cloth, not large; and are mostly open at one end' and on the sides, the latter: being turned-up. The tents form the common rendezvous of men, women, children, calves, lambs, and kids" (Robinson, *Researches*, 1, 485). Few Arabs have more than one tent, unless the family be augmented by the families of a son or a deceased brother, or in case the wives disagree, when the master pitches a tent for one of them adjoining his own. An encampment is generally arranged in the form of an enclosure, within which the cattle are driven at night, and the center of which is occupied by the tent or tents of the emir or sheik. If he is a person of much consequence, he may have three or four tents, for himself, his wives, his servants, and strangers, respectively. The first two are of the most importance, and we know that Abraham's wife had a separate tent (^{<0245>}Genesis 24:67). It is more usual, however, for one very large tent to be divided into two or more apartments by curtains. The holy tabernacle was on this model (^{<0231>}Exodus 26:31-37). The individual tents of Leah, Rachel, Zilpah, and Bilhah may thus have been either separate tents or apartments in the principal tent in each case (^{<0333>}Genesis 31:33). When the pasture near an encampment is exhausted, the tents are taken down, packed on camels, and removed (^{<2382>}Isaiah 38:12; ^{<0257>}Genesis 26:17, 22, 25). The beauty of an Arab encampment is noticed by Shaw (*Travels*, p. 221; see ^{<0245>}Numbers 24:5). In choosing places for encampment, Arabs prefer the neighborhood of trees, for the sake of the shade and coolness which they afford (^{<0180>}Genesis 18:4, 8; Niebuhr, *loc. cit.*). Some tribes have their tents constructed so as to house their flocks at night. Grant describes such a one among the Hertush Kurds: "Our tent was about forty feet long

and eighteen or twenty wide, one side left quite open, while a wall of reeds formed the other sides... The ample roof of black hair-cloth was supported by a number of; small poles, and secured with cords and wooden pins driven into the earth. About, one fourth of the tent was fenced off with a wicker trellis for the lambs of the flock, which are kept there during the night” (*Nestorians*, p. 93). The manufacture of tents formed a regular and lucrative trade (σκηνοποιός), at which Paul occasionally labored, especially in connection with Aquila, at Corinth (Acts 18:3. *SEE PAUL*).

Picture for Tent 3

A feature of Oriental life so characteristic as the tent could not fail to suggest many striking metaphors to the Biblical writers, and accordingly the Hebrew has special terms for pitching (חִנּוּ or חִנַּי) and striking (קָטַע) a tent. The tent erected and its cords stretched out’ are often figuratively alluded to in the Scriptures. Thus Isaiah represents God as the one “that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a teint to dwell in” (Isaiah 40:22). He also says, in speaking of the glorious prosperity of the Church and the need of enlargement, “Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations;” spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes” (Isaiah 54:2; see also 33:20). It is a work of some effort to pitch a tent properly, especially a large one, requiring the united efforts of willing hands. Hence the pathetic language of Jeremiah in mourning over the desolations of God’s people: “My tabernacle is spoiled, and all my cords are broken; my children are gone forth of me, and they are not; there is none to stretch forth my tent any more and to set up my curtains” (Jeremiah 10:20). “These tents are rapidly struck and removed from place to place, so that the eye which to-day rests on a large encampment active with life may to-morrow behold nothing but a wilderness. Thus Isaiah says, “Mine age is departed, and is removed from me as a shepherd’s tent” (Isaiah 38:12). The facility with which tents are taken- down and the frailty of their material are beautifully alluded to by Paul in 2 Corinthians 5:1 (see also 2 Peter 1:13, 14). — See Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 33-40; Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, ch. 3; Rhodes, *Tent-life from the Earliest Times* (Lond. 1858); Conder, *Tent-work in Palest.* 2, 275 sq.

Tenth Deal

(ⲰⲠⲤⲘ, 'issaron, a tenth; Sept. δεκατόν), the tenth part, a measure of things dr, specially for grain and meal (ⲀⲐⲚⲟ Exodus 29:40; Leviticus 14; Numbers 15, 28, 29); more fully the tenth of an ephah (as the Sept. and Vulg. explain at 15:4), i.e. an omer, or about three and a half quarts (comp. ⲀⲐⲚⲟ Leviticus 5:15; 6:13; ⲀⲐⲚⲟ Numbers 5:15). *SEE METROLOGY.*

Tenths

in English law, are the tenth part of the yearly value of every spiritual benefice as it is valued in the *Liber Regis*. This was an impost formerly paid to the pope, and was annexed to the crown by the 26 Henry VIII, c. 3, and the 1 Elizabeth, c. 4; but by the 2 Anne, c. 11, was granted, together with the first-fruits, to-wards the augmentation of poor clergymen. A, tax on the temporality, and also certain rents reserved by the king .out of the monastic possessions he granted to his subjects, were also. called tenths. Tenths of ecclesiastical benefices and lands were first paid in 1188 towards Henry II's crusade. *SEE TAXATIO ECCLESIASTICA; SEE TEMPORALITIES OF BISHOPS; SEE TITHES.*

Tentzel, Wilhelm Ernst

a German theologian, was born July 11, 1659, at Greussen, in Thuringia. He became lecturer at the gymnasium at Gotha in 1685, and was appointed in 1696 historiographer there, and died at Dresden, Nov. 24, 1707. In the theological department he is especially known by his controversy with the Jesuit Schelstrate on the *arcani disciplina* (q.v.): *Dissertatio de Disciplina Arcani* (Wittenb. 1683; also in his *Exercitationes Selectae* (Leips. and Frankft. 1692), written against the *Antiquitas Illustrata*. Tentzel also published *Exercitationes X de Hymno Te Deum Laudamus* (ibid. 1692). Of great interest is also his historical narrative of the beginning and first progress of Luther's Reformation, thus explaining Seckendorf's history of Lutheranism, edited by Cyprian (ibid. 1718, 3 vols.): — *De Proseuchis Samaritarum* (Wittenb. 1682): *Dissertatio de Ritu Lectionum Sacrarum* (ibid. 1685). See *Theol. Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Winer, *handbuch der theol. Literdtur*, 1, 609, 628, 738, 849, 854; 2, 799; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Ecclesiast.* (Hamburg, 1718), vol. 1; *Regensburger Real-Encyklop.* s.v. (B,P.)

Teo

SEE ANTELOPE.

Teocalli

(Aztec, *teotl*, “god,” and *calli*, “house”); a name given to the aboriginal temples, many remains of which are still in existence. Recent investigations have rendered it probable that many structures which, on Spanish authority, have been received as temples and palaces were in reality multiple houses.

Teotl

the name for God among the ancient Mexicans. He is called “the Cause of causes” and “the Father of all things.” He was identified with the sun-god, which, on this account, was designated *the Teotl*.

Tephillin

SEE PHYLACTERY.

Te'rah

(Heb. *Te'rach*, $\text{j r}\Pi$, *station*, *SEE TARAH*; Sept. $\Theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\rho}\alpha$, $\Theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$; Josephus, $\Theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\rho}\omicron\varsigma$, *Ant.* 1, 6, 5; Vulg. *Thare*), the father of Abram, Nahor, and Haran, and through them the ancestor of the great families of the Israelites, Ishmaelites, Midianites, Moabites, and Ammonites (^{<01124>}Genesis 11:24-32). B.C. 2293-2088. The account, given of him in the Old Test. narrative is very brief. We learn from it simply that he was an idolater (^{<0341>}Joshua 24:2); that he dwelt beyond the Euphrates in Ur of the Chaldees (^{<01128>}Genesis 11:28); that in the westerly migration which he undertook in his old age he went with his son Abram, his daughter-in-law Sarai, and his grandson Lot, “to go into the land of Canaan, and they came unto Haran and dwelt there” (ver. 31); and, finally, that “the days of Terah were two hundred and five years; and Terah died in Haran” (ver. 32). Taking the language of Abraham about Sarah being the daughter, of his father but not of his mother (^{<0121>}Genesis 20:1, 2) in its natural sense, Terah must have had children by more wives than one; but we have no particular account of his domestic relations in this respect.

In connection with this migration a chronological difficulty has arisen which may be noticed here. In the speech of Stephen (~~400b~~ Acts 7:4) it is said that the further journey of Abraham from Haran to the land of Canaan did not take place till after his father's death. Now as Terah was two hundred and five years old (the Samar text and version make him one hundred and forty-five, and- so avoid this difficulty) when he died, and Abram was seventy-five when he left Harali (enl. 12:4) it follows that, if the speech of Stephen be correct, at Abram's birth Terah must have been one hundred, and thirty years old; and therefore that the order of anis sons- Abram, Nahor, Haran given in ~~0113b~~ Genesis 11:26, 27 is not their order in point of age. Lord Arthur Herve says (*Geneai*. p. 82, 83), "The difficulty is easily got over by supposing that Abram, though named first on account of his dignity, was not the eldest son, but probably the youngest of the three, born when his father was one hundred and thirty years old a supposition with which the marriage of Nahor with his elder brother Haran's daughter, Milcah, and the apparent nearness of age between Abram and Lot, and the three generations from Nahor to Rebekah corresponding to only two, from Abraham to Isaac, are in perfect harmony." *SEE ABRAHAM*.

From ~~400c~~ Acts 7:2-4 it appears that the first call which prompted the family to leave Ur was addressed to Abraham, not to Terah, as well as the second, which, after the death of his father, induced him to proceed from Haran to Canaan. The order to Abraham to proceed to Canaan immediately after Terah's death seems to indicate that the pause at Haran was on his account. Whether he declined to proceed any farther, or his advanced age rendered him unequal to the fatigues of the journey, can only be conjectured. It appears, however, from ~~0610c~~ Joshua 24:2,14 that Terah was given to idolatry, or rather, perhaps, to certain idolatrous superstitions, retained together with the acknowledgment and worship of Jehovah, such as existed in the family in the time of his great-grandson Laban (~~0610d~~ Genesis 31:30). This may suggest that it was not in the divine wisdom deemed proper that one who had grown old in such practices should enter the land in which his descendants were destined to exemplify a pure faith.

From the simple facts of Terah's life recorded in the Old Test. has been constructed the entire legend of Abram which is current in Jewish and Arabian traditions. Terah the idolater is turned into a maker of images, and "Ur of the Chaldees" is the original of the furnace" into which Abram was cast (comp. Ezekiel 5, 2). Rashi's note on ~~0112b~~ Genesis 11:28 is as follows: "In the presence of Terah his father in the lifetime of his father. And the

Midrash Haggadah says that he died beside his father, for Terah had complained of Abram his son before Nimrod that he had broken his images, and he cast him into a furnace of fire. And Haran was sitting and saying in his heart, ‘If Abram overcome, I am on his side; and if Nimrod overcome, I am on his side. And when Abram was saved, they said to Haran, On whose side art thou? He said to them, I am on Abram’s side. So they cast him into the furnace of fire and he was burned; and this is [what is meant by] *Ur Casdim* (Ur of the Chaldees).” In *Bereshith Rabba* (par. 17) the story is told of Abraham being left to sell idols in his father’s stead, which is repeated in Weil, *Biblical Legends*, p. 49. The whole legend depends upon the ambiguity of the word rb[, which signifies “to make” and “to serve or worship” so that Terah, who in the Biblical narrative is only a worshipper of idols, is in the Jewish tradition an image-maker; and about this single point the whole story has grown. It certainly was unknown to Josephus, who tells nothing of Terah except that it was grief for the death of this son Haran that induced him to quit Ur of the Chaldees (*Ant.* 1, 6, 6).

In the Jewish traditions Terah is a prince and a great man in the palace of Nimrod (Jellinek, *Bet hamidrash*, p. 27), the captain of his army (*Sepher Hayyashar*), his son-in-law according to the Arabs (Beer, *Leben Abraham*, p. 97). His wife is called in the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, fol. 91 a) Amtelai; or Emtelai, the daughter of Carnebo. In the book of the Jubilees she is called Edna, the daughter of Arem, or Aram; and by the Arabs Adna (D’Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s.v. “Abraham;” Beer, p. 97). According to D’Herbelot, the name of Abraham’s father was Azar in the Arabic traditions, and: Terah was his grandfather. Elmakin, quoted by Hottinger (*Smegma Orientale*, p. 281), says that, after the death of Yuna, Abraham’s mother, Terah took another wife, who bare him Sarah. ‘He adds that in the days of Terah the king of Babylon made war upon the country in which he dwelt, and that Hazrun, the brother of Terah, went out against him and slew him; and the kingdom of Babylon was transferred to Nineveh and Mosul. For all these traditions, see the book of Jasher and the works of Hottinger, D’Herbelot, Weil, and Beer above quoted. Philo (*De Somniis*) indulges in some strange speculations with regard to Terah’s name and his migration.

Ter'aphim

(Heb. *teraphim*, ⲙⲓⲣⲁⲓⲙ] only thus in the masc. plur. in the Bible, but in the fem. plur. ⲧⲱⲣⲓⲧⲓ] *teraphoth*, in Rabbinical writers) seems to denote tutelar household images, by whom families expected, for reverence bestowed, to be rewarded with domestic prosperity, such as plenty of food, health, and various necessaries of domestic life. This word is in the A. V. always rendered either by “teraphim,” or by “images” with “teraphim” in the margin, except in ⲉⲓⲉⲛⲁ 1 Samuel 15:23; ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ Zechariah 10:2, where it is represented by “idolatry,” “idols.” The singular of the word does not occur, though in ⲉⲓⲉⲛⲁ 1 Samuel 19:13,16 it appears that only *one* image is referred to. Possibly; as in the case of the Roman Penates (which word, also, has no singular), these representative images were always two or three in number. Strange to say, in the Sept. they are represented by a different rendering in nearly every book where the word occurs: in Genesis 31 by ⲉἶδωλα; in ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ Judges 17:18 by θεραφῖν or τὸ θεραφεῖν; in 1 Samuel 19 by κενοτάφια; in ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ Ezekiel 21:21 by γλυπτὰ; in ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ Hosea 3:4 by δῆλοι; and in ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ Zechariah 10:2 by ἀποφθεγγόμενοι. In the Vulg. we find nearly the same variations between *theraphim*, *statua*, *idola*, *simulacra*, *figurae idolorum*, *idololatria*. For other translations, which we find to be equally ‘vague and various, see below.

I. Derivation of the Term. — The etymology and meaning of this word may be inferred from the various modes in which it is represented by the Greek translators, such as θεραφεῖν, τὸ θεραφεῖν, or τὰ θεραφῖν, reminding us of the etymological connection of *ārf* *ārt*, *to nourish*, with τρέφ-ειν. Its remote derivatives in modern languages, viz. the Italian *tarifa*, French *tarif*, and even the English *tripe*, throw a little light upon our subject. According to its etymology, the word *teraphim* has been literally translated *nutritores*, *nourishers*. It seems that the plural form was used as a collective singular for the personified combination of all nourishing powers, as the plural *teraphim* signifies God, in whom all superior powers to be revered with reverential awe are combined (comp. the classical epithets of gods—Sol, Phoebus, Ceres, Venus, Cybele, Pales, Trivia, Fides, Sibylla, etc., ἄλμος, ὄμπνιος, τρόφιμος). The word *teraphim* signified an object or objects of idolatry, as we may learn from some of the above renderings of the Sept., εἶδωλον, γλυπτόν; and that it was in meaning similar to the *Penates* is indicated by κενοτάφιον. Aquila renders it

μορφώματα, προτομαί, ἀνθυφαίρεσις, ἐπίλυσις, εἶδωλα;
Symmachus also translates it εἶδωλα.

The book Zohar derives the name teraphim from **ārt**, *turpitude*, but mentions also that rabbi Jehuda derives it from **hpr**, *to slacken*, because they slackened the hands of men in well-doing. The rabbi adds that they uttered a **hprāwbn**, *prophetia laxa, inanis, vana*, a loose sort of prediction. Hence rabbi Bechai says that **μyprt** are the same as **μypr**, *feeble*, objects not to be depended upon. But in Tanchuma the former etymology is produced, since the teraphim were **hç[m ārwf**, *opus turpitudinis seufeditatis* (see Buxtorfii *Lex. Talmud. et Rabb. s.v. ārt*, which root occurs in the Lat. *turpis*). Onkelos renders teraphim in Genesis 31 by **aymml x**, and Jonathan in Judges 17 and 18 by **ʿyamr**, *images*. The Targum on ^{<0304>}Hosea 3:4 has **ywj m**, *indicans, expounder of oracles*, where the Greek has **δήλων**; and the Targum on ^{<0323>}1 Samuel 15:23 **atw[f**, *idols*. Goussetius, under **ārt**, goes so far as to assert that the word **ἄνθρωπος** is formed from **μyprth**. Lud. de Dieu, and after him Spencer, in *Leg. Rit. Hebr. Dissert.* (7, 1. 3, c. 3, § 7), urges the frequent interchange of the sounds *t* and *s* and *sh*, in order to show that teraphim and seraphim are etymologically connected. Hottinger, in his *Smegma*, and Kircher, in the first volume of his (*Edipus Egyptiacus*, exhibit the etymological progression thus: *Sor Apis* (**σὼρ ἄπ**, *ark of the ox*), *Sarapis*, *Serapis*, *Terapis*, *Teraphim*. The Arabic author Aben Neph also asserts the identity of *Teraphim* and *Serapides*. Others appeal to **apr**, **θεραπεύειν**, *to heal* (comp. Wichmannshausen, *Dissertatio de Teraphim*; Witsius, *zEgyptiaca*, 1, 8; Ugolino, *Thes. 12:786*). Coln, in his *Biblische Theologie*, derives teraphim from the Syriac *araph, percontari*. Gesenius' (*Thesaur.* p. 1519) refers it to the Arabic root *taraph*, "to live in comfort;" and compares it with the Sanscrit *trip*, "to delight," and the Greek **τέρπομα**. Fürst (*Heb. Lex.*) returns to the root **ārt**, in the sense of *nourishing*.

II. Biblical References. —

1. Teraphim are first mentioned in ^{<0319>}Genesis 31:19, where we are told that Rachel stole the teraphim of her father Laban, and successfully concealed them from his search under the *hiran*, or coarse carpet which is used to cover the wicker-work pack-saddle of the camel. Aben-Ezra says

that she stole them in order that her father might not, by means of their oracles, discover the direction of Jacob's flight (and we note that Laban adopted this or some other mode of augury from' his use of the word *nichdshthi*, "I have augured" [30, 27]); but Josephus says that she carried off these τύπους τῶν θεῶν that they might serve as a material protection to her if overtaken, although she herself disbelieved in them (καταφρονεῖν μὲν τῆς τοιαύτης τιμῆς τῶν θεῶν διδάξαντος αὐτήν τοῦ Ἰακώβου [Ant.; i, 19, 8]); and, lastly, some suppose that she was tempted by the precious metals of which they were made. It is far, more probable: that, like her father, Rachel, whose mind was evidently tainted with superstition (^{<0134>}Genesis 30:14), regarded the teraphim as tutelary "gods" (^{<0130>}Genesis 31:30). Laban's eagerness to recover them shows the importance in which they were held; and it is important to observe that, although a believer in Elohim (^{<0135>}Genesis 31:53), he openly paid to these teraphim, which were probably ancestral divinities of his family (ibid.), an idolatrous worship. Jurieu (*Hist. des Dogmes et des Cultes*, 2, 3, 456), after elaborately entering into the question, thinks that they may have been images of Shem and Noah. From this Biblical notice it would seem that they were usually somewhat large figures, which could not very easily be secreted.

2. It is extremely probable that these household deities were among the "strange gods" and talismanic earrings which Jacob required his family to give up, and which were buried by him under the boughs of *Allon-Meonenim*, "the sorcerers oak" (^{<0137>}Judges 9:37). But an isolated act would naturally be ineffectual to abolish a cult which had probably existed for centuries in the Aramaean 'home of the Shemites; and, consequently, in the time of the Judges we find the worship of teraphim existing in full vigor. The 17th and 18th chapters of Judges are entirely occupied with the story of Micah, an Ephraimite, who in those wild and ignorant times had fancied that' he could honor Jehovah (^{<01713>}Judges 17:13) by establishing a worship in his own house. To the ephod and teraphim which he already possessed (ver. 5) his mother added a *Pesel and Massekach* (possibly "a graven and a molten image") made out of the gold which she had consecrated to Jehovah and which he had stolen. When Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, arrived at the house in his accidental wanderings, Micah engaged him as a regular priest, and anticipated, in consequence the special blessing of Jehovah. The five Danite spies consulted these oracular Penates of Micah through the intervention of Jonathan (18:5), and

informed the Danites on their way to Laish of the images which the house contained. The Danite warriors, with the most unscrupulous indifference, violently carried off the whole apparatus of this private cult, including the priest himself, to their new city and we are informed that it continued to be celebrated till the day of the captivity of the land," which, as we see from the next verse, may perhaps mean till the capture of Shiloh by the Philistines. What is most remarkable in this narrative is the fact that both Micah, who was a worshipper [of Jehovah, and the Danites, who acknowledged Elohim. (ver 5, 10), and Jonathan, the grandson of Moses himself, should, in spite of the distinctest prohibitions of the law, have regarded the adoration of teraphim and other images as harmless, if not as laudable and that this form of idolatry, without any political motive to palliate it as in the case of Jeroboam, should have been adopted and maintained without surprise or hesitation, nay, even with eager enthusiasm, by an entire tribe of Israel. This is very much as at present some forms of image-adoration are blended with the service of God. That such will-worship, however, was only comparatively innocent, and originated in an obstinate *pruritus* of improving rather than obeying God's revelation, Samuel clearly expressed in reproving Saul (⁰⁹¹³1 Samuel 15:23), "Stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry" (literally teraphim). We do not read that the stubbornness of Saul led him actually to worship teraphim. However, his daughter possessed teraphim, as; we shall see presently.

3. The next notice of teraphim which we find is in ⁰⁹¹³1 Samuel 19:13-16, where Michal, to give David more time to escape, deceives 'the messengers of Saul by putting the teraphim' in his bed," with a pillow of goats'-hair for his bolster." The use of the article shows that "the teraphim" was something perfectly well known (Thenius, *ad loc.*); and the fact that we thus find it (or them.) in the house of a man so pious as David entirely confirms our inference as to the prevalence of these images. The suggestions of Michaelis that Michal may have worshipped them unknown to David, and that barren women were especially devoted to them, are wholly without foundation. The article (**μυρᾶθη**) explodes; the arguments of Michaelis (*De Theraphis, Comment Soc. Gött.* 1763), Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, 623), etc., that the teraphim in this instance was a mere hastily made doll of rags; in fact, a sort of malkin. We may legitimately infer from the passage that they had some rude resemblance to the human shape, being, perhaps, something like the Hermae; hence Aquila in this place renders the word by **πρωτομαί**. The Sept. rendering **κενοτάφια** very probably points

to the belief that the teraphim were images of deceased ancestors (κενοτάφιά τινα ησαν ἐλισσόμενα ὡς τύπος νεκροῦ. Suid. *vid. Bochart, Hieroz.* I; 2, 51); and the rendering' of put a pillow of goats'-hair for his bolster" by καὶ ηπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν ἔθετο πρὸς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, "she placed the goats' liver at his head," shows that they read **rbk]** "liver," for **rybk]** "mattress." Now if this ancient reading were correct, it brings the passage into remarkable parallel with ^{<21>}Ezekiel 21:21, where Nebuchadnezzar is said to have decided his course by belomantia, together with consultation of teraphim and looking into the liver (*extispicium*). It is possible that Michal may have been divining by means of a sacrifice to the teraphim: when Saul's messenger arrived, and that she put the yet palpitating liver on the bed with the image, which in a small, dark, narrow recess might well enough pass for a human being. Josephus, with his usual want of honesty, omits all mention of the teraphim, and only says that she put the liver under the bedclothes, hoping that its motion would make the men more easily believe that David was gasping! (*Ant.* 6:11, 4). Theodoret (*Quaest.* 49, in 1 *Reg.*) repeats this preposterous notion.

On every revival of the knowledge of the written Revelation of God the teraphim were swept away, together with the worse forms of idolatry (^{<22>}2 Kings 23:24): "The workers with familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the images (teraphim), and the idols, and all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah land in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away, that he might perform the words of the law which were written in the book that Hilkiah the priest found in the house of the Lord."...

4. The next passage in historical order about the teraphim is ^{<23>}Hosea 3:4, which is encompassed by difficulties. The prophet, purchasing Gomer to himself, bids her be chaste for many days, "for the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a sacrifice, and without an image (*matsebâh*), and without an ephod, and without teraphim." Here it would certainly be the *prima facie* impression of every unbiased reader that the *matsebâh* and the teraphim are mentioned without blame as ordinary parts of religious worship. Without, however,-entering into the question (which, perhaps, cannot be decided) whether Hosea did or did not mean to commend or tolerate these material adjuncts to a monotheistic worship, it is certainly not surprising that the reverence paid to the teraphim should have continued in Israel side by side with that paid to the calves, which beyond all doubt: were intended to be mere Elohistic symbols; and this is

the less surprising when we remember that one of these cherubic emblems was set up in the very city (Dan) to which the teraphim of Micah had been carried; and probably, indeed, because of the existence there of the irregular worship established by Moses' grandson. But here, again, the Sept. version is curious and perplexing, for it uses the word **δῆλοι** (sc. **λίθοι**, bright gems), a word which, like **δήλωσις**, it uses elsewhere of the Urim and Thummim (^{<0272>}Numbers 27:21; ^{<0286>}1 Samuel 28:6); and Aquila seems to have had the same notion in adopting the word **φωτισμούς**, and it is even countenanced by Jerome, who in this passage includes the teraphim among the "instrumenta sacerdotalis habitus." This is one starting-point for the theory, supported with such a mass of splendid but unconvincing learning by Spencer (*De Legg. Hebr.* lib. 3, dissert. 7 p. 920-1038), that the teraphim and urim were identical. He argues not only from this rendering **δῆλοι**, but also

- (1) from the frequent union of ephod with teraphim;
- (2) from the supposition that urim means "fires," and that teraphim means the same, being a mere Aramaic equivalent for seraphim, the burning ones
- (3) from the constant use of teraphim for oracular purposes.

He concludes, therefore, that they were small images, permitted as a kind of necessary concession to deeply rooted idolatry, placed in the folds of the ephod and believed to emit predictions of the divine will. How ill the theory accords with the data before us will be obvious at once. This passage seems to indicate that as the use of teraphim, like that of the Penates and Lares among the Romans, was connected with nationality, it necessarily perished with; the nationality itself.

5. The teraphim were consulted even after the Captivity by persons upon whom true religion had no firm hold, in order to elicit some supernatural *omina*, similar to the *auguria* of the Romans. Thus (^{<3802>}Zechariah 10:2): "For the idols (teraphim) have spoken vanity," etc. In like manner at a previous age, in connection with the *haruspicia* instituted by the king of Babylon, we read (^{<4521>}Ezekiel 21:21, 26) that he consulted images (teraphim).

The main and certain results of this review are that the teraphim were rude human images; that the use of them was an antique Aramaic custom; that

there is reason to suppose them to have been images of deceased ancestors; that they were consulted oracularly; that they were not confined to Jews; that their use continued down to the latest period of Jewish history; and lastly, that, although the more enlightened prophets and strictest-later kings regarded them as idolatrous, the priests were much, less averse to such images, and their cult was not considered in any way repugnant to the pious worship of Elohim; nay, even to the worship of him “under the awful title of Jehovah,” as in the case of Aaron, Jonathan, Uriah, etc. (See some acute remarks on this subject in Nicolas, *Etudes Crit. sur la Bible*, p. 129-135.) In fact, they involved a monotheistic idolatry, very different indeed from polytheism; and the tolerance of them by priests as compared with the denunciation of them by the keener insight and more vivid inspiration of the prophets offers a close analogy to the views of the Roman Catholics respecting pictures and images as compared with the views of Protestants. It was against this use of idolatrous symbols and emblems in a monotheistic worship that the second commandment was directed, whereas the first is aimed against the graver sin of direct polytheism. But the whole history of Israel shows how early and how utterly the law must have fallen into desuetude. The worship of the gold pin calf and of the calves at Dan and Bethel, against which, so far as we know, neither Elijah nor Elisha said a single word; the tolerance of high places, teraphim, and baetyla; the offering of incense for centuries to the brazen serpent destroyed by Hezekiah; the occasional glimpses of the most startling irregularities sanctioned, apparently, even in the Temple worship itself, prove most decisively that a pure monotheism and an independence of symbols were the result of a slow and painful course of God’s disciplinal dealings among the noblest thinkers of a single nation, and not, as is so constantly and erroneously urged, the instinct of the whole Shemitic race; in other words, one single branch of the Shemites was, under God’s providence, educated into pure monotheism only by centuries of misfortune and series of inspired men. In fact, we have most remarkable proofs that the use of teraphim coexisted with the worship of Jehovah even in comparatively pious families; and we have more than one instance of the wives of worshippers of Jehovah not finding full contentment and satisfaction in the stern moral truth of spiritual worship, and therefore carrying on some private symbolism by fondling the teraphim. It seems, however, that this swerving from truth was comparatively innocent. It was never denounced and suppressed with the same rigor as the worship of Moloch. There is, in fine, no positive evidence that the teraphim ever were

actually worshipped. They seem rather to have been cherished as *talismans* than as idols. *SEE MAGIC.*

III. Opinions of Later Scholars. — Besides Spencer's theory, to which we have already alluded, we may mention others, utterly valueless indeed, yet curious as bearing on the history of the subject.

1. Rabbins. — According to the great rabbi Eliezer, who was the son of Hyrcanus and the brother-in-law of Gamaliel II, who seems to have been the tutor of Paul (in *Pirke Aboth*, and the Targum of Jonathan on ^{<1319>}Genesis 31:19), the worship of teraphim was connected with atrocities. "The makers of teraphim slaughtered a man who was a first-born, cut his head off and salted it, and cured it with spices and oil. After this, they wrote the name of an impure spirit and sentences of divination on a golden plate, which they placed under the tongue of the head which was fastened to the wall, and lighted lamps before it, and knelt down in adoration, upon which the tongue began to utter divinations." Rabbi Salomo, or Rashi (^{<1234>}2 Kings 23:24), says, "The teraphim uttered divinations by magical and horoscopic- arts." 'On ^{<1913>}1 Samuel 19:13 sq., he adduces the opinion that the teraphim were horoscopic and astrological instruments made of brass; but he confesses that this opinion, to which he is himself much inclined, is not consistent with the account of Michal, from which it is evident that the teraphim had the shape of man. On Genesis 31 Aben-Ezra adduces the opinion that the teraphim were *automata*, made by astrologers so as to show the hours and to mutter divinations. Hence the Persian Tawas in Genesis 31 translates *astrolabia*. Aben-Ezra also adduces the opinion that Rachel stole the teraphim of Laban in order to prevent him from idolatry, and from asking the teraphim whither his children had fled. Rabbi Levi ben-Gersom (on Genesis) states that the teraphim were human figures, by which the imagination of diviners was so excited that they supposed they heard a low voice speaking about future events with which their own thoughts were filled, although the image did not speak, an operation which can only be performed by such natural organs as God has provided for that purpose.

2. Moderns. — Michaelis, in *Commentationes Societati Göttingen si oblatae* (Brem. 1763), p. 5 sq., compares the teraphim to the *Satyri* and *Sileni*, referring to the statement of Pausanias (6, 24, 6), that there were graves of Sileni in the country of the Hebrews; and alluding to the *hairy ones* ("devils," *μυγρυ[ς]*) of ^{<1870>}Leviticus 17:7. Creuzer asserts that the

teraphim had something of *asses* in them (*Commentationes Herod.* 1, 277; *Symb.* 3, 208 sq.); and refers to the old calumny that the Jews worshipped the head of an ass (Tacit. *Hist.* 5, 4 Rutilius, 1, 387). Creuzer appeals also (*Symb.* 2, 340) to Genesis 31 in order to prove the fertilizing, or rather fecundizing, power of the **μypr̄t**, which scarcely can be proved from ver. 19 (comp. here Rosenmüller *Scholia*; Jahn, 3, 506 sq.).

IV. Recent Illustrations. — M. Botta found in cavities under the pavement of the porch of the palace at Khorsabad several small images of baked clay of frightful aspect, sometimes with lynx head and human body, and sometimes with human head and lion's or bull's body. Some have a miter encircled at the bottom with a double pair of horns, and others have their hair rolled in large curls. In front of several doors he saw the same cavities, of the size of one of the bricks, and about fourteen inches in depth, lined with tiles, and having a ledge round the inside, so that they might be covered by one of the bricks of the pavement, without betraying the existence of the cavity. It has been suggested that these images are the teraphim, or household gods, of the ancient Assyrians, which, being secreted under the pavement near the doors, were intended to protect the entrances of the palace from the admission of evil. See Bonomi, *Nineveh*-p. 156.

Picture for Teraphim 1

Figures somewhat similar but less hideous have been found among the Egyptian ruins and elsewhere, which seem to have been employed with a like significance. See Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 25.

Picture for Teraphim 2

V. Literature. — The principal authorities concerning the teraphim are Michaelis, *De Teraphis*, in the *Comment. Soc. Gött.* (Brem. 1763), p. 5 sq.; Hersen, *De Teraphim* (Viteb. 1665); Wickmannshahsen, *De Teraphim* (ibid. 1705); also in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 23:7; Antast, *De Diis Familiae Jacobi* (Lips. 1744); Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2660-64; Pfeiffer, *Exerc. Bibl.* p. 1-28; Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 296; Selden, *De Diis Syris Syntagm.* 1, 2' Spencer, *De Legg. Hebr.* p. 920-1038; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 623; Carpzov, *Appar. Crit.* p. 537546; Jurieu, *Hist. Crit. des Dogmes*, 2, 3; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v.; Winkler, *Anim. advers. Philol.* 2, 351 sq. **SEE IDOLATRY.**

Terebinth

Picture for Terebinth 1

a majestic Oriental tree, which has been made by many a rival of:the oak. as a representative of the Heb. *hLaj hl ael yaor* *~/Lai* *SEE PLAIN*. So Celsius (*Hierob.* 2, 34-58), and' naturalists generally since. Travelers frequently confound the two trees. They are, however, quite different in many particulars. The bark, shape, and general character are remarkably alike, but the wood, the leaf, and the blossom differ very obviously. *SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS*. The terebinth is the *Pistacia terebinthus* of botanists, called by the Arabs the *betm* or *butni*, and well known in the Greek islands as the *turpentine-tree*. *SEE TEIL*. In Chios especially a considerable quantity of turpentine is extracted from it by tapping the trunk; but this is not practiced in Palestine, where the inhabitants seem to be ignorant of its commercial value. It is a very common tree in the southern and eastern parts of the country, being generally found in situations too warm for the oak, whose place it there supplies, although they are occasionally found immediately adjoining, as at Tell el-Kady. (Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 581). It is seldom, seen in clumps or groves, never in forests, but stands isolated and weird-like in some bare ravine or on a hillside, where nothing else towers above the lower brushwood. The *but* is *not* an evergreen, as is often represented, but its small feathered lancet-shaped leaves fall in the autumn and are renewed in the spring. They are pinnate, the leaflets larger than those of the lentisk, and their hue is a very dark reddish-green, not quite so somber as the locust-tree. The flowers are in clusters like those of a vine, inconspicuous, and are followed by small oval berries, hanging in clusters from two to five inches in length, resembling much the clusters of the vine when the grapes are just set. They are of a ruddy purple and remarkably juicy. Another fruit, or rather excrescence, is found on the tree, scattered among the leaves, of the size of a chestnut, of a putrid color variegated with green and white. The people of Cyprus believe that it is produced by the puncture of a fly; when opened it appears full of worms (Mariti, 1, 209; 2, 114). From incisions in the trunk there flows a sort of transparent balsam, constituting a very pure and fine species of turpentine, with an agreeable odor, like citron or jessamine, and a mild taste, and hardening gradually into a transparent gum. It is called Cyprus or Chian turpentine, and is obtained in July by wounding the bark in several places, leaving a space of about three inches between the

wounds. From these the turpentine is received on stones, upon which it becomes so much condensed by the coldness of the night as to admit of being scraped off with a knife, which is always done before sunrise. It is again liquefied in the sun and passed through a strainer, in order to free it from all extraneous matters. The quantity produced is very small, four large trees, sixty years old, only yielding two pounds and a half: it may be somewhat more in favorable situations. In consequence of this, and its superior qualities, the turpentine is very costly, and is often adulterated with inferior substances (Kitto, *Phys. Hist. of Palest.* p. 238). The tree is found also in Asia Minor (many of them near Smyrna), Greece, Italy, the south of France, Spain, and in the north of Africa, and is there described as not usually rising to the height of more than twenty feet. It often exceeds that size, however, in the mountains, and in the plains of Syria it is very much larger. *SEE OAK.*

Picture for Terebinth 2

Many terebinths remain to this day objects of veneration in their neighborhood, and the favorite burying place of a Bedawin sheik is under a solitary tree. Eastern travelers will recall the "Mother of rags" on the outskirts of the desert—a terebinth covered with the votive offerings of superstition or affection. The "oak of Mamre," near Hebron, was said to be a terebinth, which remained till the 4th century (Jerome, *De Loc. Heb.* 87; Sozomen, *Eccles. Hist.* 2, 4; comp. Josephus, *War*, 5, 9, 7), and on its site Constantine erected a church, the ruins of which still remain. It is said that the tree dried up in the reign of Theodosius the Younger; but that the trunk produced a new tree, from which Brocard (7, 64), Salignac (10, 5), and other old travelers declare that they brought slips of the new and old wood to their own country (Zuallart *Voyage de Jerusalem*, 4,: 1) The tree was accidentally destroyed by fire in A.D. 1646 (Mariti, p. 520). Its modern representative, however, is a true oak, as is proved both by its leaves and actual acorns. The tree on which Judas hanged himself is said to have been a terebinth, and its descendant is yet shown to the credulous, overhanging the valley of Hinnom. Towards the north of Palestine the tree becomes more scarce; but in ancient Moab and Ammon, and in the region around Heshbon, it is the only one that relieves the monotony of the rolling downs and boundless sheep walks; and in the few glens south of the Jabbok there are many trees of a larger size than others which remain west of the Jordan (Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible.*, p. 401). In Turkey the burial-grounds of Christians, particularly the Armenians, are planted with terebinth-trees,

the cypress being reserved for the Mohammedans (Calcott [Lady], *Script. Herbal*, p. 504). *SEE TURPENTINE-TREE.*

Te'resh

(Heb. *id.* **vrT**, prob. Pers. *strictness*; Sept. [in some copies only] **Θάρας** or **Θάρρας**; *Vulg. Thares*), the second-named of the two eunuchs who kept the door of the palace of Ahasuerus, and who were hanged, their plot to assassinate the king being discovered by Mordecai (^{<1702>}Esther 2:21; 6:2). B.C. 479. Josephus: calls him *Theodestes* (**Θεοδέστης**, *Ant.* 11:6, 4 and 10), and says that, the conspiracy having been detected by Barnabazus, a servant of one of the eunuchs, who was a Jew by birth, and who revealed it to Mordecai, the conspirators were crucified.

Terminism and the Terministic Controversy

The word *Terminism* has reference to the terminus of the period of grace accorded to man as an individual or in the mass. The basis of the dispute which arose upon this matter was the Middle-Age, Augustinian theory, that the end of this earthly life is in every in-stance the end of gracious opportunity, so that even unbaptized children become at death the prey of hell.. The Reformation led the consciousness of Christians back to the dynamic conditions of salvation, namely, on the one hand, to the free grace of God, and, on the other, to the internal, religious, and moral state of repentance. In the light of the former condition it was possible to suppose that the *terminus gratiae* might be extended beyond the *terminus vitae*; under the latter it could be contracted to even narrower limits than the duration of earthly life. A recognition of the possibility of widening the period of grace led to the development of the doctrine of the Apocatastasis (q.v.), while its contrary gave rise to Terminism.

The leading promulgators of Terminism were the *Friends*, who taught that every person has a special day of visitation, which is but transient and may end. before the close of the life of earth (see. Winer, *Comp. Darstellung*, p. 87). The Pietists also contributed towards the growth of that idea by their depreciation of the worth of repentance late in life. The controversy upon the subject was fairly opened by the appearance of a work by J.G. Bise, deacon at Sorau (died 1700), entitled *Terminus Peremptorius Salutis Humanoe*, etc. (1698). A number of responses were written, the more important of them- by Neumann, professor at Wittenberg, *Diss. de Term. Salut.* etc. (Viteb. 1700), and *Diss. de Tempore Gratiae*, etc. (1701); also

Ittig, professor at Leipsic, *Vortrage iib. d. prophet., apostol. u. evang. — luth. Lehre*, etc., With other works. Rechenberg, the son-in-law of Spener, came to the assistance of Bapse with his *Diss. de Grat. Revocatricis Termino* (Lips. 1700). The dispute was dropped on the death of Ittig, in 1710, and the advance of rationalism deprived the question of interest. For the theology of our time, the only importance of the discussion lies in its possible influence in occasioning profounder determinations with regard to the possibility of becoming hardened against grace in this life, and the infinite consequences depending upon the hour of death and the free sovereignty of God.

The literature of the controversy is largely given in the works of Rechenberg and Ittig. See also Winer, *Theol. Literatur*, p. 446; Bretschneider, *Systemat. Entwickl.* p. 693. On the dispute itself. see Einem, *Kirchengesch. d. 18. Jahrh.* 2, 737; Walch, *Einl. in d. Religionsstreitigk. d. evang. — luth. Kirche*, 2, 551 sq.; Baumgarten, *Geschichte d. Religionsparteien*, p. 1282 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Terms

in law, are the periods in England when the courts of law hold their sittings at Westminster for the discharge of their judicial functions. There are four in every year, namely, Hilary term, Easter term, Trinity term, and Michaelmas term; but the last of these is usually at the commencement of the legal year. They were supposed by Selden to have been established by William the Conqueror; but Spelman has shown that they originated in the observances of the Church, and were no more than those leisure periods when there was neither fast nor festival nor rural avocation to withhold the suitor from attending the court. At first the courts in Christian countries continued open all the year round, but the Church interposed. The sacred season of Advent and Christmas originated the winter vacation; the time of Lent and Easter gave rise to that of the spring; the third we owe to Pentecost; and the requisitions of agricultural pursuits account for the long space that intervenes between Midsummer and Michaelmas. Sundays and other holydays were included in the prohibition which, in 517, was established by a canon of the Church, and, says Blackstone, fortified by an imperial constitution of the younger Theodosius, comprised in the *Theodosian Code*. In the commencement and duration of these terms, these regulations of the Church were kept in view. Edward the Confessor, in one of his laws, says that from Advent to the octave of Epiphany, from

Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, from the Ascension to the octave of Pentecost, and from four in the afternoon of every Saturday until the end of the succeeding Monday, the peace of God and holy Church should be kept throughout the realm (*Ancient Laws and Institutions of England*, p. 190). We learn from Britton that in the reign of Edward I no secular plea could be held, nor any man sworn on the evangelists, during Advent, Lent, Pentecost, or the times of harvest and vintage, and the days of the great litanies and all solemn festivals. The bishops, however, he adds, granted dispensations that assizes and juries might be taken at these seasons; and afterwards, by statute Westminster 1, 3 Edward I, c! 51, it was enacted that assizes of novel disseisin mort d'ancester and darrein presentment should be taken in Advent, Septuagesima, and Lent. The portions not included in the prohibitions became what are called *terms*, and were denominated according to the saint to whose feast they occurred most nearly.

Terms Of Communion,

those conditions on which the members of a particular Church are agreed, and which are the basis of their fellowship. Terms of communion are not to be identified with terms of salvation; nor should terms of lay communion be as comprehensive and theological as those of clerical fellowship.

Terrace

(**hL****S****æ**) *mesillah*, ^{491b}2 Chronicles 9:11; Sept. ἀνάβασις; a *highway*, as elsewhere usually rendered), a staircase, constructed by Solomon for his edifices out of the alnum-trees imported from the East Indies. *SEE PALACE; SEE TEMPLE.*

Terrasson, Andre

a French clergyman, and first of a literary family of considerable note in France, was born at Lyons in 1669, became a priest of the Oratory, preacher to the king, and afterwards preacher to the court of Lorraine. His pulpit services were much applauded, and attended by crowded congregations. His exertions during Lent in the metropolitan church at Paris threw him into an illness from which he died, April 25, 1723. His *Sermons* were printed in 1726 (4 vols. 12mo) and 1736. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict. s.v.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, s.v.*

Terrasson, Gaspard

brother of the preceding, was born at Lyons, Oct. 5, 1680, and was sent, at the age of eighteen, to the house of the Oratory at Paris. He resided afterwards in different houses of his order, chiefly at Troyes, where he delivered a funeral oration for the dauphin, son of Louis XIV. For some time he, employed himself in delivering exhortations in the seminaries, but after Andre's death he accepted solicitations to preach, and soon acquired a reputation superior to that of his brother. He preached in Paris during five years; but Various circumstances, particularly his attachment to the Jansenists, obliged him to leave both the Congregation of the Oratory and the pulpit at the same time. He was appointed curate of Treigny in 1735; but, persecution still following him, he was sent to the Bastile, which he, left in 1744 to be confined with the Minims at Argenteuil. He was at length set at liberty, and died in Paris, Jan. 2, 1752, leaving *Sermons* (4 vols. 12mo), and an anonymous book, *Lettres sur la Justice Chretienne*, which was censured by the Sorbonne.

Terrasson, Jean

brother of the two preceding, was born at Lyons in 1670, where he also studied, and entered the Oratory. In 1707 he was admitted into the Academy of Sciences, and he entered into the literary discussions of the day. In 1721 he became professor of philosophy in the College of France, and in 1732 he was made a member of the French Academy. Towards the end of his life he lost his memory. He died in. Paris, Sept. 15, 1750. He published a number of historical works. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Terrier

a formal survey and plan or schedule of Church property, ordered by English canon law to be made and preserved in the bishop's registry. A terrier of glebe lands made under queen Elizabeth is preserved in the British Exchequer.

Territorial System

This title is applied to that theory of Church government which assumes that the ruler of a country possesses, *by virtue of his sovereignty*, the right to govern the Church, if Protestant, which has been established within his

realm. The Middle Ages had witnessed a constant association of the Church with the State, which was at times carried so far as to include the one under the other as one of its parts. When the principles of the Jewish theocracy could be asserted, the Church would attempt to subject the State to its authority; but when a relapse into heathen principles took place, the State was ready to enforce the authority of the civil power over the religion of the land. When the reformatory movements of the 15th century had failed, the renewed agitation, of which Zwingli, Luther, etc., were the representatives, addressed itself to the princes and estates of the land. The sovereign powers of either party assumed the right to dictate the creed of their subjects. The Roman Catholic prince who became a Protestant sought to carry his country with him over to Protestantism; the Lutheran who passed over into the Reformed Church assumed to transfer his subjects also. The belief of the prince was to determine the creed of the land. The Peace of Westphalia ended this anomalous practice, but expressly recognized the sovereignty of the prince as the source of *the jus reformandi*. The dangerous character of the principle which derived all the rights belonging to an evangelical Church from the head of the State was soon recognized, and led to the development of the theory which is usually known as the *episcopal system*.

The territorial system was formulated at the close of the 17th century as a foil to that theory, finding its leading advocates in Christian Thomasius (q.v.) and his pupil Brenneisen (*De Jure Principis circa Adiaphora* [Halse, 1675], in Thomasius, *Auserlesene deutsche Schriften*, 1696, p. 76 sq.), and its principal opponent in Johann Benedikt Carpzov (q.v.). As formulated by Thomasius, the reigning prince possesses, as a natural right, the authority to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of his country, and of banishing persons who disturb the peace of the Church. He may dismiss a preacher who dispenses false teachings, and may forbid the introduction of new confessions, etc.; but he cannot impose his own creed upon his subjects, nor finally determine in matters of religion. The theory found many supporters, jurists as well as theologians, among them J. H. Bohmer and Job. Jac. Moser (q.v.). It has been defended in quite recent times, in connection with their liturgical disputes, by Miller, Marheinecke, Augusti, and others. The *collegial system* deprived the territorial theory of every support; and the present tendency towards an entire separation between State and Church is wholly antagonistic to its prevalence. Both legislation and praxis have suffered from its influence to the present day.

On the entire subject, see *Stahl, Kirchenverfassung nach Lehre u. Recht d. Protestanten*, p. 22 sq.; Richter, *Gesch. d. evang. Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland*, p. 212 sq. — , Friedberg, *De Finibus inter Ecclesiam et Civitatem*, etc. (Lips. 1861); Lehmann, *De Pace Religiosa*, 1, 23; Nettelbladt, *Observatt. Juris Ecclesiastici* (Halse, 1783, 8vo); the works of Thomasius, Carpzov, etc.; Bohmer, *Consilia et Decisiones*, tom. 1, pars 1, respons. 15. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. **SEE CHURCH AND STATE; SEE COLLEGIAL SYSTEM.**

Terry, Parschal

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Aquebogue, Long Island, N. Y., Nov. 3, 1806; was licensed to preach by the Methodist Protestant Church of New York; preached at Aquebogue for two years; was ordained, by the Congregational Convention of Long Island in 1831, and labored for a number of years at Patchogue; but, feeling the need of a more thorough course of theology, studied in the seminary attached to Yale College, graduated in 1840, and became a member of Onondaga Presbytery. In 1843 he was editor of the *Religious Recorder* at 'Syracuse, N. Y.; in 1848 removed to Marathon, N. Y., and was received by Cortland Presbytery; thence, in 1853, to Painesville, O., where he ministered three years. He subsequently labored, in 1857, at Unionville, O.; 1858, Thompson; 1861, Hudson; 1862, Franklin Mills; 1863, Troy. He died Oct. 20, 1865. 'He was a man of more than usual talents, which he improved by culture. See *Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p.322.

Ter Sanctus

is the triumphal hymn of the ancient liturgies, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory," etc., and is based on the three holies (^{2MB} Isaiah 6:3; Revelation 4, 8). In all ancient liturgies the *Ter Sanctus* comes near, but before, the prayer of consecration, and is sung by the choir and the people. "The pontiff who is to celebrate approaches the altar and praises the works of God, and, giving thanks for all, associates himself with the angels, and vociferates with them the triumphal hymn Holy, holy, holy; and the people also recite it, typifying the equality of peace which we shall hereafter enjoy with the angels, and our union with them" (Simeon of Thessalonica, *Comm. on Lit. of St. Chrysos.*). This hymn formerly concluded with the words "Hosanna in the highest, blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest." This is the

case in the liturgies of St. James, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, the Malabar, Mozarabic, and Sarum. In that of St. Clement the *Sanctus and Hosanna* are separate, and the Mozarabic has the further addition "Hagios, hagios, hagios, Kyrie ho Theos." The prefaces of *Ter Sanctus* are very various, being adapted to different festivals and seasons. But they invariably end with the doxological form represented by the "Therefore with. angels and archangels," etc., of the Prayer-book. In all liturgies the preface is sung or said by the celebrant alone, the choir and people joining in at the hymn itself. Hence in the Sarum Missal, followed by the Prayer-books of 1549 and 1552, the *Sanctus* is printed as a separate paragraph. The *hymn* is also called *Trisagion* (q.v.).

Tersteegen, Gerhard

the mystic aid sacred poet, was born at-Meurs, on Nov. 25,1697. He early acquired a thorough knowledge of ancient languages, including the Hebrew, and friends advised his preparation for a. learned career; but, his father having died, his mother was induced, from domestic considerations, to choose a mercantile life for him instead. He was apprenticed to his brother-in law at Mülheim in 1713, and in the following year was powerfully wrought upon by the grace of God. Mülheim was at that time the scene of an exalted and vigorous piety which was kept alive through, the holding of weekly convocations, and made itself felt in all the affairs of life. These convocations became *an* occasion of offence to the Church at large, and Hoffmann, the Mülheim pastor, was cited before the Classis of Duisburg, which decided that he must refrain from holding them in future, and induced the Synod of Cleves to take similar action. Nothing has been found, however, to show that Hoffmann was guilty of heterodoxy, or that the convocations served any other purpose than that of leading many souls to Christ. In spite of these inquisitorial measures, the convocations. were obstinately continued at Mülheim, and Tersteegen, for his part, was alienated from the Church to such a degree as to refrain from participating in the public worship, and particularly in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, of which evident sinners were allowed to partake. He finished his apprenticeship, but two years afterwards, in 1719, under the impulse of religious sentiment, renounced his business for one of a more retired character. He now became a ribbon-weaver and an ascetic. He had no companion save the girl who wound his silk. His clothing was poor, his food scanty and simple; but his charities, whatever might be his income, were numerous. He considered this ascetical, hermit life the ideal condition

of a Christian on the earth, and for a time endured its trials and privations with unwavering confidence in the care of his heavenly Father; but gradually he became the prey of internal anxieties which tortured him during five years with but occasional and transient interventions of hope. But in 1724 that period of suffering came to its close. He celebrated the return of his Savior's smile in the hymn *Wie bist Du mir sonnig gut, mein Hohepriester Du* and entered into a covenant with his Lord which he signed with his own blood-probably in imitation of the marquis de Renty, whose life he had treated with great pleasure in his book *Leben heiliger Seelen*, 1, 3.

With the conclusion of this period of spiritual darkness his preparation came to an end. He was thenceforward, though much against his will, thrown among men and obliged to take an active part in the affairs of religion. He resided with his brother, and while employed in the tuition of that brother's children was led to undertake a work which initiated his career as a mystical writer-the *Unparteiischer Abriss christlicher Grundwahrheiten*, a catechetical manual, first printed in 1801 and again in 1842. In this book he evidently leaned on the French mystic Pierre Poiret (q.v.) as respects both its arrangement and matter. The first three centuries of the Church are represented as having been pure, and the succeeding ages, from Constantine to the 15th century, as a period of great apostasy. The light broke through with power in the Reformation, but afterwards again declined. Christianity exists more generally in name than in fact. Upon this work followed a number of translations and prefaces, in the preparation of which Tersteegen was accustomed to spend the time after six o'clock in the evening. The list includes Labadie, *Manuel de Piété* (with preface dated Mülheim, May 21, 1726); Jean de Bernieres Louvigny's works (*Das verborgene Leben mit Christo in Gött*, etc., with preface dated Dec. 18, 1726); Thomas a Kempis, *Imitatio Christi*; Gerlach Petersen, *Soliloquia* (1727). In 1733 he began the publication of the work entitled *Auserlesene Lebensboschr. heil. Seelen*, the final (third) volume of which appeared in 1753, followed by a second edition of the whole work in the next year. The saints so commemorated belong altogether to the Roman Catholic communion a fact which Tersteegen excused on the ground that others had rendered a similar service to Protestantism but there is satisfactory proof that he possessed an especial fondness for the peculiar piety cultivated by the mystical ascetics of the former Church. In 1749 he published a translation of a poetical composition by Madame Guyon

illustrative of the inner life, and with this work completed the series of his mystical writings. In them all he takes Poiret-sometimes Godfrey Arnold (q.v.) also for his master. His mystical tendency is sometimes exaggerated into Quietism (q.v.) in them, so that he can speak in glowing terms of approval of a state of perfect rest for the soul which begins and continues through the direct operation of God on the soul without any mediation whatever, even though it be that of Scripture or of Christ.

Tersteegen yielded to the persuasions of Hoffmann and others, and began to address public assemblies at about the time when his first literary efforts were put forth. In 1728 he renounced his handicraft and gave himself wholly to the care of souls. His wants were supplied by the contributions of friends and by several legacies, so that he was even able to exercise a liberal benevolence. His advice was desired by great numbers of people living everywhere in the territories of Cleves and Berg. Otterbeck, a farm between Mülheim and Elberfeld, became a station where a number of his adherents lived together in the practice of industry, self renunciation, and piety. He furnished them twelve rules of conduct (given at the close of vol. 3 of his letters), and watched over them with jealous care. A work written in their behalf in 1727 became a bulwark against Antinomianism (q.v.), and saved them from the excesses into which other, but kindred, associations were drawn. A second center of his influence was Elberfeld, and subsequently Barmen. This region was troubled with the fanatical influence of Eller (q.v.) and his supporters. To counteract that influence, Tersteegen wrote an effectual admonition (comp. *Wegder Wahrheit*, 11). Solingen was a third station, and it was there that Tersteegen delivered the only *sermon* ever preached by him. At Crefeld extraordinary manifestations accompanied a work of grace, which were controlled through his judicious counsel. He was also brought into relations with the Moravian Brotherhood, and was solicited by Zinzendorf, Dober, and other leaders to cast in his lot with theirs, but he steadily refused, less on the ground of their unusual methods than because he believed their teachings to be erroneous. He charged them with identifying sanctification with justification and with misrepresenting the legal and the evangelical elements of religion. He found in them no earnest striving in the way of a progressive sanctification, and no willingness to receive the doctrine of the necessity for thorough going self-denial and persistent watchfulness and prayer, which they denounced as legalism. His position hindered the

Moravians from securing an establishment in the regions of the Lower Rhine.

In 1740 an occurrence at Solingen led the authorities to issue a positive prohibition of conventicles, and Tersteegen saw his extended and successful labors interrupted. During ten years he was able to hold public gatherings only in Holland, whither he frequently journeyed; but his correspondence and private labors increased enormously. He regarded the prohibition as a trial, and counseled submission. But when in 1750 a new awakening took place, he began once more to assert the right of "private assemblies." He wrote an awakening sermon at this time on ^{<4754>}2 Corinthians 5:14, which was favorably received and led to the ultimate publication of a series of discourses under the title *Geistliche Briosamen*, etc. (1773, 2 vols. in 4 pts.). They represent the culmination of his powers, and are equaled in contents and method by but few of the productions of his contemporaries.

The favor with which these sermons were received brought their author into general notice, and led to the appointment of a royal commissioner to inquire into, the work of Tersteegen among his adherents. The person selected for this duty was a member of the high consistory named Hecker, a native of the Rhine provinces and a friend to Tersteegen. Through him the latter was induced to draw up a confession of his faith, and subsequently a critique of the *Cuvres du Philosophe de Sans-souci*, which elicited the approval of the king. A steady approximation on the part of Tersteegen and his friends towards the State Church is noticeable from this period, but he was never formally identified with it because of its tolerance of open sinners as communicants. He discussed this question in a tract issued in 1768, shortly before his decease. A feeble and, broken constitution troubled him all his days; but he attained to the age of seventy-two years, passing away in a quiet slumber April 3, 1769.

As a poet, Tersteegen was prolific, and thoroughly, though evangelically, mystical. His apprehension of the idea of self-renunciation and a blessed loss of self in God was so profound as to prevent the Church of his day from appreciating his merit. His hymns are now found, however, in the collections of every German Church. His principal collection of hymns was published in 1729 under the title *Geistliches Blumengdrtleins* (15th ed. Essen, 1855). He also rendered the mystical poems of Labadie into German, and contributed to the collection known as *Gottgeheiligt*

Harfenspiel d. Kider, etc. His works have been published in Germany by G. D. Badecker.. His life was written by Dr. Kerlem; (Mülheim, 1853), and Gobel in his *Geschichte d.christl. Lebens*, etc., 3, 289-447. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tertia

(Lat. *third*), the name given in the early Church to the third hour of prayer; that is, nine in the morning. Different theories are given of its origin; some saying that it was observed in regard to our Savior's being condemned by Pilate at that time, others that it is in memory of the Holy Ghost coming upon the apostles at that hour. This is the reason assigned by Cassian and Basil. On all festivals? this service was omitted, because on Sundays the communion was used, which always began at this hour. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 13 ch. 9, § 11.

Tertiana

the term applied to the third part of all Church revenues in the Isle of Man, which third part was received by the bishops of that island. See Bingham,; *Christ. Anti.* bk. 9 ch. 8, § 6.

Tertiaries

(TERTIUS ORDO DE POENITENTIA; TERTIARI; FRATRES CONVERSI; also SORORES TERTH ORDINIS) is the name given to the members of a unions organized primarily in connection with the mendicant orders, but subsequently connected also with other orders. They are not required to live in the convent or undergo the three principal vows, and Were designed to retain their place in the world and represent the order in whose privileges they shared in the common walks of life. Their origin is, traced back to Norbert, the founder of the Order of Remonstrance's. The Templars, too, had a similar institution connected with their organization. The actual introduction of the-Order of Tertiaries was due, however, to Francis of Assisi, and dates back to 1221, the occasion for its creation being the effect produced by his preaching at Carnario, where men and women in great numbers dissolved the matrimonial relation in order to give themselves to repentance. All virtuous ant-orthodox persons were received into the order. The rule forbade participation in festivities, disputes, and offensive wars, and required works of charity, diligent religious exercises, an annual convocation for penance, and masses for the souls of the

Tertiaries, living or dead. The order was governed by superiors periodically chosen. Its costume was to be of inferior stuff, neither wholly white nor black, and without ornament—an ash-colored coat and rope being finally chosen, over which ordinary secular clothing is permitted to be worn. The female tertiaries adopted a similar rule and costume, with the occasional addition of a white veil. The rule was confirmed by popes Honorius III, Gregory IX, and Nicholas IV. The order grew rapidly, and found favor in the highest circles, having numbered among its members the emperor Charles IV, kings Louis of France, Bela of Hungary, and Philip of Spain, queen Blanca of Castile, princess Anna of Austria, etc.

Towards the close of the 13th century a branch order was established among the male, and a century later among the female, Tertiaries to satisfy the craving of some for a stricter rule the *Regulated Order of Tertiaries* (*Tertiari Regulares*). After a rapid extension, this secondary order separated into different congregations, which, in substance, followed the Franciscan rule. The latter, in turn, gave rise to a series of congregations of Hospital Brothers and Sisters. They take the simple vows, and an additional one which binds them to care for the sick, and to live in hospitals or unions known as “families” and amenable to the bishops.

Tradition credits Domini with the founding of an order of Tertiaries, male and female. An association of nobles and knights was formed by him, after the conversion of the Albigenses, to recover the alienated property of the Church and convents. They were accordingly styled *Milites de Militia Christi*. Their vow bound them to that work, to diligent attendance on public worship, etc., and to the wearing of a garb of ashy hue. Their wives were pledged to promote the objects of the order, and were not allowed to marry again after becoming widows. In the middle of the 13th century this association became an order of penitents, assumed the Dominican rule, and was placed under the Dominican general, receiving the title of “Brothers, and Sisters of the Penance of St. Dominic.” Other orders, e.g. the Augustines, Minims, Servites, Trappists, etc., subsequently organized associations of Tertiaries. See Musson, *Pragmat. Gesch. d. vornehmst. Monchsorden*, etc. (Paris, 1751 sq.). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Ter'tius

(*Τέρτιος*, Graecized from the Lat. *tertius*, *third*; Vulg. *Tertius*) was the amanuensis of Paul in writing the Epistle to the Romans (16, 22). A.D. 55. He was at Corinth, therefore, and Cenchrese, the port of Corinth, at the

time when the apostle wrote to the Church at Rome. It is noticeable that Tertius intercepts the message which Paul sends to the Roman Christians, and inserts a greeting of his own in the first person singular (ἀσπάζομαι ἐγὼ Τέρτιος). Both that circumstance and the frequency of the name among the Romans may indicate that Tertius was a Roman, and was known to those whom Paul salutes at the close of the letter. Secundus (~~400~~ Acts 20:4) is another instance of the familiar usage of the Latin ordinals employed as proper names. The idle pedantry (indulged in by Burmann, *Exercit. Theol.* 2, 161 sq.) which would make him and Silas the same person because *tertius* and *γυναιξ* mean the same in Latin and Hebrew, hardly deserves to be mentioned (see Wolf., *Curae Philologicae*, 3, 295); and equally idle is Roloffs conjecture (*De Trib. Nomin. Pauli* [Jen. 1731]) and Storck's (*Exercit. de Tertio*, in the *Fortges. niutzl. Samml.* p. 23) that Tertius is but a pseudonym for Paul himself. In regard to the ancient practice of writing letters from dictation, see Becker's *Gallus*, p. 180. No credit is due to the writers who speak of him as bishop of conium (see Fabricius, *Lux Evangelica*, p. 117). — Smith. See also Briegleb, *De Tertio* (Jen. 1754); Eckhard, *De Signo Pauli* (Viteb. 1687); Hertzog, *De Subscriptionibus Pauli* (Lips. 1703). **SEE PAUL.**

Tertre, Jacques (as a priest Jean Baptiste) du

a French missionary, was born at Calais in September, 1610. After traveling for some time, he returned to France, and entered the Dominican order at Paris in 1635. Five years after he was sent as a missionary to the American islands, returned to France in 1658, and died at Paris in 1687. He published *Histoire Généralé des Antilles Habitees par les Francois* (1667-71, 4 vols. 4to). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Tertullian(us), Quintus Septimius Florens

is the most ancient of the Latin fathers whose works are now extant, and one of the most noteworthy personages belonging to the early Church. Our knowledge of his personal history is extremely limited. He was born at Carthage in A.D. 160, or near that date, his father being a Roman centurion in the service of the proconsul of Africa. His natural endowments were great, and they were supplemented by a comprehensive course of studies whose fruit appears in the wealth of historical, legal, philosophical, physical, and antiquarian elements contained in his writings. 'He was destined for the civil service of the empire, and was accordingly trained in

Roman jurisprudence and the art of forensic eloquence (comp. Eusebius, *H.E.* 2, 2, where Tertullian is described as one of the most ‘highly esteemed Romans—not as Rufinus renders it, “one of the most distinguished writers of the Latin Church” inter nostros scriptores admodum clarus”). ‘His mode of argumentation and terminology everywhere reveal the legal turn of his mind, and his writings in many places throw light on disputed points of the Roman civil law. Tertullian was ‘converted to ‘Christianity when between thirty and forty years of age, and he immediately became its fearless champion against pagans, Jews, and heretics, especially Gnostics. He was the first religious teacher after the apostles who attained to a clear recognition of the mighty contrast between sin and grace, and who presented it in all its force to the mind of the Church. He was married (see his tract *Ad Uxorem*), but nevertheless entered the ranks of the clergy.’ Jerome, says that he was first a presbyter of the Catholic Church, but his own writings do not determine whether he was a member of the spiritual order prior to his lapse into Montanism or not. It is certain, however, that he sojourned for a time in Rome (see *De Cultu Fen.* c. 7; Eusebius, *H. E.* 2, 2).

The transition to ‘Montanism’ occurred a few years after Tertullian’s conversion, and about A.D. 202. The act doubtless had its origin in his eccentric disposition and rigorous moral views, which predisposed him to regard that heresy with favor and to dislike the Roman Church. Jerome attributes it to personal motives excited by the jealousy and envy of the Roman clergy, and modern writers have ascribed it to disappointed ambition. We know, however, that the penitential discipline of the Church was administered at Rome with exceeding laxity, and that such indifference was an abomination in the eyes of Tertullian (*Philosophumena* [ed. Miller, Oxon. 1851], 9:290). Assuredly he did not regard Montanus as the Paraclete. He recognized in the latter simply an inspired organ of the Spirit. He, rather than Montanus, became the head of the Montanistic party in Africa, giving to their undefined views a theological character and a conceded influence over the life of the Church, and establishing it on foundations sufficiently firm to enable it to protract its being down to the 5th century. He died in old age, between A.D. 220 and 240. The assertion that he returned to the Catholic Church before he died is sometimes made, but cannot be substantiated, and the continued existence of the sect of Tertullianists would seem to contradict the assumption (see Neander, *Tertull.* [2d ed.], p. 462; August. *De Haer.* H. 86). It is a significant fact,

and an argument in behalf of the liberal interpretation of ancient Church history for which Protestantism contends, that it was precisely this great defender of Catholic orthodoxy against Gnostic heresy who was a schismatic to such a degree that he has never been included by the Church of Rome among the number of her saints, or among that of the *patres* as distinguished from the mere *scriptores ecclesiastici*.

As a writer, Tertullian was exceedingly fresh and vigorous, but also angular, abrupt, and impetuous. He possessed a lively imagination, a fund of wit and satire, as well as of acquired knowledge, and considerable depth and keenness; but he was deficient in point of logical clearness and self-possession, as well as of moderation, and of a thorough and harmonious culture. He was a speculative thinker, though the bitter opponent of philosophy. His aspiring mind sought in vain for adequate language in which to express itself, and struggled constantly to force the ideas of Christianity within the forms of the Latin tongue. His style thus became exceedingly forcible, nervous, vivid, concise, and pregnant. His adversaries were assailed without mercy and with all the weapons of truth and of art, and nearly always appear in his writings in ridiculous plight. He was the direct opposite to Origen, holding the extreme position of realism on the borders of materialism. He was, furthermore, the pioneer of orthodox anthropology and soteriology, the teacher of Cyprian, and forerunner of Augustine, in the latter of whom his spirit was reproduced in twofold measure, though without its eccentricities and angularities. It is possible, also, to trace resemblances between him and Luther with respect to native vigor of mind, profound earnestness, unregulated passion, polemical relentlessness, etc.; but the father lacked the childlike amiability of the Reformer, who was both a lion and a lamb.

Tertullian's writings are usually of brief extent, but they traverse nearly all fields of the religious life, and they constitute the most prolific source for the history of the Church and of doctrines in his time. No satisfactory classification of them can be executed, because but few of them afford the necessary data on which to base a scheme. The classification here presented rests upon the nature of the several writings as being either Catholic or Anti-Catholic, in which light the former are considerably more numerous than the latter.

(I.) Catholic Writings, or such as Defend Orthodox Christianity against Unbelievers and Heretics. — Most of these works date from the Montanist era of the author's life.

1. Apologies against Pagans and Jews. — First of all, the *Apologeticus*, addressed to the Roman magistracy, A.D. 198 (Mohler) or 204 (Kaye), and forming one of the best rebuttals of the charges raised by the heathen of the time against Christianity. Similar in character are the *Ad Nationes Libri II. In De Testimonio Animae* the author develops an argument for the unity of God and the reality of a future state from the innate perceptions and feelings of the soul. In the work *Ad Scapulam* he remonstrates with the African governor of that name, who was bitterly persecuting the Christians. The *Adversus Judaeos Liber* draws from the Old-Test. prophets the proof that the Messiah has appeared in the person of Jesus of Nazareth (comp. Hefele, *Tertull. als Apologet*, in the *Tub. Quartalschrift*, 1838, p. 30-82).

2. Doctrinal and Polemical Writings Aimed against Heretics. — Here belongs, first, the *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, or rules to be observed by Christians in dealing with heretics. The argument involves, as its fundamental principle, the idea that heretics, as innovators, are under the necessity of proving their positions, while the Catholic Church is assured in its sole right to the allegiance of Christendom by the uninterrupted current of apostolical tradition and an unimpaired succession, so that it need not enter into controversy with heretics. After the defection to Montanism, Tertullian wrote against various individual heretics, e.g. in the fifteenth year of Septimius Severus (A.D. 207 or 208), *Adversus Marcionem Libri V*, his most extensive and learned polemico-dogmatical work, and a principal source for the study of Gnosticism: — *Adversus Hermogenem*, a painter at Carthage, who had adopted the dualistic theory of the eternity of matter: — *Adversus Valentinianos*, a tragico-comical representation of the Valentinian Gnostics: and *Scolpiace*, an antidote against the scorpion-poison of such heretics.

Particular Gnostical doctrines are, assailed in *De Baptismo*, a defense of water-baptism against the Cainites and their peculiar theory of a mystical spiritual baptism: — *De Anima*, an inquiry into the nature, etc., of the *soul*: — *De Carne Christi*, a defense of the true humanity of Christ: — and *De Resurrectione Carnis*, a confutation of the heresy which denied the resurrection of the body. The tract *Adversus Praxeam* assails the Phrygian

Antimontanist Praxeas, and confutes his patri-passionist errors in the interest of the orthodox view of the Trinity.

3. Ethical and Ascetical Writings. — This class is composed of works of small size, but of considerable value to the regulation of practical life and the administration of ecclesiastical discipline. The list includes, *De Oratione*, an exposition of the Lord's Prayer and rules for prayer and fasting: — *De Spectaculis*, a warning against theatrical exhibitions: — *De Idololatria*: — *Ad Uxorem Libri I.*, advice to his wife to govern her action in case she should outlive him: — *De Paenitentia*, a Catholic and Anti-montanistic presentation of the doctrine of repentance, dating from the earlier period of his Christian life: *De Patientia*, a commendation of the virtue of patience, accompanied with a lamentation because of his own lack of that virtue: — *Ad Martyros*, an exhortation addressed to the confessors who in the time of Septimius Severus awaited, in prison the martyr's death.

(II.) Anti-Catholic Writings, in which Montanistic Divergences from Catholic Customs are Expressly Defended. *De Pudicitia*, a retraction of the principles laid down in the earlier work *De Paenitentia* and violent advocacy of the rigoristic view on which deadly sins, like murder, adultery, and flight from persecution, should never be condoned: — *De Monogamia*, an emphatic denunciation of second marriages (comp. Hauber, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, No. 3): — *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, in which three degrees of chastity are distinguished the first, absolute and lifelong restraint; the second, continence from the time of baptism; the third, refraining from contracting a second marriage: — *De Virginibus Velandis*, denouncing the habit of unmarried women appearing in public unveiled as being contrary to nature, the will of God, and the discipline of the Church generally: — *De Habitu Muliebri et de Cultu Feminarum* condemns the adorning of the person by females with ornaments, *etc.*: — *De Jejuniis adversus Psycliicos* (Catholics) is a defense of exaggerated fasting: — *De Fuga* denies the right of Christians to flee from persecution: — *De Corona Militis* commends a Christian soldier who refitted to wear the festive chaplet on a great occasion and suffered punishment for his act: — *De Pallio* is a witty explanation of his conduct in wearing the *pallium* instead of the ordinary Roman *toga*, difficult for us to understand because of its numerous allusions to obscure customs of the time.

The earliest edition of the collected works of Tertullian was that of Beatus Rhenanus (Basle, 1521). It was followed by those of Pamelius (Antw.

1579), Rigaltius (Paris, 1634; Venice, 1744), Semler (Halle, 1770/73, 6 vols.), Leopold in Gersdorf, *Bibl. Patr. Eccl. Latin. Selecta* (Lips. 1839-41), parts 4-7, and Migne (Paris, 1844). The latest and best edition is that of Oehler, *Q. Sept. Florent. Tertull. etc.* (Lips. 1853, 3 vols.). Vol. 3 contains the dissertations on Tertullian of Pamelius, Allix, Nic. de Nourry, Mosheim, Nosselt, Semler, and Kaye. The life of Tertullian has been written by: Neander, *Antignosticus, Geist des Tertul. u. Einl. in dessen Schriften* (Berl. 1825; 2d ed. 1849); Hesselberg, *Tertullian's Lehre* (Dorpat, 1848), pt. 1, "Life and Writings;" Kaye [Anglican bishop of Lincoln], *Eccl. Hist. of the 2nd (and 3rd Centuries, Illust. from the Writings of Tertullian)* (Lond. 1845; 3rd ed. 1848). See. Moiler, *Papulogie* (ed. Reithmayr, Ratisbon, 1840), 1, 701-790S; Bhuringer, *Kirche Christi* (Zurich, 1842), I, 1, 270-374; Hase, *Kirchengesch.* (7th ed.), 84, p. 109; Kurtz, *Handb. d. Kirchengesch.* (3rd ed.), 1, 307; Hauck, *Tertullian's Leben und Werke* (Erlang. 1877); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Tertul'us

(*Τέρτυλλος*, a diminutive from the Roman name *Tertius*, analogous to *Lucillus* from *Lucius*, *Fabullus* from *Fabius*, etc.), "a certain orator" (⁴⁴⁰¹Acts 24:1) who was retained by the high-priest and Sanhedrim to accuse the apostle Paul at Caesarea before the Roman procurator Antonius Felix. A.D. 55. **SEE PAUL.** He evidently belonged to the class of professional orators, multitudes of whom were to be found not only in Rome, but in other parts of the empire, to which they had betaken themselves in the hope of finding occupation at the tribunals of the provincial magistrates. Both from his name, and from the great probability that the proceedings were conducted in Latin (see especially Milman, *Bampton Lectures for 1827*, p. 185, note), we may infer that Tertullus was of Roman, or at all events of Italian, origin. The Sanhedrim would naturally desire to secure his services on account of their own ignorance, both of the Latin language and of the ordinary procedure of a Roman law-court; for the Jews, as well as the other peoples subject to the Romans, in their accusations and processes before the Roman magistrates, were obliged to follow the forms of the Roman law, of which they knew little. The different provinces, and particularly the principal cities, consequently abounded with persons who, at the same time advocates and orators, were equally ready to plead in civil actions or to harangue on public affairs. This they did, either in Greek or Latin, as the place or occasion required.

The exordium of his speech is designed to conciliate the good will of the procurator, and is' accordingly overcharged with flattery. There is a strange contrast between the opening clause— **πολλῆς εἰρήνης τυγχάνοντες διὰ σοῦ**—and the brief summary of the procurator's administration given by Tacitus (*Hist.* 5, 9): “Antonius Felix per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem, jus regium servili ingenio exercuit” (comp. Tacit. *Ann.* 12:54). But the commendations of Tertullus were not altogether unfounded, as Felix had really succeeded in putting down several seditious movements. **SEE FELIX**. It is not very easy to determine whether Luke has preserved the oration of Tertullus entire. On the one hand, we have the elaborate and artificial opening, which can hardly be other than an accurate report of that part of the speech; and, on the other hand, we have a narrative which is so very dry and concise that, if there were nothing more, it is not easy to see why the orator should have been called in at all. The difficulty is increased if, in accordance with the greatly preponderating weight of external authority, we omit the words in ~~Acts~~ Acts 24:6-8, **καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον...ἔργεσθαι ἐπὶ σέ**. On the whole, it seems most natural to conclude that the historian, who was almost certainly an ear-witness, merely gives an abstract of the speech, giving, however, in full the most salient points, and those which had the most forcibly impressed themselves upon him, such as the exordium and the character ascribed to Paul (~~Acts~~ Acts 24:5).

The doubtful reading in vers. 6-8, to which reference has already been made, seems likely to remain an unsolved difficulty. Against the external evidence there would be nothing to urge in favor of the disputed passage, were it not that the statement which remains after its removal is not merely extremely brief (its brevity may be accounted for in the manner already suggested), but abrupt and awkward in point of construction. It may be added that it is easier to refer **παρ' οὐ** (ver. 8) to the tribune Lysias than to Paul. For arguments founded on the words **καὶ κατὰ...κρίνειν** (yet. 6.) arguments which are dependent on the genuineness of the disputed words see Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History*, bk. 1, ch. 2.; Biscoe, *On the Acts*, 6:16.

We ought not to pass over without notice a strange etymology for the name Tertullus proposed by Calmet, in the place of which another has been suggested by his English editor (ed. 1830), who takes credit for having rejected “fanciful and improbable” etymologies, and substituted improvements of his own. Whether the suggestion is an improvement in

this case the reader will judge: “Tertullus, **Τέρτυλλος**, *liar, impostor*, from **τερατολόγος**, *a teller of stories, a cheat*. [Q.y. — Was his true appellation *Ter-Tullius*, ‘thrice Tully,’ that is, extremely eloquent, varied by Jewish wit into Tertullus?]

Teschenmacher, Werner

a minister of the Reformed Church in Juliers-Cleves-Berg, and a writer of some prominence in ecclesiastical and political literature, was born at Elberfeld in September, 1589. He was educated at Herborn and Heidelberg, and afterwards served the Church from 1610 or 1611 until 1633 in her pulpits, where he gained the reputation of an eloquent and able preacher of the Word. His services were much in request by the churches, Elberfeld, Cleves, and Emmerich, at that time the seat of the Brandenburg government, being his principal fields of labor. He was also greatly esteemed for his fine tact and skill in diplomacy, qualities that led to his selection for the conduct of many affairs in which the preservation and welfare of the Protestant churches of the duchy were at stake during that stormy period of religious wars. He was, however, of hasty temperament and exceedingly self-willed, so that he frequently came into conflict with other clergymen, and occasioned the government, which wished him well, considerable trouble in the effort to sustain him. His retirement from the pulpit was the result of a collision with Stover, a newly appointed colleague to his charge. He removed to Xanten and gave himself to literary labors until his death, on Good-Friday, April 2, 1638. Teschenmacher’s writings are chiefly historical in character, and of brief extent. They are, *Repetitio Brevis Cathol. et Orthodox. Reliquae Singularis Dei Beneficio ante Saeculum a Papatu Reform. in Clivic, Julice, Montium. Ducatibus*, etc. (Veselise, 1635, 43 pp.): — *Annales Eccles. Reformationis AEcclesiarum Cliviae*, etc. (1633): — *Annales Cliviae*, etc. (1638; 2d ed. by Dithmar, Frankf.-on-the-Oder, 1721), a political work which is still valuable. Works in MS.: *Sermons*: — *A Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, in Latin*: — *Annaliu Eccl. Epitome in qua precipue Gravissima Quaestio explicatur de Successione et Statu Eccl. Christ, etc.* An autobiography *in extenso*, and a biography by P. Teschenmacher, are both lost. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tesserae

(*tokens*). The early Christians, when compelled to travel, were careful to secure a recognition by their fellow-Christians wherever they went. They were always provided with letters of recommendation; and when arriving in a strange town had only to inquire for the church, and to produce these letters, when they were received as brethren, and provided with every accommodation during their stay.

Test

the imposition of an oath, or any other act by which the religious principles of any individual are *put to proof*. Tests and disabilities are distinct from *penalties* properly so called: it would be absurd to talk of *punishing* any one for being a woman, a minor, a person destitute of natural capacity, or opportunities of education, etc., on the ground that these are excluded as unfit for certain offices and privileges. Yet test laws do operate as a punishment; not because they are cause of pain, but inasmuch as they tend to produce that change of conduct which punishment is designed to produce.

Test Acts

also called CORPORATION ACTS, the popular name given to two English statutes imposing certain oaths on the holders of public offices. Act 13 Charles II, c. 2, directs that all magistrates shall take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, as well as an oath renouncing the doctrine that it is lawful to take arms against the king; and provides that they must receive the communion according to the rites of the Church of England within a year before election. Act 25 Charles II, c. 1., imposed the like conditions on the holders of all public offices, civil and military, and obliged them, in addition, to abjure all belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. These acts which were practically evaded to a large extent by means of an act of indemnity passed every year, were repealed by 9 George IV, c. 17, in so far as regarded the administration of the sacrament, for which a declaration set forth in that act was substituted. A statute of William IV substituted a declaration for an oath in most government offices. A new form of oath has been substituted for the oaths of supremacy, allegiance, and abjuration by 21 and 22 Victoria, c. 48. — *Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.*; see Skeats, *Hist. of Free Churches of England* (see Index).

Testament

is the frequent rendering, in the New Test., of the Greek **διαθήκη** (literally a *disposal*), and both are used in two distinct senses (see Cremer, *Lex. of N.T. Greek*, p. 576 sq.).

1. The natural, and in classical Greek, as in ordinary English, the only, signification is a devisement by will or legacy (Plutarch, *De A dulat.* 28; Plato, *Legg.* 922; Demosth. 1136, 12), and in this sense the word occurs in ^{<3096>}Hebrews 9:16, 17. **SEE INHERITANCE.**

2. But the more common signification in the New Test. is one that has come over from the Sept., which often uses **διαθήκη**. as a rendering of the Heb. **tyrḅ** or *covenant*; and in this sense “testament” is the rendering in the A.V. of the Greek word in ^{<3072>}Hebrews 7:22; 9:20; ^{<6119>}Revelation 11:19; and especially in the phrase the *new testament* (^{<4063>}Matthew 26:28; ^{<4144>}Mark 14:24; ^{<4221>}Luke 22:20; ^{<4066>}1 Corinthians 3:6; ^{<3015>}Hebrews 9:15 [i.e. “new covenant,” as ill ^{<3008>}Hebrews 8:8; 12:24]), which has gained currency as the title of the Christian Scriptures as a whole. See *New-Englander*; May, 1857, Lond. (Wesleyan) *Quar. Rev.* July, 1857. **SEE COVENANT.**

Testament, Old And New.

When the books written by the apostles of Jesus Christ, or by apostolic men, came to be placed alongside the sacred books of the Hebrews, as comprising the entire scriptural canon, it became necessary to distinguish the two divisions by appropriate designations. A usage which already prevailed furnished the designations required. The gracious engagements into which God was pleased to enter with individuals and communities bear in the Old Test. the name of **tyrḅ** or *covenant* (q.v.), and to this corresponds the Greek **διαθήκη** in the Sept. and New Test. Of these covenants two stand out from all the rest as of pre-eminent importance—God’s covenant with Israel mediated by Moses, and that covenant which he promised to establish through the Messiah. ‘In the Jewish Scriptures this latter is designated **hvdj }tyrḅ ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη** (^{<2613>}Jeremiah 31:31), and this, adopted by our Lord (^{<4063>}Matthew 26:28), and familiarly used by the apostles (^{<4066>}2 Corinthians 3:6; ^{<3015>}Hebrews 9:15, etc.), would naturally suggest the application of the phrase **ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη** to the former. Among the Jews such expressions as **twḅwl tyrḅḥi pláakes tḥs**

διαθήκης, for the tablets on which the law was inscribed (^(~~899~~)Deuteronomy 9:9); *tyrβhιypceβιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης* (^(~~1247~~)Exodus 24:7; ^(~~1227~~)2 Kings 23:21; 1 Macc. 1, 5.7), βίβλος διαθήκης (Ecclus. 24:23), were in common use. From these it is an easy transition to such an expression as that of the apostle (^(~~4784~~)2 Corinthians 3:14), ἡ ἀνάγνωσις τῆς παλαιᾶς δίαθήκης, where the name appropriate to the thing contained is used of that which contains it. There thus arose in the Greek Church the usage of the phrases ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη and ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη as designations of the Jewish and Christian sacred writings respectively. In the Latin Church the usage prevailed of calling these *Vetus et Novum Testamentum*. Why the word *Testamentum* was selected to represent διαθήκη rather than *Foedus* or *Pactum* may be explained by the fact that the former rather than the latter is the proper equivalent of the Greek word. Hence in the old Italia made from the Sept. it is always used where the Greek has διαθήκη; and in the-Vulgate it is used similarly in those books that remain in the old version, whereas in those which Jerome translated from the Hebrew *tywb* is represented by *feedus orpactum*. That this usage was an early one in the Latin Church is evident from the words of Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4:1): “Duos Deos dividens (Marcion) alterum alterius Instrumenti vel, *quod magis usui est dicere*, Testamenti.” The use of *Testamentum*, however, does not seem to have been universally accepted till a much later period. In the passage quoted Tertullian evidently gives the preference to the word *instrumentum*, a term used technically to denote a writing by which anything is to be attested or proved (comp. Quintil. *Inst. Orat.* 12:8; 12); and this is the word he generally uses (comp. *Adv. Marc.* 4:2; *De Pudic.* c. 12, etc.). Rufinus also has “novum et vetus instrumentum” (*Expos. Symb. Apostol.*); and Augustine uses both *instrumentum* and *testamentum* in the same context (*De Civ. Dei*, 20:4). Lactantius, however, freely uses *testamentum* as a well accredited term when he wrote (*Inst. Div.* 4:20).

From the Vulgate and the usage of the Latin fathers, *Testament* has naturally passed into the title of the two divisions of the Scriptures in the English and most of the European versions. **SEE NEW TESTAMENT; SEE OLD TESTAMENT.**

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the

is one of the seventy-two Apocryphal books of the Old Test. which were at one time in circulation, and, according to Epiphanius (*Lib. de Mensuris et*

Ponderibus, § 10), it formed one of the twenty-two canonical books sent by the Jews to Ptolemy, king of Egypt. *SEE APOCRYPHA*.

I. Author of the Work and his Object. — There can be no dispute that the writer's main object and purpose was the conversion of the Jewish nation to the Christian faith. To gain his object his appeal is based not on the authority of Moses or the law of Sinai, but is referred back to the earlier period of the patriarchs, where, underlying the simple covenant between God and man, were latent the first germs of Christianity. From this it has been inferred that the writer-himself was a Jew. Grabe, the first who treated at length of the Testaments, thought that the writing in question was the work of a Jew shortly before the Christian era; and to account for the presence of passages which no Jew could possibly have written, he had recourse to the theory of interpolation. This opinion, however, has found but little favor, and critics have generally agreed to the conclusions of Nitzsch, who definitely attributed the work to a Judæo-Christian writer, an opinion adopted now even by Ritschl, who in 1850 maintained that author was a Christian of Pauline tendencies. Without entering upon the different views advanced on this point, we pass on to the

II. Time of Composition. — That it was not composed before A.D. 70 we may infer from the author's allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem, which assigns to the *Testaments* a date subsequent to this event. On the other hand, it is already quoted by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 5, 1; *Scorp.* c. 13) and Origen (*Horn. in Jos.* 15:c. 6); and thus we may safely infer, without quoting the different opinions, that the most probable date for its composition is 80-110 or 120 of our era.

III. Language in which the Work was Written. — The Testaments, as we have it now, was no doubt written in the Hellenistic Greek, in which we now possess the work. Grabe maintained that it was originally written in Hebrew and was translated into Greek with the canonical books of the Old Test. But against this view it has been argued that already the title of the book, αἰδιαθηκαι τῶν ἱβ Πατριαρχῶν, indicates its Greek original, because the Hebrew תּוֹרַת בְּרַבְרַת תּוֹד[ע] would have been presented by the Greek εὐλογίαί, ἐντολαί, or μαρτύρια. We also find a number of instances of paronomasia, hardly possible on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original. Such are ἀθετεῖν...νουθετεῖν, ἀφαίρεσις ..ἀνάίρεσις (*Test. Judah*, note 23), λιμὸς...λοιμὸς (*ibid.*); ἐν τάξει...ἄτακτον (*Naphth.* note

2), *τάξις... ἀταξία* (*ibid.* 3). We find various expressions pertaining to the Greek philosophy, as *διάθεσις, αἴσθησις, φύσις τέλος, διαβούλιον, συμβουλευεῖν τινί*. Taking all in all, we are led to the supposition that it was originally written in Greek (see Nitzsch, *De Test. XII Patr.* [Wittemb. 1810], p. 16; Vorstman, *Disquis. de Testam. XII Patriarch.* p. 8 sq.).

IV. *Contents of the Testaments:* — The work professes to be, as its name implies, the utterances of the dying patriarchs, the sons of Jacob, to their children. In these are given, more or less briefly, the narrative of their lives, with some particulars not to be found in the scriptural account, and there are built thereon various moral precepts for the guidance of their descendants, who may thereby be preserved from the sires into which their fathers fell. “Still,” says Vorstman, “all the patriarchs are convinced that their children will deal wickedly, falling away from God, defiling themselves with the sins of every nation. They therefore prophesy what is to come; they foretell the troubles impending on: their children. But they venture to raise more joyous strains than these. God himself is to put an end to their troubles; he will visit his people; he will break the power of sin. Prophecies of a Messiah are brought forward by the patriarchs. With such hopes they die. Their discourses, therefore, may justly be called Testaments when at the point of death they speak to their children their last words. They leave to them nothing save injunctions and prophecies. The words of Benljamin (c. 10) will apply equally to all: *ταῦτα γὰρ ἀντὶ πάσης κληρονομίας ὑμᾶς διδάσκω.*”

V. *Messianic Ideas of the Book.* — The Messianic views are strongly tinged by national feeling. The Messiah, combining in himself the functions of high-priest and of king, is to arise from the tribe of Levi as well as from the tribe of Judah. Still there is a tendency throughout which aims at teaching that’ his high-priestly office is greater than his kingly one. The Messianic passages having reference to the promised Messiah of Israel may be divided into such as speak of him as divine-as God coming into the world in the likeness of man-and into such as refer to him as man alone. Of the latter we read *in Test. Levi*, c. 16. “*And the man (ἄνδρα) who reneweth the law by the power of the Most High shall ye call a deceiver; and at last as ye suppose, ye will slay him, not knowing his resurrection (ἀνάστημα), wickedly taking the innocent blood upon your own heads. And because of him shall your holy places be desolate.*” . . . Judah (c. 24) says, “*And after these things a star shall arise to you out of Jacob in peace,*

and a man (ἄνθρωπος) shall rise up of my seed, as a sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin 'shall be found in him." Naphtali says (c. 4), "Until the compassion (σπλάγγνον) of the Lord shall come, a man (ἄνθρωπος) working righteousness and showing mercy to all that are afar off and to those that are near."

Such are the only passages which dwell merely on the human nature of the Messiah. Let us look at those which refer to his divine nature. Thus the patriarch Dan (c. 6) bids his children "draw near to God and to the angel that intercedeth for you (τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ παραιτουμένῳ ὑμᾶς). He is called "the mediator between God and men" (οὗτός ἐστι μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων). "His name shall be in every place in Israel, and among the Gentiles, Saviour" (τὸ δὲ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἐν παντιτόπῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι Σωτήρ). Levi (c. 4) speaks of the Messiah as υἱὸς Κυρίου. Simeon (c. 6) speaks of "the Lord, the ῥGreat God of Israel, who shall appear upon the earth as man, and who shall save all the Gentiles and the race of Israel." Judah (c. 22) tells his children, "Among the Gentiles shall my kingdom be consummated, until the salvation shall have come to Israel; until the appearing of the God of righteousness to give quietness in peace to Jacob and all nations." Asher (c. 7) tells his children that they should be dispersed throughout the world until "the Most High should visit the earth, himself coming as a man (ἄνθρωπος), eating and drinking with men.... He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles; God speaking in the person of man" (Θεὸς εἰς ἄνδρα ὑποκρινόμενος). Joseph (c. 19) says to his children, "And I saw that from Judah was born a virgin wearing a linen garment, and from her went forth a lamb without spot" (ἀμνὸς ἄμωμος). That reference is here made to the sinlessness of the Messiah there can be no doubt. Hagenbach (in his *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 143, ed. 3) refers to Hippolytus as furnishing the first instance of the application of the word "spotless" to our Lord, but we have here an earlier example. Thus Benjamin (c. 3) speaks of "the Lamb of God and the Savior of the world," that "spotless he shall be delivered up for the wicked, and sinless shall he die for the ungodly." Levi tells his children that they shall slay the Messiah and "wickedly take the innocent (ἄθῶος) blood upon their heads." Judah (c. 24) says, "No sin shall be found in him."

As to the office of the Messiah, he is continually spoken of both as king and high-priest (*Sim.* c. 7; *Gad.* c. 8; *Dan.* c. 5; *Jos.* c. 19). As king

springing from the tribe of Judah (*Sim.* c. 7), he is to wage war and to triumph over Beliar, the personification of the kingdom of evil (*Levi*, c. 18; *Dan*, c. 5, 6; *Benj.* c. 3). As high-priest he was to have no successor (*Levi*, c. 18), i.e. with him the offering of sacrifices was to come to an *enj.* The Messiah is a Savior; Levi is bidden to “proclaim concerning him who shall redeem Israel” (c. 2; *Dan*, c. 5; *Jos.* c. 19; *Benj.* c. 3); and another patriarch adds, “He that believes in him shall reign in truth in the “heavens” (*Dan*, c. 5). The Messiah was to suffer: “Thy sons shall lay hands upon him to crucify him” (*Levi*, c. 4); “and he shall enter into the front of the Temple (τὸν πρῶτον ναόν), and there shall the *Lord* be treated with outrage and he shall be lifted up upon a *tree* (*Benj.* c. 9; see also *Levi*, c. 10,14,16). The rending of the Temple veil is alluded to as the act in which the Spirit of God went over to the Gentiles: “The veil of the Temple shall be rent,” says Benjamin (c. 9), “and the Spirit of God shall be removed unto the Gentiles as fire poured forth.” Levi (c. 10) says, “The veil of the Temple shall be rent, that it shall not cover your shame.” As to the Messiah’s ascension and triumphant reception into heaven, see *Levi*, c. 18; *Benj.* c. 9. That he was to return to future judgment, comp. *Levi*, c. 16.

VI. Dogmatical and Ethical Ideas. — The salvation of the Messiah is to be obtained by faith as the means of justification with God: The kingdom of evil is to come to an end “on the day on which Israel shall believe” (*Dan*, c. 6). “As many as have believed in him on earth shall rejoice with him when all shall rise again, some to glory and some to shame” (*Benj.* c. 10). Allusion is made to the importance of baptism for this end. Thus Levi (c. 16) tells his children the punishment that shall befall them for their treatment of the Messiah: “Ye shall be a curse among the Gentiles and shall be scattered abroad until he shall again visit you and in pity shall take you to himself ἐν πίστει καὶ ὕδατι.” The same patriarch (c. 18) again says of the Messiah, “In water shall he himself give the glory of the Lord of his sons in truth forever.” Both the righteous and the wicked shall rise again; the former to rejoice with the Messiah, the latter to weep and lament and to be destroyed forever (comp. *Judah*, c. 25; *Sim.* c. 6; *Levi*, c. 18; *Zeb.* c. 10). Benjamin declares (c. 10), “Then shall ye behold Enoch, Noah, Shem, and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, arising on the right hand in joy; then shall we also arise, each one in our tribe, and worship the king of heaven... And as many as believed on him upon earth shall rejoice with him when all shall arise, some to glory and some to contempt. And the Lord shall judge Israel first, even for the wrong they did to him; for when he came as a

deliverer, God in the flesh, they believed him not. And then shall he judge all the nations, as many as believed him not when he appeared upon earth.”

Man, who has been formed in the image of God (*Naphth. c. 2*), is composed of two parts, body and spirit, conformable to each other. To man seven spirits were given at his creation by God, in themselves not necessarily either good or bad, referring, as they do, mainly to external sensations. These spirits were ζώή (i.e. the *ζρη*, the mere animal life), ὄρασις, ἀκοή, ὄσφρησις, λαλιά, γεῦσις, and σπορά, all of which, as ζώή, refer exclusively to the mere animal life of man, as does also a supplementary eighth spirit, that of ὕπνος. Superadded to these are seven other spirits, given to man by Beliar, representing seven principal evil tendencies (*Reub. c. 2, 3*). The latter, which are spoken of generally as τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης, are wholly bad, and represent different evil tendencies of humanity. They are the spirits of πορνεία, ἀπληστία, μάχη, ἀρεσκεία or μαγγανεία, ὑπερηφανία, ψεύδος, and ἀδικία. Within man war is waged by his two selves. Judah speaks of the two spirits that “attend (σχολλάζουσι) upon man, the spirit of truth and the spirit of error; and in the midst is the spirit of the understanding of the mind,” which may turn to either side it will (*c. 20*). The spirit of truth seems to be almost equivalent to conscience, for it is added, “The spirit of truth testifieth all things, and accuseth all.” Reuben, too, speaks, of his conscience (συνείδησις) troubling him all his life long for his crime of incest. Man has a free will to choose between the two ways that God has given to him. He can choose either “the darkness or the light, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar” (*Levi, c. 19*); and, though man is weak and ever prone to error, yet if he persevere in his attempts to do right, “every spirit of Beliar will fly” (*Sim. c. 2, 5; Judah, c. 18, 19, 21; Issach. c. 7; Zeb. c. 9; Gad, c. 4*) from him.

Sin, therefore, being especially regarded as proceeding from τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης, is constantly spoken of as ἄγνοια, τύφλωσις, and the like, for which pardon is readily granted by God. Ignorance, however, though affording a plea for pardon, cannot of itself be accounted an excuse for the sin; the appeal is still to be made to the mercy of God. But as from sins ignorantly committed man passes on to those done against light and knowledge, so is there a deeper cast of sins than ἄγνοια. Thus it was ἄγνοια on the part of Zebulon (*c. 1; comp. Dan, c. 1; Gad, c. 2*) not to reveal to his father his brethren’s crime of selling Joseph; that crime,

however, was **ἀνομία** on their part. And this is alike true for a sin actually committed and for one as yet in embryo in the thoughts of the heart; ‘for Simeon (c. 2), whose hatred for Joseph had led him to contemplate the sin of murder, is accounted in God’s sight guilty of that crime, and therefore punished. We see here the doctrine of the apostle endorsed: “He that hateth his brother is a murderer.”’

The doctrine of God’s retributive justice is fully believed in. Sin brings its own punishment in this world (comp. *Reub.* c. 1; *Sim.* c. 2; *Gad.* c. 5), therefore man should follow God’s laws (comp. *Reub.* c. 4; *Sim.* c. 4; *Levi.* c. 13; *Benj.* c. 3; *Zeb.* c. 8). The fear of God appears as the chief motive for the fulfillment: of righteousness (comp. *Reub.* c. 4, **πορεύεσθε ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδαίς ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου**; *Simn.* c. 3, **ἡ λύσις τοῦ φθόνου διὰ φόβου Κυρίου γινεται**; *Gad.* c. 5, **ὁ φόβος τοῦ θεοῦ νικᾷ τὸ μῖσος**; *Benj.* c. 3, **γὰρ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἀγαπῶν τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀερίπυ πνεύματος τοῦ Βελιὰρ οὐ δύναται πληγῆναι**; *Jos.* c. 11; *Levi.* c. 13). It is also, worthy of remark that most of the patriarchs dwell more especially on some one particular form of vice to be shunned, ordinarily that vice wherein each severally had succumbed to temptation. Thus the system of ethics which prevails throughout, the *Testaments* presents a very high and noble code of morals to us, not unworthy of a teacher who sought to win over his countrymen to the Christian faith.

VII. Sources. — Having given, in the main, an outline of the most important points contained in the *Testaments*, the question as to the sources for the work cannot be superfluous. From the work itself we infer that the book of Enoch must have been known to the author. Thus seven Testaments out of twelve allude to it as **γραφὴ Ἐνώχ, βιβλος (βιβλίον, βιβλαί, λόγοι) Ἐνώχ τοῦ δικαίου, γραφὴ νόμου Ἐνώχ** (see *Sim.* c. 5; *Levi.* c. 9, 10, 14 16; *Napht.* c. 4; *Judah.* c. 18; *Dan.* c. 5; *Benj.* c. 9), and other similar expressions. Zebulon refers to the **γραφὴ πατέρων** (c. 9), and Levi (c. 5) and Asher (c. 7) refer to **αἱ πλακῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν**, “heavenly tablets.” As to the latter, whether they were a book containing what is foreknown and foreordained in heaven as to the course of the future, and were appealed to when some oracular declaration of weighty import was needed, or whether they were something else, we are at a loss to state, although they are often quoted in the book of Enoch, and Jubilees. Besides the works mentioned, there can be no doubt that the author of the *Testaments* knew the book of Jubilees, since the amount of coincidence

between the two writings is very great (comp. e.g. *Reub.* c. 3 with *Jubilees*, c. 33; *Levi*, c. 2,4, 5,8 with *Jubilees*, c. 32; *Levi*, c. 9 with c. 31; c. 11 with c. 34; *Judah*, c. 3-7 with c. 34,38; c. 9 with c. 37; c. 10 with c. 41; c. 19 with c. 41; *Reub.* c. 7, *Sim.* c. 8, *Levi*, c. 19, *Judah*, c. 26, *Zeb.* c. 10, *Dan*, c. 7, *Napht.* c. 9, *Gad*, c. 8, *Asher*, c. 8, *Betj.* c. 12 with *Jubilees*, c. 46, etc.). He also made use of the Targums, Josephus, the Midrashim, and the like. Of greater importance is it to know that the author also made use of the New Test., and for the latter fact we refer to the elaborate article of Warfield, *The Apologetical Value of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, in the (N. Y.) *Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1880, p. 57 sq.

VIII. *History of the Work.* — Habent sua fata libelli.” It is remarkable that this work, which was known to Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem*, 5, 1; *Scorpiace*, c. 13) and Origen (*Horn. in Josuam* 15 c. 6), became first known to the world at large through the Latin version of Robert Grosseteste, or Greathead, bishop of Lincoln, of the 13th century. This version soon spread over Europe, and, in the course of time, translations into a large number of languages were made from it into English, French, German, Dutch, Flemish, Danish, Bohemian, and Armenian. More than four centuries had passed since Grosseteste’s Latin version, when at last the Greek text was for the first time published by Grabe, in his *Spicilegium Patrum et Haereticorum* (Oxford, 1698), from a MS. in the university library of Cambridge, collated with one at Oxford. In 1713 Fabricius published the Greek text in his *Codex Pseudepigraphus V.T.* (Hamburg), adding but slightly to the criticism of the text. In 1714 Grabe published a second edition, relating the true text in several passages, but in many places altering Grosseteste’s Latin version, which witnessed to the true reading, to suit Grabe’s incorrect text. Fabricius also published a second edition in 1722, on the whole less accurate than his first. Afterwards the text and notes as given in Grabe’s second edition were reprinted, with but few additions, by Galland, in his *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum* (Venice, 1765), i, 193 sq. In 1869 Robert Sinkler published an accurate transcript of the Cambridge MS., carefully collated with the Oxford, to which he added, in 1879, a collation made from two other MSS., viz. a Roman MS. in the Vatican Library (Cod. Grsec. 731), and a Patmos MS. in the library of the Monastery of St. John the Evangelist (Cod. 411).

IX. *Versions.* — As already indicated, there existed versions in different languages before the Greek text was published. The editions of the Latin

version are numerous. That which is presumably the *edilio princeps* bears neither date, printer's name, nor place of printing, The title is *Testamenti duodecim I Patriarcharum Filiorum Jacob. I e Greco in Latini versa Roberato Linconiensi I Episcopo Interprete*. From this was taken the edition printed at Hageniau in 1532 by John Secerius, at the instance of Menrad Molther. The work of Julianus Pomerius *Contra Judaeos* is published in the same volume. Besides the separate editions, the *Testaments* is published in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*.

In English there exist at least three independent translations one from the Latin, the others from the Greek. The translation from the Latin first appeared in 1577, and was often reprinted, especially in the 17th century. The first edition is of great rarity, and there exists no copy of it even in the British Museum. The second edition, of 1581, of which there is a copy in the British Museum, has the following title-page:

“The Testaments of the Twelue Patriarches, the Sonnes of Jacob: translated out of Greeke into Latine by Robert Grosthead, sometime Bishop of Lincolne, and out of hys copy into French and Dutch by others: Now englished by A.G. To the credit whereof an auncient Greeke cotype written in parchment, is kept in the Vniversity Library of Cambridge. At London Printed by John Daye, dwelling ouer Aldersgate. 1581. Cum priuilegio Regiae Maiestatis.”

There are about forty other English editions printed after the year 1581. A translation was made directly from the Greek (of Grabe and Fabricius) by Whiston in his *Collection of Authentic Records belonging to the Old and New Testament* (Lond. 1727), i, 294 sq. In Clark's *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (vol. 22), Mr. Sinker published a translation from his edition of the Greek text. It may be mentioned here that the Muggletonians (q.v.) in England receive the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* as inspired, together with the Old and New Tests., the book of Enoch, and the works of Reeve and Muggleton. From the English a Welsh version was published at Carnarvon (1822), *Testament y deuddeg Patriarch, sef Meibion Jacob....*

There are at least two translations in French, both taken from the Latin. One was published in 1548 at Paris, another in 1713. The latter was also republished in Migne's *Encyclopédie Theologique*, vol. 23 (*Dict. des Apocryphes*, vol. 1), coll. 854 sq.

In Germany the *testaments* have evidently been very popular, as may be inferred from the number of editions that have appeared. The oldest German translation is the one published in 1559 at Basel: *Das Testament der zwolf Patriarchen der Sunen Jacobs*; the latest the one published at Tübingen in 1857 *Aechte apocryphische Bucher der Heiligen Schrift... (2) Das T.d. zwolf Patriarchen*.

The Dutch and Flemish editions are also very numerous. There are two editions without any date, but which must have appeared before 1544, since an edition was published in that same year. Altogether there exist about fourteen editions in Dutch and Flemish, the last published in 1679.

The *Testaments* was translated into Danish by Hans Mogenson, and four editions of his translation, were published, the first in 1580, the last in 1701.

In the Icelandic there exist some MS. translations; but whether one or the other has ever been printed we are at a loss to state.

The Bohemian version can claim to be the first of the translations from the Latin, having been made long before the invention of printing. It is referred to by Thomas Stitny about the year 1376. There exists a MS. at Breslau, in the library of the Dominicans at St. Adalbert, dated 1491, and another in the university library at Prague (17, B. 15, No. 6) dated 1465. The oldest printed translation bears the date 1545. Only two copies, each of a different edition, are extant—one in the library of the National Museum at Prague, and the other in the university library there.

An Armenian version exists in MS., dated 837, i.e. A.D. 1388, in the library of the Mechitarists at Vienna, which appears not to have been printed.

X. Literature. — Besides Grabe, see Vorstman, *Disquisitio de Testamentorum XII Patriarcharum Origine et Pretio* (Rotterdam, 1857)'; Nitzsch, *Commentatio Critica de Testamentis XII Patriarcharum, Libro V. T. Pseudepigrapho* (Wittenb. 1810); Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1850); Kayser, in Reuss und Cunitz's *Beitrdgge zu den theol. Wissenschaften* (Jena, 1851), p. 107-140; Wieseler, *Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel* (Gott. 1839); Langen, *Das Judenthum in Paldstina zur Zeit Christi* (Freiburg, 1866), p. 140 sq.; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift jür Wissenschaft*

und Leben (Bresl. 1869), p. 116 sq.; Warfield, *The Apologetical Value of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, in the (N. Y.) *Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1880, p. 57 sq.; but, above all, Sinkler, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum* (Camb. and Lond. 1869); and his *Appendix* (ibid. 1879). (B. P.)

Testes Synodales

persons chosen to help the church-wardens in fulfilling their duties, and in promoting order, quiet, and decorum at visitations, synods, and clerical meetings. They were also called SIDESMEN, synodsmen, or QUESTMEN
SEE QUESTMEN (q.v.).

Testimonial

Every candidate for admission to holy orders in the Church of England is required to present to the bishop a testimonial of good conduct from his college, or from three beneficed clergymen. The usual form of this document is as follows: "Whereas our well-beloved in Christ, A. B., hath declared to us his intention of offering himself a candidate for the sacred office of [a deacon], and for that end hath requested of us letters testimonial of his learning and good behavior, we, therefore, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do testify that the said A. B., having been previously known to us for the space of [three] years last past, hath, during that time, lived piously, soberly, and honestly, and diligently applied himself to his studies: nor hath he at any time, so far as we know and believe, held, written, or taught anything contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the united Church of England and Ireland; and, moreover, we believe him in our consciences to be a person worthy to be admitted to the sacred order of Deacons. In witness whereof," etc.

A similar testimonial is required from candidates by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. As this is one of the safeguards which ecclesiastical rule has established to preserve the purity of its ministers, it would be a fatal error to allow it to become a mere matter of form. No conscientious man can safely sign such a document unless fully assured of the facts to which he bears such solemn testimony.

Testimony of Disownment

an official document issued by the monthly meeting of the Society of Friends against an obdurate and impenitent member. The testimony of disownment is a paper reciting the-offence, and sometimes the steps which

have led to it; next, the means unavailingly used to reclaim the offender; after that a clause disowning him, to which is usually added an expression of desire for his repentance and for his restoration to membership. In case the expelled member repents, he is bound to send in a written acknowledgment of his offense, his penitence, and his desire for restoration to the membership of the society.

Te'ta

(*Τητά* v.r. *Ἀττητά*; *Vulg. Topa*), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5; 28) of the name HATITA *SEE HATITA* (q.v.) of the Heb. lists of Temple doorkeepers (Ezra 2, 42; Nehemiah 7. 45).

Tetragrammaton

(*τέτταρα*, *four*, and *γράμμα*, *letter*), a term to designate the sacred name of the Deity, *Jehovah*, in four letters, *hwhy*. By the possession of this name the early Jewish opponents of Christianity declared that the miracles of Christ were performed. The mystical word *Om* of the Buddhists of India and Thibet is supposed to possess similar virtues to the present day.

Tetrapla

a Greek term used to designate a certain edition of the Holy Scriptures, being four independent and separate Greek versions, ranged side by side, viz. those of Aquila, Symmachus, the Seventy-two, and Theodotion.

Tetrapolitana Confessio

(also SUEVIA. and ARGENTINENSIS) is the title by which the confession of faith submitted to the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 by the four cities of Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau is known.

The endeavor to construct a confession which should fairly represent the views of all the sections of the evangelical party failed through the stubborn refusal of the Saxons to unite in any way with the Zwinglians of the cities, and the Strasburg deputies consequently invited Bucer and Capito to prepare a separate symbol for the use of the latter. Capito had previously prepared a sketch of the Reformed faith by order of the Council of Strasburg, and this paper became the basis of the new confession. The latter was completed by July 11, 1530, and, after having been submitted to the confederated cities and received their signatures (with the single

exception of Ulm), was placed in the hands of the imperial vice-chancellor, Merkel, for transmission to the emperor.

The confession contains twenty-three articles, and is characterized by great clearness and moderation of statement, completeness, and thoroughness of elaboration. Its first article asserts the chief formal principle of Protestantism, wholly wanting in the *Augustana*, that the Bible is the only source and rule of doctrine. It teaches that the disciples of Christ partake of his body and blood in the sacrament in a spiritual sense only. The form of expression, however, is everywhere conformed to that of the *Augustana*—a feature which reveals the hand of Bucer (q.v.), who was already at work upon plans for the promotion of union among Protestants.

A reply to this confession, written by Eck, Faber, and Cochlseus, was returned Oct. 24. This *Confutation* was filled with perversions and insults, and was read before deputies and theologians of the four cities. A copy of this reply was denied them, but they succeeded in obtaining one, which was appended to the first edition of the *Tetrapolitana*, published in German by Bucer at Strasburg in 1531. A Latin edition followed a month later, in September. Bucer was compelled to publish the confession in order to put an end to false representations of its character; but his own persistent efforts in behalf of union between the Protestant churches contributed to subordinate it to the Saxon confession. In 1532 the Strasburgers consented to subscribe the *Augustana*, though with the express understanding that the *Tetrapolitana* should be regarded as their proper symbol. Finally, when Bucer was dead and Martyr (q.v.) was gone from Strasburg, a rigid Lutheranism took possession of the city. An attempted reprint of the first edition of the *Tetrapolitana* by Sturm in 1580 was prevented by a decree of the council. The last edition, which includes the *Confutation and Apology*, appeared, so far as is known, at Zweibrucken in 1604.

For the literature and editions, see Niemeyer, *Collectio Confession* (Lips. 1840), p. 83 sq.; comp. Baum, *Capito und Bucer* (Elberfeld, 1860), p. 486 sq., 595; Planck, *Gesch. d. prot. Lehrbegriff* (2d ed. Leips. 1796). III, 1, 68 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Te'trarch

(*τετράρχης*, from *τέτταρα*, *four*, and *ἀρχή*, *government*), properly denotes the governor of a province or district which was regarded as the fourth part of a larger province or kingdom, while the district itself was

called a *tetrarchy* (τετραρχία or τετραδαρχία). The earliest use of the word which seems to have been discovered is in connection with the division of Thessaly as originally constituted (Eurip. *Alcest.* 1154; Strabo, 9:5) and as reconstructed in the time of Philip of Macedon (Demosth. *Phil.* 3, 26), and of Galatia before its conquest by the Romans, B.C. 189. The first of these countries was then divided into four parts, each of which was named a tetrarchy, and its ruler a tetrarch, subordinate to the tagus (Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, 6:13 sq.). The second was divided into three sections, each of which was again subdivided into four smaller ones, to which and to their governors the same terms were applied (Fischeri *Prolusiones*, p. 428, note); and these were ultimately fused into one ἐπαρχία under Deiotarus, cir. B.C. 54 (Strabo, 566; Plutarch, *De V. M.* [ed. Wytt], vol. 2). In the later days of the Roman republic, and during the empire, the etymological meaning was almost entirely lost sight of, and it was applied, like “ethnarch” and “phylarch,” to the petty tributaries,” the creatures of a proconsul’s breath, and the puppets of his caprice” (Merivale, *Hist. of the Rom.* 4:167), whose importance did not warrant their receiving the title of “king” (see *Sallust, Cath.* 20:7; Cicero, *Milo*, 28:76; *Vatin.* 12:29; Horace, *Sat.* 1, 3, 12; Veil. Pat. 2, 51; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15:25). It is in this secondary sense that in all probability the word is used in the New Test. of the tetrarchs of Syria, the heirs and successors of Herod the Great. Niebuhr (*Hist. of Rome*, 2, 135) compares them to the *zemindars* of Bengal after their recognition by lord Cornwallis (179L-93) as proprietors of the soil, and enjoying some amount of sovereign rights within the limits of their zemiudary. The title of tetrarch was certainly given by Antony to Herod the Great in the early part of his career (B.C. 41) and his brother Phasael (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:13, 1), without reference to territorial divisions; and though it appears that the tetrarchs Antipas and Philip did actually receive a fourth part of their father’s dominions, while Archelaus as “ethnarch” inherited half (*ibid.* 17:11, 4; *War*, 2, 6, 3), this correspondence of the name and the share may be considered accidental, or, at furthest, the exact use of the term in the New Test. must be confined to Antipas and Philip.

In the New Test. we meet with the designation, either actually or in the form of its derivative τετραρχεῖν, applied to three persons:

1. Herod Antipas (ⓂMatthew 14:1; Luke 3, 1, 19; 9, 7; ⓂActs 13:1), who is commonly distinguished as “Herod the tetrarch,” although the title of “king” is also assigned to him both by Matthew (ⓂMatthew 14:9) and

by Mark (~~⚭~~Mark 6:14, 22 sq.). Luke, as might be expected, invariably adheres to the formal title which would be recognized by Gentile readers. This Herod is described by the last-named evangelist (3, 1) as “tetrarch of Galilee;” but his dominions, which were bequeathed to him by his father, Herod the Great, embraced the district of Peraea beyond the Jordan (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:8, 1): this bequest was confirmed by Augustus (*War.* 2, 6, 3). After the disgrace and banishment of Antipas, his tetrarchy was added by Caligula to the kingdom of Herod Agrippa I (*Ant.* 18:7, 2). *SEE HEROD ANTIPAS.*

2. Herod Philip (the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra, *not* the husband of Herodias), who is said by Luke (~~⚭~~Luke 3:1) to have been “tetrarch of Itursea and of the region of Trachonitis.” Josephus tells us that his father bequeathed to him Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Paneas (*Ant.* 17:8, 1), and that his father’s bequest was confirmed by Augustus, who assigned to him Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, with certain parts about Jamnia belonging to the “house of Zenodorus” (*War.* 1, 6, 3). Accordingly, the territories of Philip extended eastward from the Jordan to the wilderness, and from the borders of Persea northward to Lebanon and the neighborhood of Damascus. After the death of Philip his tetrarchy was added to the province of Syria by Tiberius (*Ant.* 18:4, 6), and subsequently conferred by Caligula on Herod Agrippa. I, with the title of king (*ibid.* 18:6, 10). *SEE HEROD AGRIPPA I; SEE HEROD PHILIP I.*

3. Lysanias, who is said (~~⚭~~Luke 3:1) to have been tetrarch of Abilene, a small district surrounding the town of Abila, in the fertile valley of the Barada or Chrysorrhoea, between Damascus and the mountain range of Antilibanus. *SEE ABILENE.* There is some difficulty in fixing the limits of this tetrarchy, and in identifying the person of the tetrarch. *SEE LYSANIAS.* We learn, however, from Josephus (*Ant.* 18:6, 10; 19:5, 1) that a Lysanias had been tetrarch of Abila before the time of Caligula, who added this tetrarchy to the dominions of Herod Agrippa I — an addition which was confirmed by the emperor Claudius.

Tetrastyle

Picture for Tetrastyle

(*τετράστυλον*), a name given to the periphery of the area or court between the porch and the church building proper in ancient times. This court was without any covering except that each side had porticos or

cloisters, built upon columns. In the porch or in the porticos stood the first class of penitents to beg the prayers of the faithful as they went into the church. Tetzal, JOHANN, the notorious Dominican monk whose shameless traffic in indulgences impelled Luther to take the first step towards the Reformation, was born and reared at Leipsic, where his father, Johann Tietze, pursued the business of goldsmith. In 1487 Tetzal received the degree of bachelor of philosophy, having distinguished himself in the examination above all the other competitors. He possessed an imposing figure, a sonorous voice, and considerable skill in dialectics and oratory, and was accordingly selected to preach the indulgence connected with the year of jubilee, after he had associated himself with the Dominican fraternity in his native town, and had displayed great zeal in his monastic duties. He: entered on the traffic in indulgences in 1502, and prosecuted it to his own great pecuniary advantage and equal notoriety, making use of even blasphemies and obscenities to enforce his appeals for money. Nor was he more circumspect with regard to his conduct. The drinking-rooms of taverns were favorite places of resort in which to ply his trade; he permitted himself to commit crimes of violence; and an adulterous connection with the wife of a citizen led to his being sentenced to death by drowning at Innsbruck. Having been pardoned, and, after a time, liberated from imprisonment, lie resumed his traffic, and became, if possible, more bold and shameless than before.

When pope Leo X appointed commissaries for the sale of indulgences for the alleged purpose of obtaining funds with which to complete the edifice of St. Peter's at Rome, Tetzal was made an under-commissary. He held a special concession from the emperor for-the prosecution of his business, and after a time obtained a papal brief permitting him to sell indulgences everywhere in Germany. To these advantages he added that of being made an inquisitor. In 1517 he began to issue letters of indulgence in his own name, having previously acted as the agent of archbishop Albert of Mayence. He pronounced absolutions, for money, from the most heinous crimes, without regard to repentance and with the assurance of complete exemption from the fires of purgatory. His peculiarly impudent and frivolous bearing shocked all who possessed intelligence, without at all restraining his conduct, until he arrived on the borders of Saxony. At this point of Tetzal's progress Luther was made aware of the hurtful consequences of his operations through the confessional, and at once denounced the Dominican's business from the pulpit. Tetzal replied, and

Luther drew up the *famous Ninety-five Theses*, which Tetzel, for his part, burned in the market-place of Jitterbock. He then obtained the degree of licentiate and doctor of theology from Frankfort-on-the-Oder, in order to combat Luther from a more favorable position, and he enlisted the services of Wimpina, rector of that university, in his cause. The latter drew up 106 theses antagonistic to those of Luther, which were in turn burned by the students at Wittenberg, and afterwards fifty additional theses, upon which Tetzel disputed in January, 1518.

The dispute had in the meantime excited attention in Rome, and aroused the conviction that more positive measures must be employed to preserve the authority of the Church. The negotiations of Cajetan with Luther had failed, and the legate Miltitz was sent to Saxony to manage the affair. Having arrived at Altenberg, the legate cited Tetzel to appear before him; but the latter declined to obey, on the ground that the journey would involve his life in danger at the hands of Luther's adherents. He appeared, however, on the repeated summons of the legate, after the latter had reached Leipsic; and, having been found guilty of immoralities and shameless conduct, was harshly reprimanded and threatened with the anger of the pope and expulsion from his order. He wished to flee from the country in order to avoid the dangers which he now saw to be threatening his peace, but sickened before he could execute his purpose, and died ill the Dominican convent at Leipsic in July, 1519. Luther pitied the man in his wretchedness, and forwarded him a letter of consolation. The statement that Tetzel died of the plague is without support.

Literature. — Cyprian, *Frid. Myconii Hist. Reforms.* etc. (Lips. 1718); Loscher, *Vollst. Ref.* — *Acta st. Documenta* (ibid. 1720). 1, 415; the works and letters of Luther as gathered by Walch, De Wette, etc.; Hechtius, *Vita Jo. Tezelii* (Wittenb. 1717); Mayer, *Diss. de Jo. Tezelio* (Vitemb. 1717); Kapp, *Disp. Hist. de Nolnullis ndulgent. Qucest. Sccec. XV et XVI* (Lips. 1720); and *Exercit. in Ambros. Altamur. Elogium Joh. Tezelii* (ibid. 1721); Kappen, *Schauplatz des Tetzelischen Ablaiskrams*, etc. (ibid. 1720), and *Sammung eiuiger Schrifjen über d. Abllass*, etc. (ibid. 1721); Vogel, *Leben... Joh. Tetzel's* (ibid. 1717, 1727); *Deutsche Bücher u. Schriften*, pt. 8; Hofmann, *Lebensbeschreibung... Tetzel's* (ed. Poppe, ibid. 1844); Seidemann, *Carl v. Miltitz* (Dresd. 1844); id. *Luther's Briefe*, etc. (Berl. 1856), p. 10, 18, 699; Grone, *Tetzel u. Luther*, etc. (Soest, 1853). — Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* s.v. Texerants. A local name given to the ALBIGENSES *SEE ALBIGENSES* (q.v.) in those districts of Southern

France where the members of that wide-spread sect were mostly found among the weavers” *ab usu texendi*” (Ekbert, *Adv. Cathar. in Bibl. Max. Lugd.* 23:601).

Text

The application of the word *text* to the Word of God is derived from the Latin. From the similarity between spinning and weaving, and the art of composition, both in prose and verse, the Latin authors applied to the latter several expressions proper to the former. Horace says, “*Tenui deducta pematafilo;*” and Cicero uses the terms *texere orationem* and *contexere carmen*. Among later Roman writers, *textus* occurs often in the sense of a piece or composition; and, by excellence, came to denote the Word of God, just as the word *Scriptura* did. The meaning of the words *text* and *gloss* may be ascertained from the method of writing the Scriptures before the art of printing was invented. The following may be taken as a specimen: (⁴⁰⁷²³Matthew 7:23.) Et tunc colifitebor illis quia Non novit lux in nulla approbavi, sed reprobavi qui operamini, tenebras non dicit, qui aspicit, quas si nunqui lnu novi vos. disoperati estis, aspiceret, tene ne tollat penibre non essent. tentiam, sed binonesset cedite a me omnes qui opera qui injudici quia licet non hanon hos novit, ergo eos, qui mandata beatis facultaejus custodiunt tom peccandi tamen habetis mini iniquitatem. affectum. The sentences at the sides are the *gloss*; the middle, which is in larger type, is the *text*; and between the lines of that is put the *interlinear gloss*, in which place a translation, or version, in some ancient manuscripts in the Cottonian and other libraries, is sometimes inserted. The *text* here means the Word of God, as opposed to the *gloss*; and because the text was usually written in a large and strong hand, hence such writing was called *text-hand*. By *gloss* was generally meant a commentary or exposition taken out of the Latin fathers; but afterwards it came to signify any exposition or larger commentary. Hence our English phrase, *to put a gloss on anything*, that is, a favorable construction; *gloss*, a shining outside; and *to gloze, to flatter*.

Text Of Scripture.

This term is used to signify a *portion* of the text; i.e. a short sentence out of Scripture, used either as the groundwork of a discourse from the pulpit, or brought forward to support an argument or in proof of a position; The custom of taking a text for a sermon is probably coeval with that of

preaching set discourses; and the use of texts as authority in doctrinal points is of the very essence of true theology, and was ever the custom even of those who, professing the name of Christians, denied the truth of Christ. One must therefore be on his guard against receiving everything for which a text is quoted, not accepting it as proof until its true sense is known; “otherwise, so many sentences, so many authorized falsehoods.” In the application of a text we should always consider its meaning in the passage with which it is connected, else we may be putting forward as truth what is in fact but an authorized falsehood; we should also guard against the practice of taking a text from Scripture in a sense which, however sound and true, is not that of the passage itself, as, for instance, “Hear the Church,” employed as if it were a precept, in the imperative mood. The non-observance of the latter caution has a tendency to lead others to the neglect of the former. *Textus* is a technical term for the book of the Gospels as used at the Christian sacrifice. Copies of the Gospels, richly illuminated, and bound in gold and silver, are often exposed on the high-altars of Continental churches. Sometimes they are kept in shrines, and only brought out for use in the mass at the highest and most important festivals. References to such exist in large numbers in early writers, and many remarkable examples are preserved in the sanctuaries on the Continent, two of which, at Aix-la-Chapelle and Mayence, are known to antiquaries. Numerous rich examples are reckoned up among the treasures of old St. Paul’s in London, Lincoln Minster, and Salisbury Cathedral. That in the wood-cut at head of next column is from an early Flemish specimen.

Textus Receptus

Picture for Textus

(i.e. *the received text*), a phrase generally employed by critics to denote the currently accepted text of the Greek Testament. This is usually considered to be that of the Elzevirs especially the edition of 1633, the preface of which contains the expression “Editionem *omnibus acceptam* denuo doctorum oculis subjecimus,” referring to the edition of which that was a reprint. The most commonly printed text, however, is that of Stevens, usually Mills’s edition. Sometimes the phrase *textus receptus* is in like manner extended to the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, especially Van der Hooght’s edition, which has been reprinted by Hahn. **SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.**

Tezcatlipoca

(*Shining Mirror*), the chief of the thirteen greater gods of the ancient Mexicans. On the monuments and in the paintings he is often represented as encircled by the disk of the sun. Lord Kingsborough (*Antiquities of Mexico*) states that "all the attributes and powers which were assigned to Jehovah by the Hebrews were also bestowed upon Tezcatlipoca by the Mexicans." Mr. Hardwick, however, inclines to the belief that this deity was merely the deified impersonation of the generative powers of nature, and as such his highest type was the sun. A festival in his honor was held annually in May, when a young and beautiful person was sacrificed, and the heart of the victim, still warm and palpitating, was held up towards the sun, then thrown down before the image of the god, while the people bowed in adoration.

Thaborium

(Θαβώριον or Μεταμόρφωσις, *Festum Transfigurationis, s. Patefactionis Christi*), the Feast of the Transfiguration of Christ. It was exalted to a feast of universal observance by pope Calixtus III in 1457, the day assigned to it being August 6. The ancient Church had not altogether ignored, but none the less greatly neglected, its observance. The purpose of its modern revival was the commemoration, first, of the transfiguration of Christ, and, second, of the defeat of the Turks at the siege of Belgrade in 1456. See Augusti, *Christl. Archäologie* (Leips. 1820), 3, 292 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Thacher, George, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born in Hartford, Conn., July 25, 1817. His early education was received at Hopkins Grammar-school, Hartford. He was graduated from Yale College in 1840, and in the same year entered Yale Theological Seminary, where, after a full three years course of study, he was regularly graduated in 1843. His first pastorate was at Derby, Conn., where he went in June, 1843; on Jan. 4, 1844, he was ordained, preaching there until Oct. 10, 1848, when he was dismissed. He next received and accepted a call to Nantucket, Mass., where he was installed Nov. 14, 1848, and remained until May 14, 1850, when he was dismissed to the pastorate of the Allen Street Presbyterian Church, New York city, where he was installed May 26, 1850, and dismissed Oct. 9, 1854. He was then successively installed at the First Church, Meriden, Conn., Nov. 16,

1854, dismissed Sept. 18, 1860; Keokuk, Io., Oct. 30, 1860, dismissed April 8, 1867. At this latter date he went to Europe, where he spent a few months. Returning to New York in 1868, he supplied Mercer Street Church from May to October of the same year. He was then acting pastor at Waterloo, Io., from October, 1868, to March, 1871. In 1871 he was elected president of the State University of Iowa, in which position he remained until June, 1877. He was then, from 1877 to 1878, acting pastor at Iowa City. In 1871 he received the honorary degree of D.D. from Iowa and Knox colleges. He died in Hartford of disease of the brain and heart, Dec. 27, 1878. Dr. Thacher published *Two Sermons* at Meriden, one of which was suggested by the career of John Brown: — *A Sermon: "No Fellowship with Slavery"* (Keokuk, 1861): — *Inaugural Address*, as president of Iowa University (1871). (W. P. S.)

Thacher, Peter (1)

a Congregational minister, was born at Salem, Mass., in 1651, and was the son of Rev. Thomas Thacher, first pastor of the Old South Church, Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1671, and was tutor there for several years following. He then went to England to prepare himself more fully for his profession, but his friend Samuel Danforth dying shortly after, Mr. Thacher returned to America. He refused several tempting offers to enter the Established Church; and in September, 1681, was ordained pastor of the Church in Milton, Mass. Here he labored effectively until a week before his death, which occurred Dec. 17, 1727. "He was a person of eminent sanctity, of a most courteous and complaisant behavior, cheerful, affable, humble, and free of speech to the meanest he met." He published several theological treatises and single sermons (1708-23), for a list of which see Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 196.

Thacher, Peter (2)

a Congregational minister, the son of Thomas Thacher, Jun., and grandson of Thomas Thacher, the first minister of the Old South Church, was born in Boston in 1677. He graduated at Harvard in 1696, and immediately after his graduation began to teach at Hatfield, and is supposed to have studied divinity under the Rev. William Williams of that place. On Nov. 26, 1707, he was ordained pastor of the Church at Weymouth, where he remained between eleven and twelve years. In January, 1720, he returned to Boston and was installed pastor of the New North Church as colleague with Mr.

Webb. Here he labored until his death, Feb. 26, 1738. Mr. Thacher published an *Election Sermon* (1726), and a *Sermon on the Death of Mrs. Gee* (1730). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 266.

Thacher, Peter (3)

a Congregational minister, was born in 1688, and graduated at Harvard College in 1706. He was ordained pastor of the Church in Middleborough, Mass., in 1709, and died there April 22, 1744. He published an account of the revival of religion in Middleborough, in Prince's *Christian History*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Thacher, Peter (4), D.D.

an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Milton, Mass., March 21, 1752. He graduated at Harvard College in 1769, and was ordained pastor Sept. 19, 1770, at Malden, Mass., from which charge he was dismissed to allow his acceptance of a call from Brattle Street Church, Boston, Dec. 8, 1784. He entered upon his new charge Jan. 12, 1785, and there continued until his health failed. He died in Savannah Dec. 16, 1802. He was an active member of the convention which met in Boston in 1780 to frame a state constitution, and opposed the retention of the governor's office. The University of Edinburgh made him D.D. in 1791. He published, *An Oration against Standing Armies* (1776): — *Three Sermons in Proof of the Eternity of Future Punishments* (1782): — *Observations on the State of the Clergy in New England, with Strictures upon the Power of Dismissing them Usurped by some Churches* (1783): — *A Reply to Strictures upon the Preceding: (1788): — Memoirs of Dr. Boylston* (1789): — and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 718.

Thacher, Samuel Cooper

a Unitarian preacher and son of Peter (4), was born in Boston, Mass., in 1785. He graduated at Harvard College in 1804, and immediately after his graduation commenced his theological studies under the direction of Rev. William E. Channing. In the early part of 1805 Mr. Thacher took charge of the Boston Latin Grammar-school, but in the summer of 1806 was chosen to be the traveling companion of Rev. Mr. Buckminster. Returning in September, 1807, he was shortly after appointed librarian of Harvard College, and entered on his duties in 1808. He prosecuted his theological

studies at Cambridge, and succeeded Dr. Kirkland as pastor of the New-South Church, May 15, 1811, retaining this connection until his death, at Moulins, France, Jan. 2, 1818. His principal publications were, *Apology for Rational and Evangelical Christianity*, a discourse (Bost. 1815, 8vo): — *Unity of God*, a sermon (Liverpool, 1816, 8vo; 2d Amer. ed. Worcester, 1817, 8vo): — *Sermons*, with a *Memoir* by Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood (Bost. 1824, 8vo): — *Evidence Necessary to Establish the Doctrine of the Trinity* (1828, 12mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8:435 sq.

Thacher, Thomas

a Congregational minister, was born at Salisbury, England, May 1, 1620. He declined the offer of his father to send him to an English university, preferring to emigrate to America. On June 4, 1635, he arrived at Boston, Mass., and soon after entered the family of the Rev. Charles Chauncy, of Scituate. He was ordained pastor of the Weymouth Church, Jan. 2, 1644, where he labored for more than twenty years. He then removed to Boston, where he preached occasionally, but was principally engaged in the practice of medicine, till he was chosen first pastor of the Third (Old South) Church. His installation took place Feb. 16, 1669, and after a happy ministry he died Oct. 15, 1678. He wrote, *A Brief Rule to Guide the Common People of New England how to Order Themselves and Theirs in the Small Pocks or Measles* (Bost. 1677; 2d ed. 1702), said to be the first medical tract published in New England: — *A Fast of God's Choosing*, a sermon (1674, 4to; 1678). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 126.

Thacher, Tyler

a Congregational minister, was born at Princeton, Mass., Sept. 11, 1801: — "His ancestors for several generations, both in this country and in England, had been Puritan ministers, some of them of high distinction. Among them were Rev. Peter Thacher, of Salisbury, England; Rev. Thomas Thacher, of Boston, Mass.; Rev. Peter Thacher, of Milton, Mass.; and Rev. Peter Thacher, of Attleborough, Mass. In all not less than nine generations of the family have had representatives in the Christian ministry either in England or in America." "The subject of this sketch was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1824, and was licensed to preach April 26, 1825, and ordained as an evangelist in Wrentham, Mass., Dec. 4, 1827. He did

not permanently settle in the ministry until May 14, 1834, when he became colleague pastor with Rev. Jonathan Grant over the Congregational Church at Hawley, Mass., where he remained about nine years (1834-43) and then returned to Wrentham. For several years he supplied the Church in North Wrentham, until he moved to California in 1851. Here he remained the rest of his life, teaching and preaching, and engaged in such employments as suited his tastes. "He was distinguished among his brethren for his theological and literary attainments, and even in the wilderness where he made his home he kept up his studies in the Hebrew and Greek languages and in philosophy. He was a man of quiet, scholarly, and devout habits, and much given to the study of nature and the problems of theology." Mr. Thacher died at Cache Creek, Cal., Dec. 4, 1869. (J. C. S.)

Thacher, Washington

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Attleborough, Mass., Feb. 23, 1794. He received his classical education under the Rev. Lyman Richardson; studied theology under the Rev. John Truair; was licensed to preach by the Otsego Presbytery in 1821; was ordained in 1822; officiated as stated supply at Morrisville, N.Y., 1822-26; was pastor of the Church in Jordan, N. Y., 1826-42; resigned his charge on account of ill-health; was afterwards a stated supply at Eaton, N. Y., three years; was appointed secretary and agent of the Central Agency of the American Home Missionary Society in July, 1847; and died June 29, 1850. He was an eminently devout man and an earnest and effective preacher.

Thaddaei Acta

The mission of Thaddaeus to king Abgar of Edessa, the correspondence between Christ and Abgar, and the picture of Christ which purports to have been taken for Abgar are very old traditions, first mentioned by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 13. Whether these *Acts* formed the basis for these traditions cannot be decided. Tischendorf has published the Greek text from a *codex Paris* of the 11th century in his *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Lips. 1851), p. 261-265. (B. P.)

Thaddeei Evangelium

mentioned in the *Decret. Gelasii de Libris Apocryphis* (in *Jus Canonicum*, 15:3). Unless there is an erroneous reading for *Matthew*, it would either

belong to the apostle Judas Thaddaeus or to a Judas belonging to the seventy whom Thomas sent to Edessa to king Abgar (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 13; see Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus*, 1, 136, 379). But tradition does not determine whether Thaddaeus who was sent to Abgar belonged to the twelve or the seventy, on which point Eusebius and Jerome disagree. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* (ed. Reading), p. 38, note 5, 6.

On the correspondence between Abgar and Jesus, see especially Hofmann, *Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen* (Leips. 1851), p. 307 sq. (B. P.)

Thaddee'us

(Θαδδαῖος; Vulg. *Thaddceus*), a name in Mark's catalogue of the twelve apostles (3, 18) in the great majority of MSS. In Matthew's catalogue (10, 3) the corresponding place is assigned to Θαδδαῖος by the Vatican MS. (B), and the Sinaitic (a), and to Λεββαῖος by the Codex Bezae (D); while the received text, following the first correction of the Codex Ephraemi (C)-where the original reading is doubtful as well as many fragmentary uncial and several cursive MSS., reads Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς θαδδαῖος. We are probably to infer that Λεββαῖος alone is the original reading of ~~<0103>~~Matthew 10:3, and Θαδδαῖος of Mark 3, 18 (so Tischendorf; but Tregelles has Θαδδαῖος in both passages). By these two evangelists the tenth place among the apostles is given to Lebbaeus or Thaddaeus, the eleventh place being given to Simon the Canaanite. Luke, in both his catalogues (6, 15; Acts i, 13), places Simon Zelotes tenth among the apostles, and assigns the eleventh place to Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. As the other names recorded by Luke are identical with those which appear (though in a different order) in the first two gospels, it seems scarcely possible to doubt that the three names of Jilas, Lebbeus, and Thaddaeus were borne by one and the same person. *SEE JUDE*; *SEE LEBBEUS*; *SEE THADDAEI ACTA* and *SEE EVANGELIUM*.

Tha'hash

(Heb. *Tach'ash*, װַיִּיִּיִּיִּי *badger* [q.v.]; Sept. Τοχός; Josephus, Ταύαος. *Ant.* 1, 6,5; Vulg. *Thahas*), third named of the four sons of Nahor by his concubine Reumah (~~<01224>~~Genesis 22:24). B.C. cir. 2050.

Thalemann, Christoph Wilhelm

a Lutheran divine, was born in 1727 at Weberstadt, in Thuringia, and died, as doctor and professor of theology, at Leipsic, March 10, 1778.' He wrote, *Tractatus de Nube super Airco Feederis Commento Judaico* (Lips. 17-52): — *Tactatus de Philonis et Josephi Auctoritate inl istoria Rituum Sacrorum* (ibid. 1771): — *De Sensu Veri et Fulsi in Inter. pretatione Librorum Sacrorum* (ibid. 1775): — *Dissertatio de Eruditione Pauli Apostoli Judaica non Graeca* (ibid. 1769): — *Versio Laina Evangeliorum Matth., Luc., et Joh., itemque Act. App.*, edita a K. Ch. Tittmann (Berlin, 1780). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 419; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 138, 165, 569, 896; 2, 799. (B. P.)

Thales

a celebrated Greek philosopher, and the first of the seven wise men of Greece, was born at Miletus about B.C. 640. After acquiring the usual learning of his own country, he traveled into Egypt and several parts of Asia' to learn astronomy, geometry, mystical divinity, natural knowledge, or philosophy; etc. Returning to his own country, he communicated the knowledge he had acquired to many disciples, among the principal of whom were Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Pythagoras. He was the founder of the Ionian sect of philosophers. Laertes and several other writers agree that he was the father of the Greek philosophy, being the first that made any researches into natural science and mathematics. His doctrine is that water is the principle of which all the bodies in the universe are composed; that the world is the work of God; and that God sees the most secret thoughts in the heart of man. He taught that in order to live well we ought to abstain from what we find fault with in others; that bodily felicity consists in health; and that of the mind in knowledge. That the most ancient of beings is God, because he is uncreated; that nothing is more beautiful than the world, because it is the work of God; nothing more extensive than space, quicker than spirit, stronger than necessity wiser than time. He used to observe that we ought never to say that to any one which may be turned to our prejudice; and that we should live with our friends as with persons that may become our enemies. In geometry Thales was a considerable inventor as well as an improver; while in astronomy his knowledge and improvements were very considerable. His morals were as just as his mathematics well-grounded, and his judgment in civil affairs equal to either. He died about B.C. 550. Concerning his writings, it

remains doubtful whether he left any behind him; at least, none have come down to us. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.

Tha'mah

(Heb. *Te'mach*, **j mī**, in pause *Ta'mach*, **j mī**; *laughter* [Gesenius], or *combat* [Fürst]; Sept. **Θεμά**; Vulg. *Thema*), one of the Nethinim whose "children" returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<4125>}Ezra 2:53;" Tamah," ^{<4075>}Nehemiah 7:55). B.C. ante 536.

Tha'mar

(^{<4103>}Matthew 1:3). *SEE TAMAR*.