THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Thamer, Theobold- Three Taverns

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

Thamer, Theobald

a theological agitator in the time of the Reformation in Germany. He was a native of Rossheim, in Alsace, and studied at Wittenberg under Luther and Melancthon, taking the degree of master in 1539. He had been supported while a student by the landgrave Philip of Hesse, who wished to train the youth for service in his employment; and after a time spent as professor of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Thamer responded to the landgrave's call and became professor and preacher at Marburg. To the chagrin of his prince, however he showed himself a rigid Lutheran, whose influence was directly opposed to the compromises which Philip hoped to bring about between the contending evangelical factions. In the Smalcald war Thamer served in the field as a chaplain. He there saw reason to lose faith in the cause of the Reformation, and to discover the occasion of all the troubles of the situation in the Lutheran doctrine of justification; and on his return to Marburg he assailed that doctrine in the pulpit and the lecture room. He emphasized the ethical side of Christianity, and separated it from the doctrinal side, thus gradually coming to occupy rationalistic ground. The government dealt with him mildly, at first transferring him to Cassel, and then entering into extended negotiations with him; but as he persisted in disturbing the peace of the Church, he was dismissed from all his offices Aug. 15, 1549. He secured a position as preacher at Frankfort-on-the-Main, whence he continued to asperse the Lutheran doctrines, until he exhausted the patience of his new patrons. He then turned to the landgrave with the offer to defend his views before competent judges, and he actually visited Melancthon, Gresser, Schnepf, and Bullinger. No settlement was reached in their discussions, however, and Thamer was dismissed from the dominions of Hesse. He went to Italy and in 1557 entered the Romish Church. In time he was made professor of theology at Freiburg. He died May 23, 1569. See Neander, *Theobald Thamer*, etc. (Berl. 1842); id. *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 631; Pestalozzi, *Bullirger*, p. 461 sq.; Schenkel, *Wiesen d. Protestantismus*, 1, 144 sq.; Hochhuth, *De Th. Thameri Vita et Scriptis* (Marb. 1858), and the article in Niedner's *Zeitsch. hist. Theologie*, 1861, No. 2. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Tham'natha

(ἡ θαμναθά; Vulg. *Thamnata*), one of the cities of Judea fortified by Bacchides after he had driven the Maccabees over the Jordan (1 Macc. 9:50); no doubt an ancient TIMNATH, possibly the present *Tibneh*, half-

way between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean. Whether the name should be joined to Pharathoni, which follows it, or whether it should be independent, is a matter of doubt. *SEE PHARATHON*.

Thane, Daniel

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland and received his classical education at Aberdeen. After, coming to America, he entered the Princeton Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1748. He was ordained by the New York Presbytery and installed pastor at Connecticut Farms, N.J., Aug. 29, 1750. In 1754 he was sent by the Synod of New York to Virginia and the Carolinas. Ramsey, in his *History of South Carolina,* says that he preached on the fork of Broad and Saluda rivers, where there were only six families. These were driven away by the Indians between the years 1755 and 1763, but they returned and set up congregations, served in aftertimes by Dr. Joseph Alexander and others. In 1808 there was a flourishing congregation, with a meetinghouse on the spot where Thane preached, in 1754, under a tree. He was dismissed in 1757, and left at liberty to join the Presbytery of Newcastle or Lewes. He was settled in the united congregations of Newcastle and Christina Bridge, where he remained until 1763, when the pastoral relation was dissolved. He died soon after. Dr. Hosack, in his *Memoir* of *DeWitt Clinton,* says that this eminent man was under Thane’s tuition, and that he was minister of New Windsor, N.Y. (W. P. S.)

Thank-offering

(hdwoT hbz, <032229>Leviticus 22:29; or briefly hdwoT, <142903>2 Chronicles 29:3; <195613>Psalm 56:13; <241726>Jeremiah 17:26; literally *praise* or *thanksgiving,* as often rendered), a variety of the peace-offering (hence the full expression µymlev]hi tdwoT hbz,, <030713>Leviticus 7:13, 15), the other two kinds being the votive offering, specifically such (rdn,ehbz), and the ordinary free-will offering (jbz,hbdn]). As its name implies, it was a bloody or animal sacrifice, and its specific character was the *praise* which it embodied towards God. Like all the other divisions of the peace-offering, it was entirely voluntary, being placed in the light of a privilege rather than a duty. It is intimately associated with the “meat-offering” (q.v.).

The nature of the victim was left to the sacrificer; it might be male or female, of the flock or of the herd, provided that it was unblemished; the

hand of the sacrificer was laid on its head, the fat burned, and the blood sprinkled as in the burnt-offering; of the flesh, the breast and right shoulder (the former of which the offerer was to *heave* and the latter to *wave*) were given to the priest; the rest belonged to the sacrificer as a sacrificial feast (<46018>1 Corinthians 10:18), to be eaten, either on the day of sacrifice or on the next day (<03071>Leviticus 7:11-18, 2934), except in the case of the firstlings, which belonged to the priest alone (<03230>Leviticus 23:20). The eating of the flesh of the meat-offering was considered a partaking of the table of the Lord;" and on solemn occasions, as at the dedication of the Temple of Solomon, it was conducted on all enormous scale, and became a great national feast, especially at periods of unusual solemnity or rejoicing; as at the first inauguration of the covenant (<02405>Exodus 24:5), at the first consecration of Aaron and of the tabernacle (<03918>Leviticus 9:18), at the solemn reading of the law in Canaan by Joshua (<06831>Joshua 8:31), at the accession of Saul (<09115>1 Samuel 11:15), at the bringing of the ark to Mount Zion by David (<10617>2 Samuel 6:17), at the consecration of the Temple, and thrice every year afterwards, by Solomon (<11063>1 Kings 8:63; 9:25), and at the great Passover of Hezekiah (<14022>2 Chronicles 30:22). In two cases only (<07206>Judges 20:26; <10425>2 Samuel 24:25) are these or any other kind of peace-offering mentioned as offered with burnt-offerings at a time of national sorrow and fasting. Here their force seems to have been precatory rather than eucharistic. The key to the understanding of this is furnished by Hengstenberg: "To give thanks for grace already received is a refined way of begging for more." As prayer is founded on the divine promise, it "may be expressed in the way of anticipated thanks."

Among thank-offerings, in the most extensive sense, might be reckoned the presentation of the first-born (<02132>Exodus 13:12, 13); the first-fruits, including the fruit of all manner of trees, honey, oil, and new wine (<03230>Leviticus 23:10-13; <04812>Numbers 18:12; <13029>1 Chronicles 9:29; <16037>Nehemiah 10:37;. <14315>2 Chronicles 32:5); the second tithe (<05127>Deuteronomy 12:17, 18; 14:23); and the lamb of the Passover (<02703>Exodus 12:3-17). Leaven and honey were excluded from all offerings made by fire (<03211>Leviticus 2:11); and salt was required in all (2, 13; <41049>Mark 9:49; <51406>Colossians 4:6). So also the Hebrews were forbidden to offer anything vile and contemptible (<05318>Deuteronomy 23:18; <39107>Malachi 1:7, 8). *SEE PEACE OFFERING*.

Thanksgiving

the act of giving thanks or expressing gratitude for favors or mercy received. It implies, according to Dr. Barrow (*Sermons*, 1, ser. 8,9),

(1) a right apprehension of the benefits conferred;

(2) a faithful retention of benefits in the memory, and frequent reflections upon them;

(3) a due esteem and valuation of benefits;

(4) a reception of those benefits with a willing mind, a vehement affection;

(5) due acknowledgment of our obligations;

(6) endeavors of real compensation, or, as it respects the Divine Being, a willingness to serve and exalt him;

(7) esteem, veneration, and love of the benefactor.

The blessings for which we should be thankful are

(1) temporal, such-as health, food, raiment, rest, etc.;

(2) spiritual, such as the Bible, ordinances, the Gospel and its blessings, as free grace, adoption, pardon, justification, calling, etc.;

(3) eternal, or the enjoyment of God in a future state;

(4) also for all that is past, what we now enjoy, and what is promised; for private and public, for ordinary and extraordinary blessings; for prosperity, and even adversity, so far as rendered subservient to our good.

The obligation to this duty arises

(1) from the relation we stand in to God;
(2) the divine command;
(3) the promises God has made;
(4) the example of all good men;
(5) our unworthiness of the blessings we receive;
(6) the prospect of eternal glory.

Whoever possesses any good without giving thanks for it deprives him who bestows that good of his glory, sets a bad example before others, and prepares a recollection severely painful for himself when he comes in his turn to experience ingratitude. See Chalmers, *Sermons*; Hall, *Sermons*; Dwight, *Theology*.

Thanksgiving-day

an annual religious festival observed in the United States. It owes its origin to the desire of the Puritans for greater simplicity in the forms of worship of the Established Church, and a purpose not to celebrate any of the numerous festival-days observed by that Church. An occasional day of thanksgiving has been recommended by the civil authorities of Europe, and such a day was observed in Leyden, Holland, Oct. 3, 1575, the first anniversary of the deliverance of that city from siege. Before the adoption of an annual thanksgiving-day, we find mention of several appointed for special reasons. After the first harvest at Plymouth, in 1621,'Gov. Bradford sent four men out fowling, that they "might after a more special manner rejoice together." In July, 1623, the governor appointed a day of thanksgiving for rain, after a long drought, and the records show a similar appointment in 1632 because of the arrival of supplies from Ireland. There is also record of the appointment of days of thanksgiving in Massachusetts in 1632, 1633, 1634, 1637, 1638, and 1639, and in Plymouth in 1651,1668, 1680 (when the form of the recommendation indicates that it had become an annual custom), 1689, and 1690. The Dutch governors of New Netherland in 1644, 1645, 1655, and 1664, and the English governors of New York in 1755 and 1760, appointed days of thanksgiving. During the Revolution, Thanksgiving-day was observed by the nation, being annually recommended by Congress; but there was no national appointment between the general thanksgiving for peace in 1784 and 1789, when president Washington recommended a day of thanksgiving for the adoption of the constitution. Since that time special days have been set apart both by presidents and governors until 1864, when the present practice was adopted of a national annual thanksgiving. The president issues an annual proclamation, followed by the governors of the several states and mayors of the principal cities. Custom has fixed the time for the last Thursday in November.

Thanksgiving Service

There are various modes under the Old Test. of offering thanksgiving. Sometimes it was public, sometimes in the family. It was frequently accompanied by sacrifices (<14231>2 Chronicles 29:31) and peace-offerings, or offerings of pure devotion, arising from the sentiments of gratitude in the offerer's own mind (<03712>Leviticus 7:12, 15; <19723>Psalm 107:23; 116:7). It is usually connected with praise, joy, gladness, and the voice of melody (<23503>Isaiah 51:3), or (as <16117>Nehemiah 11:17) with singing and with honor (<66072>Revelation 7:12); but occasionally, if not generally, with supplication (<50406>Philippians 4:6) and prayer (<54203>1 Timothy 2:3; <16117>Nehemiah 11:17).

In the Book of Common Prayer there are various forms of thanksgiving, particular and general, as especially the "General Thanksgiving," which was added at the last revision, and appointed for daily use, and more particularly the "Office for the Holy Communion." But there are, besides, particular thanksgivings appointed for deliverance from drought, rain, famine, war, tumult, and pestilence; and there is an entire service of thanksgiving for women after childbirth; and certain days on which are commemorated great deliverances of the Church and nation are marked also with a solemn service of thanksgiving.

Thanner, Ignaz

a Roman Catholic divine, was born Feb. 9, 1770, at Neumarkt, in Bavaria. In 1802 he was appointed professor of catechetics at Salzburg; in 1805 professor of philosophy at Landshut; in 1808 he was called to Innspruck, and in 1810 to Salzburg again, where he died, May 28, 1856. At first he belonged to the Kantian philosophical school, but soon became converted to that of Schelling. He wrote, *Der Transcendentalismus in seiner drei. fachen Steigerung* (Munich, 1805): —*Die Idee des Organismus* (ibid. 1806): —*Handbuch der Vorbereitung zum selbstständigen wissenschaftlichen Studium* (ibid. 1807, 2 *vols.*): —*Darstellung der absoluten Identititslehre* (ibid. 1810): —*Logische Aphorismen* (Salzburg, 1811): —*Lehr und Handbuch der tuoeoretischen und praktischen Philosophie* (ibid. 1811, 2 vols.): —*Wissenschaftliche Aphorismen der kathol. Dogmatik* (ibid. 1816). See Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, 1, 306; 2, 800; *Regensburger Real-Encyklop.* s.v. (B.P.)

Tha'ra

(Luke 3, 34). *SEE TERAH*.

Thar'ra

(Vulg. *Thara*, for the Greek fails here), a corrupt form found in the Apocryphal addition to the book of Esther (12, 1) for TERESH *SEE TERESH* (q.v.).

Thar'shish

a less exact form of Anglicizing the word TARSHISH *SEE TARSHISH* (q.v.), applied in the A. V. to

(a) the place (<11102>1 Kings 10:22; 22:48) and
(b) the man (<13710>1 Chronicles 7:10).

Thas'si

(θασσί, θασσίς; Vulg. *Thasi, Hassii*), the surname of Simon the son of Mattathias (1 Macc. 2, 3). The derivation of the word is uncertain. Michaelis suggests yvæ]Ti(Chald.), "the fresh grass springs up," i.e. "the spring is come," in reference to the tranquility first secured during the supremacy of Simon (Grimm, *Comment.* ad loc.). This seems very farfetched. Winer (*Realwb.* s.v. "Simon") suggests a connection with s s;T; *fervere*, as Grotius (*ad loc.*) seems to have done before him. In Josephus (*Ant. 12*:6, 1) the surname is written Ματθῆς, v.r. θαδής, θαθής. *SEE MACCABEE*.

Thaumatopcei

(θαυματοποίοι), a term applied by the early Greek writers to those who pretended to work miracles by the power of magic, such as, James and Jambres, Simon Magus, and Apollonius Tyanaeus. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 16:ch. v, § 7.

Thaumnaturgy

SEE MIRACLES, ECCLESIASTICAL.

Thaxter, Joseph

a Unitarian minister, was born at Hingham, Mass., April 23, 1742. He graduated at Harvard College in 1768, expecting to enter the medical profession, but, deciding upon the ministry, he studied theology under Dr. Gay, and began to preach in 1771. On Jan. 23, 1776, he received a commission as chaplain in the army, and probably held that position for two or three years. He was installed pastor of the Church in Edgarton, Martha's Vineyard, in 1780. The last Sunday that he preached he fell in the pulpit, was assisted home, and died July 18, 1827. Mr. Thaxter acted as chaplain at the laying of the corner-stone of the Bunker Hill monument, July 17, 1825. His only publication, so far as known, was a *Catechism for Sabbath-schools.* See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8*:83.

Thayer, Elihu, D.D.

a Congregational preacher, was born at Braintree, Mass., March 29, 1747. He was, as a child, very forward in his studies, having read the Bible through three times at the age of seven years. He entered Princeton College, one year in advance, in 1766, and graduated in 1769. His theological studies were prosecuted partly under Rev. John Searle, Stoneham, and partly under Rev. Mr. Weld, Braintree. Licensed to preach, he supplied for nearly a year the church in Newburyport. He was then (Dec. 18,1776) set apart to take the pastoral care of the Church in Kingston, N. H. He was chosen president of the New Hampshire Missionary Society in 1801, and continued to hold the office till 1811. He died April 3,1812. A volume of his *Sermons* was published after his death (1813, 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 104.

Thayer, Nathaniel, D.D.

a Unitarian minister, was born at Hampton, N. H., July 11, 1769, studied at the Phillips Academy, Exeter, and graduated from Harvard College in 1789.. He immediately took charge of the grammar-school in Medford, and at the same time commenced the study of theology under Dr. Osgood. At the end of a year he returned to Cambridge, and continued to study under Dr. Tappan, divinity professor in the college. He held the position of tutor in college for about a year, and, being licensed to preach, spent the greater part of a year at Wilkesbarre, Pa., supplying a congregation there. On his return to Massachusetts, he preached to the New South Church, Boston, and at Dorchester. He was ordained and installed colleague pastor of the

Church in Lancaster, Oct. 9, 1793. The pastor, Rev. Timothy Harrington, lived about two years, and at his death Mr. Thayer succeeded to the sole charge of the Church. He was a man whose services were greatly esteemed and frequently employed; he was a member of no less than 150 ecclesiastical councils; preached the Artillery Election sermon in 1798, and the annual sermon before the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1823. He received his D.D. in 1817 from Harvard. When Lafayette made his tour through the United States in 1825, Mr. Thayer addressed him in behalf of the people of Lancaster. Being somewhat debilitated, he, in June, 1840, set out to travel. He reached Rochester on the 22nd of that month, retired to rest at his usual hour, and died at two o'clock the next morning. His remains were carried back to Lancaster. Mr. Thayer published a number of sermons and discourses, for a list of which see Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8:246 sq.

Theandric Operation

(θεανδρικὴ ἐνρέγεια), a theological term first used in the 7th century, and intended to express that unity of operation in the two natures and the two wills of our Lord Jesus Christ by which they act as the nature and will of one invisible Person, God and man. It was called a novel term by the Council of Lateran (A.D. 649), and discouraged as such in its 15th canon, which speaks of the "heretics" who had introduced it (τὴν ἐπ̓ αὐτῇ θεανδρικῇ καινὴν ῥῆσιν), which makes it seem likely that it has been used by some of the Monothelite sect in justification of their principles. John Damascene (*De Orthod. Fide*, ch. 66) thus explains the term "The Theandric operation, then, signifies this, that when God became man both his human operation was divine, that is, deified, and not void of participation in his divine operation, and his divine operation was not void of participation in his human operation, but either is contemplated in connection with the other. And this manner is styled periphrasis when a person embraces any two things by one expression; for as we call the divided cauterizing and the inflamed incision of a heated knife the same thing, but call the incision one operation and the cauterizing another calling them operations of different natures, the cauterizing of fire and the incision of iron so, also, speaking of one Theandric operation of Christ, we understand of the two natures to be two-the divine that of his-divinity, and the human that of his humanity."

Theatines

Picture for Theatines

an order of regular clergy 2 the Church of Rome, which was founded in the beginning of the 16th century for the purpose of defeating the efforts towards a reformation outside the Church by reorganizing the clergy, enforcing discipline in the convents, restoring an apostolical simplicity of life, and infusing a religious spirit into the Church by means of the public worship and the sermon. The order was founded by Cajetan of Thiene (thence called *Order of the Cajetans.*), bishop John Peter Caraffa of Theate, subsequently pope Paul IV who was usually called Chieti (hence *Chietines* and *Paulines*) and Boniface of Coile. It was confirmed by Clement VII in 1524 (June 24). Caraffa was its first superior, and his bishopric gave the order its name. The members renounced all worldly possessions, and refused either to labor or beg, depending, instead, on gifts which Providence should confer on them. Their number was never very considerable; but as they were chiefly of noble rank, the reputation of the order was great, and they acquired houses in many cities of Italy, Spain, Poland, and Bavaria. Mazaril conferred on it, in 1644, the only establishment it has been able to secure in France. It attempted missions in Tartary, Georgia, and Circassia, which have been unproductive of results. The garb of the order is the usual black robe of the regular clergy, with the addition of white stockings. See Caraccioli, *De Vita Pauli IV*; id. *Cajetani Thienami, Bonifacii a Colle cum Paulo IV Ord. Clericorum 'Regul. Fundave unt Vitce* (Colossians Ubiorum, 1612); Mirsei *Regulke et Constitutiones Clericorum in Cong. Viventium* (Antverp. 1638).

Two congregations of *Sisters* are attached to the Order of Theatines, both of which were founded by the hermit-virgin Ursula Benincasa. She was aided by the Spanish priest Gregory of Navarre, and recommended by Philip Neri, founder of the Oratorians (q.v.). The rule given to the congregation founded by her in 1583 bound the nuns by the three simple vows (to-a common life of poverty, affection, and humility), permitted secular employments, etc., and enforced mortifications of the body. Their number was fixed at sixty-six, because the Virgin Mary was said to have attained the age of so many years. Ursula prophesied a world-wide extension of her order, but it was able to obtain only a single house in Palermo. It was attached to the Theatines by pope Gregory XV.

The second congregation was founded in 1610 at Naples. Its members were to be thirty-six in number in each convent, and they were governed by a more rigid rule than the former class. Complete separation from the world and its affairs was enforced, severe penances and mortifications imposed, and stringent vows exacted. A novitiate of two years was required before entering the order. This congregation secured but one additional house, also in Palermo. Clement IX united the sisterhood with the Theatines. Its garb consists of a white robe, black girdle, blue scapulary and mantle, and black veil for the head and neck (see Helyot, *Ausführl. Gesch. aller geistl. u. weltl. Kloster u. Ritter-Orden* [Leips. 1753-56], 4:103 sq.). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theatre

Picture for Theatre

(θέατρον). The Greek term, like the corresponding English one, denotes the *place* where dramatic performances are exhibited, and also the *scene* itself, or *spectacle,* which is witnessed there.

1. It occurs in the first or local sense in Acts 19:29, where it is said that the multitude at Ephesus rushed to the theatre, on the occasion of the excitement stirred up against Paul and his associates by Demetrius, in order to consider what should be done in reference to the charges against them. It may be remarked also (although the word does not occur in the original text or in our English version) that it was in the theatre at Cassarea that Herod Agrippa I gave audience to the Tyrian deputies, and was himself struck with death, because he heard so gladly the impious acclamations of the people (Acts 12:21-23). See the remarkable confirmatory account of this event in Josephus (*Ant.* 19:8, 2). Such a use of the theatre for public assemblies and the transaction of public business, though it was hardly known among the Romans, was a common practice among the Greeks. Thus Valer. Max. 2, 2, “Legati in theatrum, ut est consuetudo Graeci, introducti;” Justin, 22:2, “Veluti reipublicae statum formaturus in theatrum ad contionem vocari jussit;” Corn. Nep. *Timol.* 4, § 2, “Veniebat in theatrum, cum ibi concilium plebis haberetulr.”

2. The other sense of the term “theatre” occurs in 1 Corinthians 4:9, where the Common Version renders, “God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death; for we are made (rather, *were made,* θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν) a *spectacle* unto the world, and to angels, and to

men." Instead of "spectacle" (so also Wycliffe and the Rhemish translators after the Vulgate), some might prefer the more energetic Saxon "gazing-stock," as in Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva version. But the latter would be now inappropriate, if it includes the idea of scorn or exultation, since the angels look down upon the sufferings of the martyrs with a very different interest. Whether "theatre" denotes more here than to be al object of earnest attention (θέα μα), or refers at the same time to the theatre as the place where criminals were sometimes brought forward for punishment, is not agreed among interpreters. In Hebrews 12:1, where the writer speaks of our having around us "so great a cloud of witnesses" (τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων), he has in mind, no doubt, the agonistic scene, in which Christians are viewed as running a race, and not the theatre or stage where the eyes of the spectators are fixed on them.

Among the Greeks and the states of Greek origin, the theatre — the proper appropriation of which was for the celebration of the public games — was also used as the place of assembly for every kind of public business; and served for town-hall, senate house, forum, etc., and harangues to the people were there delivered. Indeed, all important public business was transacted in these places-war was declared, peace proclaimed, and criminals were executed. Antiochus Epiphanes introduced public shows and games in Syria (2 Macc. 4:1016); and in a later age theatres and amphitheatres were erected by the Herods in Jerusalem and other towns of Syria (Josephus, *Ant. 15*:8,1; 16:5,1; 19:7,5; *War,* 1, 21, 8), in which magnificent spectacles were exhibited, principally in honor of the Roman emperors. The remains of Ione of these near Caesarea are still clearly traceable (Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2, 237). For the history and construction of such buildings in that day, see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Wettstein well observes that the very situation of the theatre at Ephesus would not a little promote and increase the tumult in the case of Paul, since, as we find from the accounts of those who have surveyed the situation of the Temple of Diana, it was within view of the theatre. See Ephesus. The shell of this theatre remains unmistakably to be recognised on Mount Priar, though the marble seats have been removed. Its ruins are described by Fellows (*Asia Minor,* p. 274) as "a wreck of immense grandeur," and it is said to be the largest of any that have come down to us from ancient days. See Lewin, *St. Paul,* 2, 328; Wood, *Discoveries in Ephesus* (Lond. 1877), ch. 4.

Theatre And The Church.

Picture for Theatre and the Church

The writers of the early Church were very severe in their invectives against all frequenters of the theatre and public stage plays, and such frequenters were excluded from the privilege of baptism. For this sentiment respecting the theatre there are two reasons assigned:

1. The several sorts of heathen games and plays were instituted upon a religious account, in honor of the gods, and men thought they were doing a grateful thing to them while they were engaged in such exercises. Christians could not, therefore, be present at them as spectators without partaking, in some measure, in the idolatry of them.

2. They were the great nurseries of impurity, where incest and adultery were represented with abominable obscenity. Venus was represented in all her lewd behavior, Mars as an adulterer, and Jupiter no less a prince in his vices than in his kingdom. The theatres, by reason of their impurities, were places of unavoidable temptation, and were considered as the devil's own ground and property. Tertullian (*De Spectac.* c. 26) says the devil was once asked, when a woman was seized by him in a theatre, how he durst presume to possess a Christian, and he answered, confidently, "I had a right to, for I found her upon my own ground." In the time of Tertullian, and when the author of the *Constitutions* drew up his collections, a Christian becoming a spectator of these plays lost his title to Christian communion. Later, when the theatres were purged from idolatry, but not from lewdness, the fathers contented themselves with declaiming against them with sharp invectives. —Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 11:ch. 5, § 9; bk. 16:ch. 11:§ 12.

It is well known, nevertheless, that the dramatic representation of modern Europe grew up under the wing of the Church, and only slowly detached itself from this its earliest shelter. Of the dramatic element which was allowed to find place in its own services we have a curious illustration in the manner in which the offering of the magi was set forth in some churches on the festival of Epiphany (Interim, *Denkwüdigkeiten,* 5, 316). Three boys, clothed in silk, with golden crowns upon their heads, and each a golden vessel in his hand, represented the wise men of the East. Entering the choir, and advancing towards the altar, they chanted the following strophe:

“O quam diguis celebranda dies ista laudibus,
In qua Christi genitura propalatur gentibus,
Pax terrenis nunciatur, gloria ccelestibus;
Novi partu signum fulget Orientis patria.
Currunt reges Orientis stella sibi prseviu,
Currunt reges et adorant Deum ad prsesepia;
Tres adorant reges uuum, triplex est oblatio.”

During the singing of these verses they gradually approached the altar; there the first lifted up the vessel which he held in his hand, exclaiming,

“Anrum primo,
And the second:
thus secundo,
And the third:
myrrham dante tertio.”

Hereupon, the first once more:

“A’urm regumi,
The second:
thus celestem,
And the third:
mori nutat unctio.”

Then one of them pointed with his hand to the star hanging from the roof of the church, and sang in a loud voice, “Hoc signum magni Regis;” and all three proceeded to make their offerings, singing meanwhile the responsal, “Eamus, inquiramus eum, et offeramus ei munera, aurum, thus, et myrrham.” At the conclusion of this responsal, a younger boy lifted up his voice, which was meant to imitate the voice of an angel, from behind the altar, and sang, “Nuntium vobis fero de supernis; Natus est: Christus dominator orbis In Bethlehem Judese; sicenim propheta dixerat ante.” Thereupon the three who represented the kings withdrew into the sacristy; singing, “In Bethlehem natus est Rex coelorum,” etc.

See the Latin monographs on theatrical representations cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 172. *SEE MYSTERIES*.

Thebes

(THEBHE, or DIOSPOLIS MAGNA) was the Greek name of a city of Egypt, and its capital during the empire, called in the Bible *No-Amon* (ˆwma;an; Sept. μερὶς Ἀμμών; <340308>Nahum 3:8) or *No* (an; Sept. Διόσ

πολις; <24655>Jeremiah 46:25; <26014>Ezekiel 30:14, 15, 16), famous in all ancient history.

I. *Name.* —The ancient Egyptian names of Thebes are, as usual, two. The civil name, perhaps the more ancient of the two, is *Ap-t, Ap-tu* (Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften,* 1. 177, pl. 36:No. 781-784). Hence the Coptic *tape,* which shows that the fem. article was in this case transferred in pronunciation, and explains the origin of the classical forms, θήβη, θῆβαι, *Thebe, Thebae* (see Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes,* 2, 136, 137). The sacred name has two forms, *Pt-A men* or perhaps *Par-Amen* (Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften,* 1, 177, No. 780), the "house of Amen," or Jupiter-Ammon, preserved in the Coptic *pianoun*; and *Nru-Amen,* the "city of Amen," the sound of the first part of which has been discovered by M. Chabas, who reads *No-Amun* (*Recherches sur le Nors Egypt. de Thebes,* p. 5). The latter form of the sacred name is transcribed in the Hebrew No-Amon, and it is easy to understand the use of its first part *Nu,* "the city," instead of the whole, at a time when Thebes was still the most important city of Egypt. This sacred name of Thebes, "the abode of Amon," the Greeks reproduced in their *Diospolis* (Διὸς πόλις), especially with the addition *the Great* (ἡ μεγάλη), denoting that this was the chief seat of Jupiter-Ammon, and distinguishing it from *Diospolis the Less* (ἡ μικρά). Of the twenty names, or districts, into which Upper Egypt was divided, the fourth in order, 'proceeding northward from Nubia, was designated in the hieroglyphics as *Za'm-the* Phathyrite of the Greeks — and Thebes appears as the Za'm-city," the principal city or metropolis of the *Za'm* name. In later times the name *Za'm* was applied in common speech to a particular locality on the western side of Thebes.

II. *Position.* —The situation of Thebes with reference to the rest of Egypt well suited it to be the capital of the country. Though farther from the Mediterranean and Syria than Memphis, it was more secure from invasion; and if it was far from the northern trade, it commanded the chief line of commerce from the Red Sea. The actual site is, perhaps, the best of any ancient town of Upper Egypt. Here the valley, usually straitened by the mountains on one side, if not on both, opens out into a plain, which is comparatively spacious. On the west bank the mountains leave a broad band of cultivable land; on the east they recede in a semicircle. On the former side they rise to a fine peak about 1200 feet high, unlike the level cliff-like form of the opposite range, a form seldom varied on either bank

throughout the whole valley. The plain between is about two miles long, and has an extreme breadth of about four miles, no large space for a great capital except in Egypt. Through the center of this plain flows the river Nile, usually at this point about half a mile in width, but at the inundation overflowing the plain, especially upon the western bank, for a breadth of two or more miles.

The monuments do not arrest the attention of the traveler as he sails up the river as do the pyramids of Memphis. On the east the massive fort-like winged portal of El-Karnak and the colonnade of El-Uksur (Luxor), and on the west the hills honeycombed with sepulchral grottos, are the most remarkable objects to be seen, but, being far apart, they are singly seen from the river. If viewed from the western mountain, the many monuments of Thebes give an idea of the grandeur of this ancient city, the greatest in the world for magnificence.

III. *History.*

1. *Classical.* —The origin of the city is lost in antiquity. Niebuhr is of opinion that Thebes was much older than Memphis, and that "after the center of Egyptian life was transferred to Lower Egypt, Memphis acquired its greatness through the ruin of Thebes" (*Lectures on Ancient History*, lect. 7). Other authorities assign priority to Memphis. But both cities date from our earliest authentic knowledge of Egyptian history. The first allusion to Thebes in classical literature is the familiar passage of the *Iliad* (9, 381-385): "Egyptian Thebes, where are vast treasures laid up in the houses; where are a hundred gates, and from each two hundred men go forth with horses and chariots." Homer-speaking with a poet's license, and not with the accuracy of a statistician--no doubt incorporated into his verse the glowing accounts of the Egyptian capital current in his time. Wilkinson thinks it conclusive against a literal understanding of Homer that no traces of an ancient city-wall can be found at Thebes, and accepts as probable the suggestion of Diodorus Siculus that the "gates" of Homer may have been the propylsea of the temples: "Non centum portas habuisse urbem, sed multa et ingentia templorum vestibula" (1, 45, 7). In the time of Diodorus, the city-wall, if any there was, had already disappeared, and the question of its existence -in Homer's time was in dispute. But, on the other hand, to regard the "gates" of Homer as temple-porches is to make these the barracks of the army, since from these gates the horsemen and chariots issue forth to war. The almost universal custom of walling the cities of

antiquity, and the poet's reference to the gates as pouring forth troops, point strongly to the supposition that the vast area of Thebes was surrounded with a wall having many gates.

Homer's allusion to the treasures of the city, and to the size of its: standing army, numbering 20,000 chariots, shows the early repute of Thebes for wealth and power. Its fame as a great capital had crossed the seawhen Greece was yet in its infancy as a nation. It has been questioned whether Herodotus visited Upper Egypt, but he says, "I went.to Heliopolis *and to Thebes,* expressly to try whether the priests of those places would agree in their accounts with the priests at Memphis" (2, 3). Afterwards he describes the features of the Nile valley, and the chief points and distances upon the river, as only an eye-witness would be'likely to record them. He informs us that "from Heliopolis to Thebes is nine days'sail up the river, the distance 4800 stadia ... and the distance from the sea inland to Thebes 6120 stadia" (2, 8, 9). In ch. 29 of the same book he states that he ascended the Nile as high as Elephantine. Herodotus, however, gives no particular account of the city, which in his time had lost much of its ancient grandeur. He alludes to the Temple of Jupiter there, with its ram-headed image, and to the fact that goats, never sheep, were offered in sacrifice. In the 1st century before Christ, Diodorus ivisited Thebes, and he devotes several sections of his geniral work to its history and appearance. Though he saw the city when it had sunk to quite secondary importance, he preserves the tradition of its early grandeur-its circuit of 140 stadia, the size of its public edifices, the magnificence of its temples, the number -of its monuments, the dimensions of its private houses, some of them'four or five stories high-all giving it an air of grandeur and beauty surpassing not only all other cities of Egypt, but of the world. Diodorus deplores the spoiling of its buildings and monuments by Cambyses (1, 45, 46). Strabo, who visited Egypt a little later-at about the beginning of the Christian sera-thus describes (17, 816) the city under the name Diospolis: "Vestiges of its magnitude still exist which extend eighty stadia in length. There are a great number of temples, many of which Cambvses mutilated. The spot is at present occupied by villages. One part of it, in which is'the city, lies in Arabia; another is in the country on the other side of the river, where is the Memnonium." Strabo here makes the Nile the dividing line between Libya and Arabia. The temples of El-Karnak and El-Uksur (Luxor) are on the eastern side of the river, where was probably the main part of the city. Strabo gives the following description of the twin colossi still standing upon the western

plain: “Here are two colossal figures near each other, each consisting of a single stone. One is entire; the upper parts of the other, from the chair, are fallen down the effect, it is said, of an earthquake. It is believed that once a day a noise, as of a slight blow, issues from the part of the statue which remains in the seat, and on its base. When I was at those places, with Elius Gallus, and numerous friends and soldiers about him, I heard a noise at the first hour of the day, but whether proceeding from the base or from the colossus, or produced on purpose by some of those standing around the base, I cannot confidently assert. For, from the uncertainty of the cause, I am inclined to believe anything rather than that stones disposed in that manner could send forth sound” (17, 46). Simple, honest, sceptical Strabo! Eighteen centuries later some travellers have interrogated these same stones as to the ancient mystery of sound; and not at sunrise, but in the glaring noon, the statue has emitted a sharp, clear sound like the ringing of a disk of brass under a sudden concussion. This was produced by a ragged urchin, who, for a few piastres, clambered up the knees of the “vocal Memnon,” and, there effectually concealing himself from observation, struck with a hammer a sonorous stone in the lap of the statue. Wilkinson conjectures that the priests had a secret chamber in the body of the statue, from which they could strike it unobserved at the instant of sunrise, thus producing in the credulous multitude the notion of a supernatural phenomenon. . It is difficult to conceive, however, that such a’trick, performed in open day, could have escaped detection, and -we are therefore left to share the mingled wonder and scepticism of Strabo (see Thompson, *Photographic Views of Egypt, Past and Present,* p. 156).

Pliny speaks of Thebes in Egypt as known to fame as “a hanging city,” i.e. built upon arches, so that an army could be led forth from beneath the city while the inhabitants above were wholly unconscious of it. He’mentions also that the river flows through the middle of the city. But he questions the story of the arches, because, “if this had really been the case, there is no doubt that Homer would have mentioned it, seeing that he has celebrated the hundred gates of Thebes.” Do not the two stories possibly explain each other? May there not have been near the river-line arched buildings used as barracks, from whose gateways issued forth 20,000 chariots of war?

2. *Monumental. —The* oldest royal names found at Thebes are those of kings of the Nantef line, who are known to have been there buried, and who are variously assigned to the 9th and the 11th dynasty, but undoubtedly reigned not long before the 12th. The 11th dynasty, which

probably.ruled about half a cbntury, began about 2000 years B.C.; and the 12th was, like it, of Theban kings, according to Manetho, the Egyptian historian. The rise of the city to importance may therefore be dated with the beginning of the first Theban dynasty. With the 12th dynasty it became the capital of Egypt, and continued so for the 200 years of the rule of that line. Of this powerful dynasty the chief monument there is only part of the ancient sanctuary of the great temple of Amen-ra, now called that of El-Karnak. The 12th dynasty was succeeded by the 13th, which appears after a time to have lost the rule of all Egypt by the establishment of a foreign Shepherd dynasty, the 15th to the 17th. Theban kings of the 12th and 13th dynasties continued, however, to govern a limited kingdom, tributary to the Shepherds, until an insurrection arose which led to the conquest of the foreigners and the capture of their capital Zoan by Aahmes, the head of the 18th dynasty and founder of the Egyptian empire, which Was ruled by this and the 19th and 20th dynasties, all of Theban kings, for about 400 years from B.C. cir. 1492. During this period Thebes was the capital of the kingdom, and of an empire of which the northern limit was Mesopotamia, and. the southern a territory upon the Upper Nile; and then, especially by the kings of the 18th and 19th dynasties, those great monuments which make Thebes the most wonderful site in Egypt were founded or excavated. The kings who have left the finest works are Thothmes III and Amenoph III of the 18th dynasty, Sethos I and Rameses II of the 19th, and. Rameses III of the 20th (19th); but throughout the period of the empire the capital was constantly beautified. During the 20th dynasty the high-priests of Amen-ra gained the sovereign power, perhaps corresponding to Mlanetho's 21st dynasty, which he calls of Tanites, and which must in this case be considered as. of Thebans. They continued to add to the monuments of the capital, though, like the later kings of the empire, their constructions were not of remarkable size. The 22nd dynasty, headed by Sheshenk I, the Shishak of the, Bible, seems still to have treated Thebes as the capital, although they embellished their native city, Bubastis, in the Delta. Under them and the kings of the 23rd, who were evidently of the same line, some additions were made to its temples, but no great independent structures seem to have been raised. The most interesting of these additions is Shishak's list of the countries, cities, and tribes conquered or ruled by him, including the names of those captured from Rehoboam, sculptured in the great temple of ElKarnak. Under the 23rd dynasty a period of dissension began, and lasted for some years until the Ethiopian conquest, and establishment of an Ethiopian dynasty, the 25th,

about B.C. 714 (see De Rougd's interesting paper, *Inscr. Hist. du Roi Pianchi-Meriamoun,* in the *Rev. Arch. N. S.* 8:94 sq.). At this time the importance of Thebes must have greatly fallen, but it is probable that the Ethiopians made it their Egyptian capital, for their sculptures found there show that they were careful to add their records to those of the long series of sovereigns who reigned at Thebes. It is at the time of the 25th dynasty. to which we may reasonably assign a duration of fifty years, that Thebes is first mentioned in Scripture, and from this period to that of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar it is spoken of as one of the chief cities of Egypt, or as No, "the city." Under the Ethiopians it was no more than a provincial capital; immediately after their rule it was taken twice at least by the Assyrians. Asshur-bani-pal, son and successor of Esar-haddon (Asshur-akh-idanna), who came to the throne about B.C. 667-666, in a first expedition defeated the troops of Tirhakah, and captured the city of Ni'a; a second time he invaded the country, which had revolted, and again captured Ni'a. The exact time of these events has not been fixed, but it is evident that they occurred either at the close of the rule of the Ethiopian dynasty, or early in that of the Saite 26th, when Egypt was governed by the Dodecarchy. Tirhakah and Niku, evidently Necho I, the father of Psammetichus I, are mentioned almost as late as the time of the second expedition. Psammetichus I came to the throne B.C. 664, and therefore it is probable that these events took place not long before, and about the time of, or a little after, his accession. These dates are especially important, as it is probable that the prophet Nahum refers to the first capture when warning Nineveh by the fate of her great rival. But this reference may be to a still earlier capture by the Assyrians, for Esar-haddon conquered Egypt and Ethiopia, though it is not distinctly stated that he captured Thebes (see Rawlinson, *Illustrations of Egyptian History, etc. from the Cuneiform. Inscriptions,* in the *Transactions* of the R. S. Lit., 2nd ser. 7:137 sq.). The Saite kings of the 26th dynasty continued to embellish Thebes, which does not seem to have suffered in its monuments from the Assyrians; but when their rule came to an end with the Persian conquest by Cambyses, it evidently endured a far more severe blow. Later Egyptian kings still added to its edifices, and the earlier Greek sovereigns followed their example. The revolt against Ptolemy X Lathyrus, in which Thebes stood a siege of three years, was the final blow to its prosperity.

Picture for Thebes 1

In subsequent times its population dwelt in small villages, and Thebes no longer existed as a city, and this has been the case ever since; no one of these villages, or those that have succeeded them — for the same sites do not appear in all cases to have been occupied having risen to the importance of a city. At the present time there are two villages on the eastern bank, El-Karnak and El-Uksur (Luxor); the former, which is inconsiderable, near the oldest part of ancient Thebes; the latter, which: is large and the most important place on the site, so as to deserve to be called a small town, lying some distance to the south on the river's bank. Opposite El-Karnak is the ruined village of El-Kurneh, of which the population mainly-inhabit sepulchral grottos; and opposite El-Uksur is the village of El-Ba'irat, which, indeed, is almost beyond the circuit of the monuments of Thebes.

Picture for Thebes 2

IV. *Description.* —The plan of the city, as indicated by the principal monuments, was nearly quadrangular, measuring two miles from north to south, and four from east to west. Its four great landmarks still are El-Karnaku and El-Uksur upon the eastern or Arabian side, and El-Kurneh and Medinet-Habf upon the western or Libyan side. There are indications that each of these temples may have been connected with those facing it upon two sides by grand *dromoi,* lined with sphinxes and other colossal figures. Upon the western bank there was almost a continuous line of temples and public edifices distance of two miles, "rom El-Kurneh to Medinet-Habft, and Wilkinson conjectures that from a point near the latter, perhaps in the line of the colossi, the "Royal Street" ran down to the river, which was crossed by a ferry terminating at El-Uksur on the eastern Side.

Picture for Thebes 3

As Memphis is remarkable for its vast -necropolis, Thebes surpasses the other cities of Egypt in its temples. The primeval kings of Egypt who ruled at the northern capital were tomb-builders, those who preferred the southern capital were rather temple-builders; and as the works of the former give us the best insight into the characteristics of the national mind, those of the latter tell us the history of the country under its most powerful kings. Thebes is the most thoroughly historical site in Egypt. The temples

are not only covered with the sculptured representations and histories of the chief campaigns of the conquering kings and the similar records of their presents to the shrines, and many other details of historical interest, but they have the advantage of showing, in the case of the most important temple or rather collection of temples, what was added under each dynasty, almost each reign, from the 16th century B.C. to the Roman dominion; and thus they indicate the wealth, the power, and the state of art during the chief part of the period for which Thebes was either the capital or an important city of Egypt. The following is the plan of an Egyptian temple (q.v.) of the age of the empire: An avenue of sphinxes, with, at intervals, pairs of colossal statues of a king, usually seated, led up to its entrance. The gate was flanked by lofty and broad wings, extending along the whole front of the temple, the long horizontal-lines of which were relieved by tapering obelisks. The first hall was usually hypanthia unless perhaps it had a wooden roof and was surrounded by colonnades. The second, but some-, times the third, was filled with columns in avenues, the central avenue being loftier than the rest, and supporting a raised portion of the roof. Beyond were the naos and various chambers, all smaller than the court or courts and the hall. This plan was not greatly varied in the Theban temples of which the remains are sufficient for us to form an opinion. The great temple of El Karnak, dedicated to Amen-ra, the chief god of Thebes, was founded at least as early as the time of the12th dynasty, but is mainly of the age of the 18th and 19th. The first winged portal, which is more than 360 feet wide, forms the front of a court 329 feet wide, and 275 long. Outside the eastern portion of the south wall of this. court is sculptured the famous list of the dominions and conquests of Sheshenk I, the Shishak of Scripture, which has already been mentioned. *SEE SHISHAK*. The great hall of columns is immediately beyond the court, and is of the same width, but 170 feet long it was supported by 134 columns, the loftiest of which, forming the central avenue, are nearly seventy feet high, and about twelve in diameter; the rest more than forty feet high, and about nine in diameter. This forest of columns produces a singularly grand effect. The external sculptures commemorate the wars of Sethos I and his son Rameses II, mainly in Syria. Beyond the great hall are many ruined chambers, and two great obelisks standing in their places amid a heap of ruins. More than a mile to the south-west of the temple-of El Karnak is that of El-Uksur (Luxor), a smaller but still gigantic edifice of the same character and age, on the bank of the Nile, and having within and partly around it the houses of the modern village. On the western bank are three temples of

importance, a small one of Sethos I, the beautiful Rameseum ,of Rameses II, commonly called the Memnonium, and the stately temple of Rameses II, the Rameseum of Medinet-Habt, extending in this order towards the south. Between the Rameseum of Rameses II and that of Rameses III was a temple raised by Amenoph III, of which scarcely any remains are now standing, except the two great colossi, the Vocal Memnon and its fellow, monoliths about forty-seven feet high, exclusive of the pedestals, which have a height of about twelve feet. They represented Amenoph, and were part of the dromos which led to his temple. Besides these temples of Western Thebes, the desert tract beneath the mountain bordering the cultivable land and the lower elevations of the mountain, in addition to almost countless mummy-pits, are covered with built tombs, and honey-combed with sepulchral grottos, which, in their beautiful paintings, tell us the lives of the former occupants, or represent the mystical subjects of the soul's existence after death. The latter are almost exclusively the decorations of the Tombs of the Kings, which are excavated in two remote valleys behind the mountain. These tombs are generally very deep galleries, and are remarkable for the extreme delicacy of their paintings, which; like most of the historical records of Thebes, have suffered more at the hands of civilized barbarians in this century than from the effects of time. For fuller descriptions, see the numerous histories and books of travel on Egypt. The ruins have been copiously depicted photographically. *SEE EGYPT*.

Picture for Thebes 4

V. *Biblical Notices.* —The most remarkable of the notices of Thebes in the Bible is that in Nahum, where the prophet warns Nineveh by her rival's overthrow. "Art thou better than No-Amon, that was situate among the rivers, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall [was] from the sea?" Notwithstanding her natural as well as political strength, Thebes had been sacked and the people carried captive (3, 8-10). The description of the city applies remarkably to Thebes, which alone of all the cities of Egypt was built on both sides of the river, here twice called, as now by the modern inhabitants, the sea. The prophecy that it should be rent asunder" (<26016>Ezekiel 30:16) probably primarily refers to its breaking-up or capture; but the traveler can scarcely doubt a second and more literal sense when he looks upon its vast torn and heaped-up ruins.

The other notices are in <26145>Ezekiel 14:15, and in <24625>Jeremiah 46:25. See No.

Thebes, The Seven Heroes Of

in Grecian mythology, were a body of chieftains who engaged in the first Theban war. Jocaste, the mother of AEdipus, was inadvertently guilty of incest with her son, and bore him the twin-brothers Eteocles and Polynices, though some authorities name Eurygania as their mother. After the discovery of his incest AEdipus was banished, and fled leaving his curse upon his children. Eteocles and Polynices agreed to reign alternately, a year at a time, and the former ascended the throne by virtue of seniority; but when the year expired he refused to make way for his brother, who thereupon fled to Adrastus, king of Argos, bearing with him the necklace and mantle of Harmpnia, both of which were covered with jewels and were exceedingly precious, having been made by Vulcan, but which were to bring misfortune to the person into whose possession they might come. Polynices reached Argos at night, and met Tydeus, who had just arrived from Etolia, and the two became involved in a quarrel, which Adrastus settled. An ancient oracle having commanded that the daughters of Adrastus should wed a lion and a boar, they were given to the visitors because they bore corresponding devices-Polynices a lion's, and Tydeus a boar's head. Adrea became the wife of the former, and Deipyle of the latter. Adrastus promised to recover the lost thrones for his sons-in-law, and directed his first efforts towards Thebes in behalf of Polynices the war of the *Seven against Thebes* (see uEschylus). The leading heroes of the Argives having been summoned, Amphiaraus, Capaneus, Hippomedon, and Parthenopeeus joined the expedition, thus completing the list of seven. Amphiaraus, a favorite of Jupiter and Apollo, a seer, foresaw the failure of the attempt, and endeavored to avoid participating in it by concealing himself, but was discovered; and compelled by his sense of honor to unite with his comrades. In the forest of Nemea the heroes suffered much from thirst; but, meeting with Hypsipyle of Lemnos, the nurse of young Opheltes, son of Lycurgus, they induced her to direct them to a spring, which she did to the harm of Opheltes, however, whom a serpent destroyed in her absence. Funeral games were held in honor of the dead, but the gods had decreed the ruin of the expedition. Tydeus was sent in advance to negotiate, but without other result than that fifty men surprised him while returning, whom, with the single exception of Maon, he slew with his own hand. The heroes then took possession of all approaches to

the city, and established themselves before the several gates. The seer Tiresias warned the Thebans that the city must fall, unless some one should voluntarily sacrifice himself for its deliverance. Menoeceus accordingly threw himself headlong from the wall, and the war began. Capaneus had already mounted the wall when Jupiter's lightning smote him to the ground, and with him fortune fled. Eteocles and Polvnices slew each other in single combat. Five of the seven heroes fell. Amphiaraus fled, and was received by Jupiter into the earth, while Adrastus escaped on his divine steed Arion, the offspring of Neptune. The victorious Thebans forbade the burial of their enemies on pain of death; and Creon caused Antigone, who had performed the last rites of love on the remains of her brother Polynices, to be buried alive. The humane intercession of Theseus, king of Athens, ultimately induced the Thebans to withdraw their cruel prohibition. Adrastus subsequently took up the sword again, and led the sons of the heroes, the so-called Epigoni, in a victorious campaign against Thebes.

Thebez

(Heb. *Tebets'*, /bĕĕ,*conspicuous*; Sept θὴβης [v.r. θαίβαις] and θαμασί; Vulg. *Thebes*), a place mentioned in the Bible only as the scene of tihe death of the usurper Abimelech (<070950>Judges 9:50). After suffocating a thousand of the Shechemites in the hold of Baal-berith by the smoke of green wood, he went off with his band to Thebez, whither, no doubt, the rumor of his inhumanity had preceded him. The town was soon taken, all but one tower, into which the people of the place crowded, and which was strong enough to hold out. To this he forced his way, and was about to repeat the barbarous stratagem, which had succeeded so well at Shechem, when a fragment of millstone descended and put an end to his turbulent career. The story was well known in Israel, and gave the point to a familiar maxim in the camp (<101121>2 Samuel 11:21). The geographical position of Thebez is not stated; but the narrative leaves the impression that it was not far distant from Shechem. Eusebius defines its position with his usual minuteness. He says, "It is in the borders of Neapolis… at the thirteenth mile on the road to Scythopolis" (*Onooast.* s.v. "Thebes"). Just about the distance indicated, on the line of the old Roman highway, is the modern village of *Tubas*, in which it is not difficult to recognize the Thebez of Scripture. It was known to Hap-Parchi in the 13th century (Zunz, *Benjaminz*, 2, 426), and is mentioned occasionally by later travelers (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 152). It stands on a hillside at the northern end of a

plain surrounded by rocky mountains. The hill is skirted by fine olive groves, and the whole environs bear the marks of industry and prosperity. It is defective, however, in water; so that the inhabitants are dependent on the rain-water they keep in cisterns, and when this supply fails, they must bring it from a stream, Fari'a, an hour distant (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3, 305). Some large hewn stones in the walls of the modern houses, and a number of deep wells and cisterns in and around the village, are the only traces of antiquity now remaining (Van de Velde, *Travels,* 2, 335; Porter, *Handbook,* p. 348).

Thebutes, or Thebuthis

All that is known of this person is the statement that Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 4:22) quotes from Hegesippus to the effect that Thebutes made a beginning secretly to corrupt the Church of Jerusalem, because Simon the son of Cleophas was appointed to be bishop of the Christians of that city instead of himself.

Theca

(θήκη, a *case*), or BURSE (*bursa*, a "purse"), a case-cover containing the corporals, and presented to the priest at mass. It was of square form, made usually of rich stuff, and lined like a bag with fine linen or silk; on the upper side was a sacred image or cross. One of the 15th century, of canvas, remains at Hessett, painted with the Veronica (q.v.) and the Holy Lamb.

Thecla

the name of several saints of the Romish Church.

1. The daughter of people living at Iconium, who is occasionally mentioned by Epiphanius, Ambrose, Augustine, and other Church fathers, and of whom tradition relates that she was converted through the preaching of Paul in the house of Onesiphorus, and that she thereupon renounced all worldly possessions and separated from her betrothed, a wealthy man named Thamyris. No arguments or appeals could change her course. Both she and Paul were imprisoned; and she was condemned to death by fire, while the apostle was banished. A cloud, however, extinguished the fire, and Thecla, uninjured, accompanied Paul to Antioch. To escape the persistency of a second wooer of noble rank named Alexander, she took refuge with a noble widow whose name was Tryphaena. Again she was

condemned to die, this time by the teeth of wild beasts, and again she escaped uninjured, the animals crouching at her feet or being killed by thunder-bolts. She now assumed male clothing and followed Paul to Myra, where she received direction from him to teach the heathen the truths of Christianity. She thereupon returned to her native city, and afterwards went to Seleucia, where she succeeded in converting many people and in healing large numbers of the sick. A shining cloud accompanied her as she went about. When she died, many miracles were wrought at her grave and by her relics. Her day is variously given-May 18 or 19, or Sept. 23 or 24. A treatise entitled Περίοδοι *Pauli et Thelae,* probably the work of an Asiatic presbyter, was in circulation as early as the 3rd century. It mentioned her missionary tours in the company of Paul, and her miracles; recommended the celibate state, and asserted its holiness; inculcated the duty of praying for the dead, and belief in purgatory; and was branded as Apocryphal by Tertullian, Jerome, and pope Gelasius I. See *Acta S.S.* 23. *Sept.* (*Antw.* 1757), 6:546-568; Baronins, *Annal. Eccl.* (Colossians Agrip. 1609), 1, 398-402; *Unschuld. Nachr. v, alten u. neuen theolog. Sachen* (Leips. 1702), p. 136 sq. *SEE THECLA AND PAUL* (*Acts of*).

2. A reputed native of Sicily of noble rank. She was instructed in Christianity by her mother, Isidora, aided many persecuted Christians, and gave burial to the bodies of many martyrs, which she had purchased. For this she was brought to trial, but escaped the threatening danger. Afterwards she instructed many heathen people, built a number of churches, and endowed with a rich income a bishopric which she founded. Jan. 10 is consecrated to her memory.

3. An alleged martyr, the associate of Mariana, Martha, Mary, and Enneis. She is reported to have lived near Asa, in Persia. A priest named Paul endeavored to persuade these virgins to renounce the Christian faith, and when they refused he caused them to be terribly scourged and then beheaded. Soon afterwards be became himself the victim of a violent death, as they had predicted. The memory of these martyrs is honored on June 9. See *Asführl. Heil. —Lexikon* (Cologne and Frankf. 1719), p. 2132 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Thecla And Paul,

Acts of. The name Thecla, which nowhere occurs in Scripture, occupies an important position in the Apocryphal writings of the New Test., because it

is closely connected with that of the apostle Paul. Under the title *Acta Pauli et Thecle* (first edited by Grabe, in his *Spicilegium SS. PP.* [Oxon. 1698; 2nd ed. 1700]; then by Jones, *A New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament* [Lend. 1726]; and finally by Tischendorf, in his *Acta Apostt. Apocrypha* [Lips. 1851], and Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* [Syriac and English, Lond. 1871, 2 vols.]), we have an Apocryphal work extant which has furnished rich material for the so-called "Thecla Legend."

I. *The Contents* of it are as follows: "When Paul had fled from Antioch and went up to Iconiumn, he was accompanied by Jeiumas and Hernmouenes two men full of hypocrisy, who pretended unto Paul as though they loved him, but they loved him not. On the way Paul made the oracles of the Lord sweet unto them, teaching them the great things of Christ. Onesiphorus, having heard that Paul was coming to Iconium, went out to meet him, that he might bring him into his house. Now he had not seen Paul in the flesh, but Titus had told of him. He therefore went along the road to Lystra. looking for Paul among them that passed by. And when he saw Paul, he beheld a man small in stature, bald-headed, of a good complexion, with eyebrows meeting, and a countenance full of grace. For sometimes he appeared like a man, and sometimes he had, as it were, the face of an angel. And when Paul saw Oniesiphorns, he smiled upon him. But Oniesiphorus said, 'Hail, servant of the blessed God.' And Paul answered, 'Grace be with thee, and with thy house.' But Demas and Hermogenes were full of wrath and hypocrisy.

> "When Paul had come into the house of Ouesiphorus, there was great joy, and they bowed their knees and brake bread. And Paul preached unto them the word, saying,
>
> "'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are they that bear rule over themselves, for God shall speak with them.
>
> "'Blessed are they that have kept chaste their flesh, for they shall become the temple of God.
>
> "'Blessed are they that have kept themselves apart from this world, for they shall be called righteous.
>
> "'Blessed are they that have wives as though they had none, for they shall have God as their portion.

“‘Blessed are they which retain the fear of God, for they shall become as the angels of God.

“‘Blessed are they that have kept the baptism, for they shall have rest with the Father and the Son.

“‘Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy, and shall not behold the bitter day of judgment.

“‘Blessed are the bodies of the virgins, for they shall be well pleasing unto God, and they shall not lose the reward of their chastity.

“‘Blessed are they that tremble at the words of God, for they shall receive consolation.

“‘Blessed are they that are partakers of the wisdom of Jesus Christ, for they shall be called the sons of the Most High God.

“Blessed are they who, for the love of Christ, are departed from conformity to this world, for they shall judge the angels, and shall be blessed at the right hand of the Father, and they shall have rest for ever and ever.’

“While Paul was thus speaking, there was a certain virgin, called Thecla, the daughter of Theacleis, betrothed to a man whose name was Thamuyris; and she sat at a window which was close by, listening attentively to Paul’s discourse concerning virginity and prayer; and she gave earliest heed to the ‘things which were spoken, rejoicing with all her heart. And when she saw many women going in to hear Paul, she, also, had an eager desire that she might be deemed worthy to stand in his presence and hear the word of Christ.

“For three days and three night4thecla listened to the apostle, till her mother sent for Thamyris to see whether he could induce her to come home. His endeavors were in vain, for Thecla only listened to the things, which were spoken by Paul. Then Thamyris started up, and went forth into the street of the city, watching those that went in and came out of the house of Onesiphorus. And he saw two men striving bitterly one with the other, and he said, ‘Tell me, I pray you, who is this that leadeth astray the souls of young men, and

deceiveth virgins, so that they do not marry, but remain as they are? I promise to give you money, for I am one of the chief men of this city.' The men, who were Demas and Hermogenes, said unto him, 'Who indeed he is we know nor, but this we know, that he deprives young men of wives, and maidens of husbands, saying unto them that in nmo other way can they have a resurrection than by not polluting the flesh, and by keeping it chaste.' At the supper which Thamyris gave them in his house, they advised him to bring the apostle before the governor, charging him with persuading the multitudes to embrace this new doctrine of the Christians. The governor, they said, will destroy him, and thou wilt have Thecla to thy wife; and we will teach thee that the resurrection which this man speaks of has taken place already, for we rose again in our children, and we rose again when we came to the knowledge of the true God.

"The next morning Paul was brought before the governor by Thamiyris, who acted in accordance with the words of his advisers. The governor said to Paul, 'Who art thou, and what dost thou teach? for they bring no small accusation against thee.' But Paul, lifting up his voice, said, 'Forasmuch as I am this day examined concerning what I teach, listen, O governor! The living God, the God of retributions, he who is a jealous God, a God who is in need of nothing (ἀπροσδεής), a God who taketh thought for the salvation of men, hath sent me to reclaim them from uncleanness and corruption, from all pleasure, and from death, so that they may not sin. Wherefore, also, God sent his own Son, whom I preach unto you, teaching men that they should rest their hope on him, who alone hath had compassion upon a world that was led astray, that men may no longer be under condemnation, but that they may have faith, and the fear of God, and the knowledge of holiness, and the love of the truth. If I therefore teach that which has been revealed to me by God, wherein do I go astray?' When the governor had heard this, he ordered Paul to be bound and he put in ward, saying, 'When I shall be at leisure, I will hear him more attentively.'

"Thecla, having bribed the keeper of the door, was admitted by night to the imprisoned apostle, and sitting at his feet, heard the wonderful works of God. When she was found there, she was

brought before the governor together with Paul; the latter was scourged and cast out of the city, but Thecla was ordered to be burned. Soon a pile was erected, and after she had made the sign of the cross she went up thereon, and the wood was kindled. When the fire was blazing, a heavy rain and hail came down from heaven, and thus Thecla was saved.

“Now Paul was fasting with Onesiphorois and his wife and children, in a new tomb, on the way from Iconium to Japhoue. After several days, when the children were hungered, Paul took off his cloak and gave it to one of the children, saying, ‘Go, my child, and buy bread.’ On the way the boy met Thecla, who was looking for Paul. When she was brought to him, he thanked God for her safe deliverance. Thecla said to Paul, ‘I will cut my hair, and will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.’ But he answered, ‘This is a shameless age, and thou art very fair. I fear lest another temptation came upon thee worse than the first, and that thou withstand it not.’ Thecla said, Only make me a partaker of the seal that is in Christ, and temptation shall not touch me.’ But Paul answered, ‘O Thecla, wait with patience and thou shalt possess the water.’

And Paul sent away Onesiphorus and all his house unto Iconium, and went to Antioch with Thecla. As they were entering into thine city; a certain ruler of the Syrians, Alexander by name, seeing Thecla, clave unto her in love, and would have given gifts and presents unto Paul. But he said, ‘I know not the woman of whom thou speakest, nor is she mine.’ At this Alexander embraced her in the street of the city. But as Thecla would not suffer this, she took hold of Alexander and tore his cloak and pulled off his crown. Ashamed of what had happened, Alexander had her brought before the governor, who condemned her to t he wild beasts, allowing her, however, at her own request that she might remain pure until she should fight with the wild beasts-to stay with a certain woman named Tryphsena.

“When the games were exhibited, they bound Thecla to a fierce lioness, but the beast licked her feet.’ And the people marveled greatly. And the title of her accusation was ‘Sacrilegious.’ And the women cried out, ‘An impious sentence has been passed in this city.’ After the show, Tryphienia again received Thecla, for her

daughter Falconilla was dead, and had said to her mother, in a dream, ‘Mother, take this stranger, Thecla, in my stead, and she will pray for me, that I may be transferred to the place of the just.’ And Thecla prayed, saying, ‘O Lord God, who hast made the heaven and the earth, Son of the Most High, Lord Jesus Christ, grant unto this woman according to her desire, that her daughter Falconilla may live forever.’

“The next day Alexander came again to fetch Thecla. But Trypusena cried aloud, so that Alexander fled away. And straightway the governor sent an order that Thecla should be brought. And Tryphsena, holding her by the hand, it, said, ‘My daughter Falconilla, indeed, I took to the tomb: and thee, Thecla, I am taking to the wild beasts.’ And Thecla wept very-bitterly and said, ‘O Lord God, in whom I have believed, to whom I have fled for refuge, thou who didst deliver me from the fire, do thou grant a recompense to Tryphsena, who hath had compassion on thy servant, and hath kept me pure.’ When Thecla had been taken out of the hands of Tryphena, they stripped her of her garments, and a girdle was given to her, and she was thrown into the theatre. And lions, and bears, and a savage lioness were let loose against her. But instead of killing Thecla, they tore one another. While she was praying, many more wild beasts were sent in. And when she had ended her prayer, she turned and saw a trench filled with water, and she said, ‘Now it is time for me to wash myself.’ And she cast herself in, saying, ‘In the name of Jesus Christ, I baptize myself on the last day.’ And the seals saw the glare of the fire of lightning, and floated about dead. And as she stood naked, there was a fiery cloud round about her, so that neither was she seen naked; nor could the wild beasts do her hurt. And when other beasts were cast into the theatre, the women wept again. And some of them threw down sweet-smelling herbs, so that there was an abundance of perfumes. And all the wild beasts, even as though they had been restrained by sleep, touched her not. When fierce bulls were let loose, Tryphsena fainted, and the multitude cried, ‘Queen Tryphsena is dead.’ Alexander now asked the governor to release Thecla, saying, ‘If Ceasar hear of these things, he will destroy the city, because his kinswoman queen Tryphaenua had died beside the theatre.’ And the governor called for Thecla out of the midst of the

> wild beasts, and said unto her, 'Who art thou? and what hast thou about thee, that none of the wild beasts toucheth thee?' And she said, 'I, indeed, am a servant of the living God; and as to what there is about me, I have believed in the Son of God, in whom God is well pleased. Therefore hath not one of the beasts touched me. For he alone is the way of salvation, and the ground of immortal life. He is at refuge to the tempest-tossed, a solace to the afflicted, a shelter to them that are in despair; and, once for all, whosoever shall not believe in him shall not live eternally. When she was released, she stayed with Tryphsena eight days. And she instructed her in the word of God, so that most, even of the maid-servants, believed. But Thecla desired to see Paul. When she was told that he was staying at Myra of Lycia, she went there, being dressed in man's attire. And when she saw him, she said, 'I have received the baptism, O Paul! For he that wrought together with thee for the gospel hath been effectual also with me for the baptism.' When Thecla told him that she was going to Iconium, Paul said to her, 'Go and teach the word of God.'
>
> "In Iconium she went into the house of Onesiphorus where Christ made the light first to shine upon her.' After having tried in vain to convert her mother — Thamyris having died in the meantime she went to Seleucia, where she enlightened many by the word of God, and where she died in peace."

This is the legend of Thecla. How great or how little the substratum of truth in it, we cannot decide. The fact is that churches were built in honor of the "beata virgo martyr Thecla;" in prose and rhyme the deeds of our heroine were celebrated; and Sept. 24 is commemorated in her honor.

II. *Date of Compilation.* —We have a long line of Greek and Latin fathers by whom Thecla is mentioned in such a manner as to lead to the supposition that whatever is said of her is the same as we find it in the *Acta Pauli et Theelce.* As one writer has followed the other, our examination will be confined to the earliest testimony to that of Tertullian. In his treatise *De. Baptismo,* ch. 17 we read: "But if any defend those things which have been rashly ascribed to Paul, under the example of Thecla, so as to give license to women to teach and baptize, let them know that the presbyter in Asia, who compiled the account, as it were, under the title of Paul, accumulating of his own store, being convicted *of* what he had done, and

confessing that he had done it out of love to Paul, was removed from his place. For how could it seem probable that he who would not give any firm permission to a woman to learn should grant to a female power to teach and baptize?" It has been taken for granted that-the meaning is that a presbyter of Asia, somewhere towards the end of the 1st century, compiled a history of Paul and Thecla and, instead of publishing it as a true narrative, either in his own name or with any name at all, but in good faith, published it falsely, and therefore wickedly, under the name of Paul, as though he were himself the writer; that he was convicted of his forgery, and deposed from the priesthood. This account has been marvelously dressed up, and some of its advocates have ventured to say that a Montanist writer of the name of Leucius was the real author of these *Acts* (Tillemont, *Memoires*, 2, 446). Jerome (*Cataloguus Script. Eccl.* c. 7), commenting upon the passage of Tertullian, says that the presbyter who wrote the history of Paul and Thecla was deposed for what he had done by John (*apud Johannem*) the apostle. That Jerome relied upon Tertullian is evident from his statement; but his conduct in fathering the story of the deposition by John upon Tertullian is inexcusable, because no such statement was made by Tertullian. On the other hand, we must bear in mind that, according to tradition, alleged or real events which occurred in Asia Minor and touched upon the life of the Church have been brought in connection with John. Thus he is said to have confuted Cerinthus, Ebion, Marcion, and even Basilides. Even miracles which were first narrated by disciples of the apostles, or by bishops of Asia Minor were afterwards referred to him (comp. *Patr. —Apost. Opp*. ed. Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, 1 [ed. 1], 194). Our passage is a proof of this. Tertullian speaks of an Asiatic presbyter, Jerome *adds apud Johannem*, and his copyists write, instead of "apud Johannem," *a Johanne.*

Now, putting aside Jerome's commentary and the other patristic testimonies, which will be found collected at great length in Baronius, Tillemont, and Schlau, we see from the external evidence as contained in Tertullian's passage that the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* must have existed in his time. To this external evidence of antiquity we have the internal, furnished by the *Acts* themselves. 'This will determine nothing as to who was their author, but will be valuable in helping us to assign an approximate date. An indication of the early origin of a Christian document is the absence of quotations from the New Test. True, this is only a negative evidence; but when found in connection with sayings attributed to

Christ or the apostles which are not found in the canonical Scriptures, it tends to establish antiquity. Now there is not a single direct citation from the New Test.; and when Paul preaches upon the Beatitudes words are boldly put into his mouth which are not in Scripture. This was becoming enough in a contemporary of the apostle, or in a writer of the 2nd century who had received them through a not far distant tradition; but it would have been unbecoming in a writer of the 3rd century, and, speaking in general terms, it was what writers of the 3rd century seldom did. Thus we could quote Clement of Rome, Iguatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, besides referring to the art. *SEE SAYINGS, TRADITIONAL, OF CHRIST*, that such has been the case; and it is therefore not a matter for surprise, but it is exactly what we might be prepared to expect, if the *Acts of Thecla* are, in the main, a document of the 2nd century, that the writer should represent Paul not only as saying "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy," but "Blessed are they which have kept the baptism, for they shall have rest with the Father and the Son." A further indication of the comparatively early date of this composition is its teaching the salvability of departed heathens. All early Christendom believed in the efficacy of prayers for those who had fallen asleep in the faith of Christ. But it was only the first two centuries which taught that prayer was of avail for such as had died without baptism and without the knowledge of Christ on earth. Thus we have a parallel case to the prayer of Thecla for Falconilla in the *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis,* where we read that Perpetua, through her prayers, saved her brother Dinocrates, who had died without baptism, "from the dark place;" and from the place of sufferings he comes to the place full of light. Augustine, commenting upon this (*De Origine Animae*, 1, 10; 3, 9), says that Dinocrates must have been baptized, and that he was suffering in consequence of some childish fault committed after baptism. But Augustine's statement that the boy was baptized is arbitrary, because best suited to his own theory. But is it in the least likely that Dinocrates had been baptized, when Perpetua herself was unbaptized, and only received baptism shortly before her martyrdom? Now in the 2nd century it was not an uncommon thing to pray for non-Christians; but after the 2nd century, not only do we lose all trace of prayer for non-Christians who had departed this life, but we find the contrary opinion firmly maintained. So entirely was this the case that, as we have seen, Augustine, "in order to get rid of the plain inference to be drawn from St. Perpetua's prayer for her brother, was driven to invent the ingenious but scarcely amiable explanation that a little child who had died at the early age of

seven years was suffering purgatorial torments for some infantile fault committed *after* his baptism."

Another indication of an early date is the fact that the name Χριστιανοί, which occurs twice in the *Acts*, is only used by the two companions of Paul, who call the attention of Thamyris to this fact as a point for accusation. This would place the compilation of the *Acts* at a time when the name "Christian" was sufficient to condemn any one, i.e. at about the time of Trajan, in the year 115. We may feel a reasonable confidence, then, that, whether the legend of Thecla be true or false, it was composed at least before A.D. 200, perhaps somewhere between 165 and 195, and most probably within a few years of the middle of that period.

III. *Object of the Author.* —Whoever may have been the author of the *Acts*, the question has been asked, What was his object? It has been said that he intended to defend and maintain the Montanist theory, and the most important evidence in favor of the Montanist authorship of the *Acts* was taken from the concluding words, "she illuminated many by the word of God;" by which is meant-illumination being taken as a synonym for baptism-she also baptized those whom she converted. Now, leaving aside the statement of Jerome that "Thecla baptized a lion," a statement which he himself calls *afiabula*, and which he did not find in Tertullian, whom he follows, and who would have undoubtedly stigmatized it as nonsense, for such it is; and, without investigating how he came to make such a statement, or whether it was originally meant that Thecla baptized a person of the name of *Leo* (which means, in Latin, "lion"), we know that Thecla baptized none except herself. The only point in the argument now are the words πολλοὺς ἐφώτισεν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, "she illuminated many by the word of God," which, as Basil of Seleucia (whether he is the author of the *Acts* or merely their editor) says, mean that "Thecla baptized those whom she converted to Christ." Now it is true that φωτίζειν has been used by Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 3, 23, 8), and Methodius (*Conv. Decem Virg.*) in the sense of "baptize," and φωτισμός for "baptism," and by Clemens Alexanfinus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1, 61; comp. 65); but this is not the only meaning, for, as Justin himself says, καλεῖται τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων thus deriving the new signification of the word from the old; and Dionysius Areopagita, Clemens Alexandrinus, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria use the word φωτι σμός, for "illumination," "instruction," which

signification is required here by the addition τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. We have here the same *usus loquendi* that we find in Ephesians 3, 9; Heb. 6:4; 10:32; and so also in the Sept., where it is used for hrwb. For examples, comp. Stephanus, *Thes. Graec. Ling.* s.v. φωτίζειν. We are not told that she instructed in public, which is the main point; and if she had preached at all, it probably was no sermon in the strict sense of the word, but a missionary discourse. This inference we make from the *Acts* themselves, according to which she lived among heathen; there was not as yet a congregation, consequently also no office. That women taught in the apostolic age was nothing uncommon, for of Aquila and Priscilla we are told (<44B826>Acts 18:26) that they took Apollo καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; and in <5A603>Romans 16:3 sq. Paul calls them τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ.

After all, we cannot perceive any Montanistic tendency in the author of the *Acts*, for his Thecla does not remind us of the Montanistic prophetesses, who even performed ecclesiastical functions. That Thecla baptized others we are not told; and when Basil of Seleucia states this of her, he does it because of his interpretation of (φωτίζειν, and indicates that in the beginning of Christianity in Asia Minor such things had happened. We need only refer to the letter of Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea, addressed to Cyprian against pope Stephen (the 75th of Cyprian's *Letters*), and to the *Apostolic Constitutions* (3, 9). The latter expressly forbid women to baptize and teach, it being ἐπισφαλές, μᾶλλον δὲ παράνομον καὶ ἀσεβές, as well as against the Scriptures. We call very well perceive how, in the face of such tendencies, which in the 3rd century could have been only of a very rare occurrence, a book must have been welcomed out of which the authority of an apostle could be quoted in favor of female prerogatives in the Church. Being disposed to generalize a single case, the difference in the time and persons was overlooked, and this special case was applied erroneously to different cases. For what we know of Thecla's baptism is, that she asked the apostle for that rite, but he exhorted her to be patient and wait. At Antioch, when in the arena, and believing that she will surely die without having received the baptism, she throws herself into the trench. After her deliverance she remains eight days with Tryphaena, and instructs her in the word of God. We are not told that she baptized some, but that most of the maid-servants believed, and that there was great joy in the house. Then she comes to Paul at Myra, saying, ἔλαβον τὸ λουτρόν, Παῦλε: ὁ γὰρ σοὶ συνεργήσας εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κάμοὶ

συνήργησεν εἰς τὸ λούσασθαι (ch. 40). Paul does not utter his disapprobation, but keeps quiet. But when she is about to leave, he does not say to her that she should teach and baptize, but go and teach." The faculty which Jesus gives to his disciples (Matthew 28:19, 20) is entirely different from the one which Paul gives to Thecla.

Thecla's case is exceptional on account of her twofold, martyrdom; being left by Paul and the adherents to his teaching, and being in *periculo mortis*, she baptizes herself, using the Christian formula. According to the whole narrative, Paul cannot make any objections because God has made himself known in delivering her, and the action of a martyr cannot be prescriptive as to others. Besides, the author brings before us a time in which ecclesiastical affairs had not yet taken a definite form, and there is not the least evidence that the object of the author of the *Acts* was to support Montanistic doctrines, and to establish the same by the authority of the apostle Paul. The only object which the author could have had in view was to describe the apostolic time, in which he succeeded only in part. It is a time when the Church commences to develop herself. But, using his own judgment in this respect, it becomes fatal, since the author connects the person of an apostle with deeds and doctrines which in this connection must be detrimental to the order of the Church. Such a writing could only be a great hindrance to the leaders of the Church; and in order to render it of no effect, it was severely criticized, and its author called to account and deposed. Yet the possibility of a historical substratum in the *Acts* is not precluded, although it is difficult to say where history ends and legend commences.

IV. *Sources of the Acts.* —We have already stated that the *Acts* contain not a single direct citation from the New Test., yet the student cannot fail to discover many, instances in which the New Test. has been used. Thus:

Picture for Thecla

That the author of the *Acts* was acquainted with the I second epistle to Timothy is unquestionable, because there are many striking parallels between that epistle and the *A.cts,* which need not be mentioned.

V. *Literature. —Espencei er Opera Omnia* (Parisis, 1619), p. 998 sq; t Baronius, *Martyrologium Romanum* (Venetiis, 1593), ad 23 Sept. p. 431-434; -id. *Annales Ecclesiastici ad Aluma* 47 (Lucae, 1738), 1, 338 sq.; Panutinus, *lotoe i1 Ed. Librorumo7 II Basilii Seleucic in Isauuria*

LEpi.scopi de Vita ac Miraculis D. Theclce (Antv. 1608), p. 222-238; Hournejus, *Hist. Eccl.* (Brunsvicii, 1649), 1, 40-42; *Vetustius Occidentalis Ecclesiae Martyrologium,* etc. (ed. Franc. M. Florentinus [Lucae, 1668]), notar ad 12 et 23 Sept.; Conbetis, *Bibliothecae Graecorum Patrumos Auctarium, Novissitnum* (Par. 1672), pt. 1; *Not. ad Nicetae Paphl. Orat. in Theclam,* p. 506-509; Tillemont, *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire Ecclesiastique,* etc. (ibid. 1694), 2, 65-70, 528-530; Ittig, *De Jeresiarchis* (Lips. 1690); *Appendix Dissertationum de Hewesiarchis* (ibid. 1696); *De Pseudepigraphis,* 1, 128, 129; *De Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum* (ibid. 1707), p. 700-705; Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum* (Oxonice, ed. 2, 1700; ed. 1, 1698), 1, 87-94, resp. 128, 330-335; *Des heiligen Clementis Historie von deunen Reisen und Leben des Apostels Petri, miuit einoem Vorberichte S. Anolds* (Berlin, 1702); *Acta Sanctorum.* (Antv. 1717), mens. Jun. 7:552, 553 (auctore Joh. Bapt. Sollerio); — *Hiieronymi Catalogun Scriptorum Ecclesias ficorum,* cum notis Erasmi Roterdatni, Mariani Victorii, H. Gravii, A. Miraei, et Jo. Alb. Fabricii-Erulestus Salomo Cyprianus recensuit et annotatiomnibus illustravit (Francof. et Lips. 1722); Dom. Georgius, in an annotation to the *Martyrology* of Alo of Vienne, in his edition of the same (Romans 1745 fol.), p. 493; Lardner, *The Credibility of the Gospel History* (2nd ed. Lond. 1748), II, 2, 697-703; *Acta Sanctorum* (Amntv. 1757), ad 23 Sept. 6:546 sq. (auctore Jo. Stittingo); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (Hamb. 1807), ed. Harles. 10:331; Thilo, *Acta S. Thomae Apostoli* (Lips. 1823), prol. p. 59, 60; Schwegler, *Der Montanismus* (Tub. 1841), p. 262-266; Tischendorf, *Act Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Lips. 1851), prol. p. 21-26; Kostlin, *Die pseudonyume Literatur der Iltesten Kirche,* in the *Theol. Jahrbücher* (Tub. 1851), p. 175, 177; Ewald, *Uebersicht der* 1851-52 *erschienenen Schrifte zür bibl. Wissenschaft,* in the *Jahrbücher zür bibl. Wissenschaft,* 1852, p. 127; Ritschl, *Die Entstehusng der altkatholischen Kirche* (2nd ed. Bonn, 1857), p. 292-294; Neudecker, art. "Thekla" in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 15,'704,705; Gutschmid, *Die Konigsnamen der appocryph. Apostelgeschichte* (Rhein. Mus. 1864), new series, 19:176-179, 396, 397; Reuss, *Gesch. d. heil. Schriften* (Brunswick, 1864), § 267, p. 264, note; Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra* (*Canonem Receptum* (*Lips.* 1866), 4:69; Renan. *SaintPaul* (Par. 1869), 1,40; Miller, *Erklarung des BarnabasBriefes* (Leips. 1869), p. 4; Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); Hausrath, *Neutestament. Zeifgeschichte* (1872), 2, 547; Lipsius, *Ueber den Ursprung und altesten Gebrauch des Christennamens* (Jena, 1873), p. 8; Mossman, *A History of the Catholic*

Church. of Jesus Christfromn the Death of St. John to the Middle of the Second Century (Lond. 1873), p. 351-400; *Der Kaiholik,* Nov. 1875, p. 461; but more especially Schlau, *Die Acten des Paulus und der Thecla und die iltere Thecla-Legende* (Leips. 1877); and the review by Lipsius in Schtirer, *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (ibid. 1877), p.543. (B. P.)

Theco’ë

(θεκωέ), the Greek form (1 Macc. 9,’33) of the Heb. name (<142020>2 Chronicles 20:20) TEKOA *SEE TEKOA* (q.v.).

Theft

(hbῃεֵ] κλέμμα or κλοπή) is treated in the Mosaic code in its widest bearings (<022201>Exodus 22:1 sq;), especially when accompanied by burglary or the abruption of animals (Josephus, *Ant. 16*:1, 1; Philo, *Opp.* 2, 336). If the stolen property had already been sold or rendered useless, the thief was required to make fivefold restitution in cases of horned cattle (comp. <101206>2 Samuel 12:6; Philo, *Opp.* 2, 337), or fourfold in case of sheep or goats; but only twofold in case the living animal was restored. But the statute likewise included the stealing of inanimate articles, as silver and gold (Josephus, *Ant. 4*:8,27). The prominence given to the former kind of theft is explainable on the ground of the pastoral character of the Hebrews (comp. Justin. 2, 2; Walther, *Gesch. d. rom. Rechts,* p. 807; *Sachs. Criminal Codex,* art. 226; Marezoll, *Criminal-Codex,* p. 388). Any other kind of property might easily be found and recovered, and hence its theft was punished by its simple restoration, with a fifth part of the value added for loss of use (Leviticus 5, 22 sq.; 6:3 sq.). Rabbinical legislation on this point may be seen in the Mishna (*Baba Metsiuh,* 2). From <200630>Proverbs 6:30, Michaelis infers a sevenfold restitution in Solomon’s time, but the passage probably speaks only in round numbers. On the ancient Greek laws, see Potter, *Antiq.* 1, 364 sq.; and on that of the twelve tables, Adam, *Romans Antiq.* 1, 426; Abegg, *Strasfrechtswiss.* p. 449; or generally Gellitus, 11:18; on that of the modern Arabs, see Wellsted, *Travels,* 1, 287; on the Talmudic, see Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 253. The Rabbinical interpretations of the law are given in the Mishna, *Baba Kamma,* 7 sq. If the burglar suffered a fatal wound in the act by night, the act was regarded as a justifiable homicide (<022202>Exodus 22:2). So likewise in Solon’s laws (Demosth. *Timocr.* p. 736) and among the ancient Romans (Heinecc. *Antiq. Jur. Romans* IV, 1, 3, 499), as well as Germans (Hanke, *Gesch. d. deutsch.*

peinl. Rechts, p. 99). Kidnapping (*plagium*) of a free Israelite was a capital crime (Exodus 21:16; Deuteronomy 24:7), punishable with strangulation (*Sanhedr. 11*:1); and was an act to which a long line of defenseless sea-coast like Palestine was peculiarly liable from piracy. A similar penalty prevailed among the ancient Greeks (Xenoph. *Memor.* 1, 2, 62; Demosth. *Philipp.* p. 53) and Romans after Constantine (see Marezoll, *Criminalrecht,* p. 370; Reim, *Criminalr. d. Romans* p. 390); comp. Philo, *Opp.* 2, 338. See generally Michaelis, *Mos. Recht,* 6:66 sq., 83 sq. *SEE STEAL*.

Theft, Christian Treatment Of.

In the early Church theft ‘was reckoned among the great crimes which brought men under public penance. Among St. Basil’s canons there is one that particularly specifies the time of penance. The thief, if he discover himself, shall do one year’s penance; if he be discovered by others, two: half the time as a prostrator, the other half a costander. —Bingham, Christ. *Antiq.* bk. 16:ch. 12:§ 4.

Theile, Carl Gottfried Wilhelm

doctor and professor of theology, was born at Grosscorbetha, near Merseburg, Feb. 25, 1799, and died at Leipsic, Oct. 8, 1853. He wrote, *De Trium Evangeliorum Necessitudine* (Lips. 1823): —*Notitia Novi Commentarii in Novum Testamentum* (ibid. *1829*): —*Tabulae Rerum Dogmaticarum Compendiarim* (ibid. *1830*): —*Christus und die Vernunft* (ibid. 1830): — *Commentarius in Epistolam Jacobi* (ibid. 1839): —*Zür Biographie Jesu* (ibid. 1837): —*Thesaurus Literatursae Theologicae Academicae, sive Recensus Dissertationum,* etc. (ibid. 1840): —Pro *Confessionis Religione adversus Confessionum Theologiam* (ibid. 1850). Besides the above, he edited, together with R. Stier, *Polyglotten-Bibel zum Handgebrauch* (Bielefeld, 1854, and often, 6 vols.); he also edited Van der Hooght’s *Hebrew Bible* (Leips. 1849, and. often), together with *Explicatio Epicriseon Masorethicarum*; *Conspectus Lectionum,* etc. This is one of the best editions of the Hebrew Bible. He also published, *Novum Testamentum, Grece et Germanice* (ibid. 1852, and often); and *Novumn Testamentum Graeca,* ex recognitione Knapii emendatius edidit argumentorum que notationes locos parallelos annotationem criticam et indices adjecit (7th ed. ibid. 1858; 11th ed. ibid. 1875, by Oscar von Gebhardt). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 419; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog.*

Literatur, 1, 85, 237, 302, 552; 2, 809; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1320 sq.; Schurer, *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, p. 1sq. (B. P.)

Theiner, Augustin

a Roman Catholic divine, was born April 11,1804, at Breslau, in. Silesia. He first studied theology, afterwards philosophy and jurisprudence, and at Halle, in 1829, was made doctor *utriusquejuris.* For several years he collected material at the libraries of Vienna, Paris, and London for canonical disquisitions. Shortly before his promotion he published, together with his brother Johann Anton (q.v.), *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den christlichen Geistlichen und ihre Folgen* (Altenburg, 1828, 2 vols.); but he soon perceived his errors, and went to Rome, where he entered the Congregation of St. Philip Neri, and received holy orders. He remained in Rome, and in 1855 Pius IX appointed him prefect of the Vatican archives. In 1870 he retired from his office, and died Aug. 10, 1874. Of his many writings we mention, *Commentatio de Romanorum Pontificum Epistol-turm Decretalium Antiquis Collectionibus et de Gregorii IX P. M. Decretalium Codice* (Lips. *1829*): *—Recherches in plusieurs Collections Inedites de Decretales du Moyendge* (Paris, *1833*): *—Geschichte der geistlichen Bildungsanzstalten* (1835): *Cardinal Frankenberg und sein Kanzpf fiir die Kirche* (Freiburg, *1850*): *—Zustande der Kathol. Kirche in Schlesien von* 1740 *bis* 1758 (Ratisbon, 1852, 2 vols.): *—Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens XIV* (Paris, 1853, 2 vols.): *— Vetera Monumenta Historica Hungariam Sacram Illustrantia* (Rome, 1859, 1860, 2 vols.): *— Vett. Monum. Polonice et Lithuaniae Gentiumque Finitinarum Historiam Illustrantia* (ibid. 1860-63, 3 *ols.*): *—Vett. Monum. Slavorum Meridionaliunm Histot. Illustr.* (1863): *—Codex Dominii Temporalis Sanctae Sedis* (1861 sq., 3 vols.). He also published a new edition of the *Annals* of Baronius, and worked assiduously upon the continuation of this gigantic work. See Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, 1, 603, 828; 2, 5, 800; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1323 sq.; *Theolog. Universal-Lex.* s.v.; *Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v.*; *Literarischer Handweiser fir das kathol. Deutschland*, 1864, p. 148 sq.; 1874, p. 303 sq. (B.P.)

Theiner, Johann Anton

brother of Augustin, was born at Breslau. Dec. 15,1799. He studied theology, was made chaplain in 1823 in Zobten on the Bober, and in 1824

was appointed professor of exegesis and canon law at Breslau. The lively interest which he took in the reformatory movements of his Church obliged him to give up his lectures, and he entered upon ministerial duties at different places. In 1845 he sided with the German Catholic movement, from which he soon withdrew, in 1848, and lived excommunicated by his Church until 1855, when he was made custos of the university library at Breslau, where he died, May 15, 1860. He wrote, *Descriptio Codicis qui Vetsionem Pentateuchi Arabicam continet* (Berlin, 1822): —Die *wolf kleinen Propheten* (Leips. *1828*): —*Dasfunfte Buch Mosis* (ibid. 1831): — De *Pseudoisidoriana Canonunl Collectione* (Breslau, 1837): —*Die reformatorischen Bestrebungen der kathol. Kirche* (Altenburg, *1845*): —*Das Seligkeitsdogma in der katthol. Kirche* (ibid. 1847): —*Enthüllungen über Lehren u. Leben der kathol. Geistlichkeit.* See *Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur,* 1, 174, 603; 2, 22, 800; *Theologisches Universal-Lex. s.v.*; *Reyensburger Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1322; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 419. (B. P.)

Theism

The etymological opposite of theism can only be *atheism,* since the word designates a conception of the universe according to which a Deity rules over nature and men, and the atheistic view denies the existence of the Deity and divine powers. Various specific contrasts are, however, contained under this general meaning of the term, as monotheism and polytheism, or deism and pantheism.

The dispute between monotheism and polytheism is no longer open. Philosophy and theology have long been agreed that the Deity can be but one, and that the idea of a multiplicity of gods involves a *contradictio in adjeco.* There can be but one supreme, perfect, absolute Being, and such a Being is required even if the superior orders generally of supernatural beings be included under the idea of the Deity. This doctrine has, moreover, the support of human experience, since history shows that in every instance where a thorough development of polytheism has been reached, it eventuates in monotheism to the extent of subordinating ,the many gods to one who is supreme, or of regarding them as simple modes of conceiving of his nature, powers, or manifestations. It may be added that the converse idea, on which the origin of polytheism is found in pantheistic identifications of the Deity with nature and its forces, affords the most satisfactory explanation possible of the beginnings and growth of this error.

The monotheistic conception once received, however, opens the way to discussions respecting the nature of the Deity and of his relations to the universe, and compels recognition of the issue between deism and pantheism. For the conceptions which underlie the terms, we refer to the articles *SEE PANTHEISM* and *SEE DEISM*, and in this place note merely that the *term deism* designates that conception of the world on which God is not only different, but also distinct, from the universe, and which therefore denies the immanence of God in the world under any form, and constitutes the direct contradiction to pantheism. It is evident that this deism harmonizes with Christianity as little as does pantheism itself. It is to be noted, however, that the Scriptures return no direct and positive answer to the question, 'How is the relation of God to the universe to be conceived?' and speculation is accordingly compelled to attempt the solution of the problem after its own fashion. *Theology* has attempted the solution-with what degree of success it does not belong to this article to determine, since theism is not a *theological*, but a *philosophical*, term.

The modern literature of philosophy apprehends the idea of theism in a more limited meaning than that indicated above, and understands by the term that tendency and those systems which attempt to mediate between pantheism and deism, and seek to solve the theological problem in question by the method of free philosophical inquiry. Such endeavors grew directly out of the development of the modern philosophy of Germany, beginning with Kant and passing through Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Herbart, etc., until deism and pantheism came to be direct contradictories within the domain of philosophy itself. A removal of the difficulty was evidently demanded by the state of philosophy; by the considerations that pantheism inevitably leads to atheism or anthropotheism by including the world of nature and mankind in the *essence* of the Deity, and that it contradicts the indestructible and. undeniable facts of human consciousness; while deism renders an infinite and absolute Being impossible by its denial of any substantial bond which connects God and the world, and its consequent assertion of the limitation of the Deity.

The object of theistic speculation, it may be assumed, was correctly stated by the younger Fichte in his essay *Ueber den Unterschied zwischen ethischem und naturalistischem Theismus*, in the *Zeitschr. fur Philosophie u. philosopische Kritik* (Halle, 1856), p. 229, in these words: "Theism denotes for us the altogether general idea that the absolute world-principle, whatever differences of opinion respecting the, limits within which it may

be objectively apprehended may obtain, can yet in no case be conceived of as blind and unconscious power under the category either of a universal substance or of an abstract impersonal reason, and must be apprehended as a being having existence *in and for itself*; to whose fundamental attribute human thought can find no other analogy and form of expression than that of *absolute self-consciousness*. Connected with this conception of the Absolute Spirit, and necessarily leading up to it, is the equally general idea that the universal fact of the interconnection of the world indicates a beginning in accident and blind chance no more than it affords room for the thought of an absolute necessity which could not be otherwise. The only appropriate thought, in view of the conditions of the world, is the intermediate idea of *adaptation to an end*, which, on the one hand, implies the possibility of a differently conditioned world order, but, on the other, asserts that the existing order is most perfect, and projected in harmony with the ideas of the good and the beautiful. This result of an empirical observation of the world, which may infinitely enlarge itself by the study of particulars in all the departments of nature, and may advance to a steadily in-creasing degree of certainty, compels metaphysical thought to ascend to the idea of an absolute original reason which determines the end; to whose attributes, as demonstrated in the universe, human language is once more unable to find other designations than perfect thought and a will which requires the good." It will be observed that the leading idea in this definition is the existence of God *in and for himself*, or of his absolute self-conscious being. The prevalence of this idea determined the general current of speculation to disagree with the Hegelian doctrine of the Absolute, according to which God is impersonal and unconscious reason, and attains to consciousness of himself only in man. The distinction between ethical and-naturalistic theism is of secondary importance, but, nevertheless, deserves notice to the extent of observing that it grew out of Schelling's advance towards theistic views, in which he attained to the recognition of God as an independent Being, and as the "Lord of Being;" but as he persisted in retaining the theoceniric position of his early teachings, and "derived" the finite world out of the absolute essence of God, he really conceived of God simply as a cosmical principle, as the younger Fichte observes. Other philosophers followed in his track, e.g. the Roman Catholic Baader (q.v.); but the representatives of the theistic tendency belonged rather to the school of Hegel than that of Schelling, as a rule, though they "passed beyond" the master and differed widely among themselves, as they adhered more or less closely to his views. The principal

names in this class are J. H. Fichte (*Bedingungen eines spekulativen Theismus* [Elberfeld, 1835]) and K. P. Fischer (*Encykl. d. philos. Wissenschaften* [Frainkf. —on-Main, 1848; vol. 3 1855]).

The present status of philosophical theism is significantly illustrated in the works of Chr. H. Weisse. This writer regards the dialectics of Hegel as the "completed form of philosophical inquiry," but rejects the pantheism to which its application brought Hegel. He holds that the teleological proof is necessary to lead to the theistic idea of God and counteract the pantheistic tendency of the ontological and cosmological arguments. The world was created for God, and finds its end in him. In his absolute essence God is absolute personality, but necessarily a trinity of persons; and in this trinity the second person, or Son, prior to the creation and independently of it, represents the eternal reason and possibility of the creation of the world. but *with* the creation is "infused into it," "enters into it," "gives himself to it." This second person of the trinity is, however to be regarded as the absolute *Primus* of the world, and not be identified with the latter, etc.. To avoid the contradiction of an absolute dualism in the Deity, it becomes necessary to postulate a third person in the trinity, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is coequal with them. In harmony with this view, the creation is not to be regarded as "the effect of a sufficient reason, but as the result of the *self-renunciation* of the second Divine Personality." This self-renunciation, though represented as the free act of God, comes to pass, however, because only in creation can God become the "God who exists as God," the "really Supreme Being," since "it is only thus that he can be the all embracing, supermundane, self-conscious Divine Spirit in whom all newly originating beings are preformed, and all existing ones are combined into a higher unity of expression or idea." At the point of his renunciation, the idea of God is seen to coincide with that which is usually termed *matte?*; the activity of the Deity becoming the matter of the creation. See Weisse, *Philosoph. Dogmatik oder Philosophie d. Christenthums* (Leips. 1855).

A review of the progress of theistic speculation reveals the fact that the demands of pantheism (monism) have been fully met in the principal endeavors to establish the theistic conception of the world on a philosophical basis. The world is represented as having, emanated from the being-the nature, essentiality, substance-of the Deity, as the realizing, renunciation, viewing; completing, of himself; his self-consciousness and subjectivity, however, being regarded as existing independently of the

world. But no similar justice has been done to the claims of deism; for the leading and fundamental demand of the deistic conception of the world is the idea of God as the *Absolute Spirit* who is *eternally complete in himself* through his absolute power and goodness, as contrasted with the world, which is bound by *conditions* and constantly engaged in the process of *becoming* and *developing.* This idea is contradicted by every view, which makes the world to be in any way a part of the *essence* of God himself, since such a view transfers the becoming and developing condition of the world into the nature of God. The *absolute* is necessarily complete and perfect.

Literature. —Schelling, Philosophied. Mythologie; id. *Philosophie d. Offenbarung*; Fischer, *Die Idee d. Gottheit* (Stuttg. 1839), and the *Encyklop.* mentioned above; Wirth, *Die Spekul. Idee Gottes,* etc. (Stuttg. 1845); *Chalybasus,System d. Wissenschffelehre* (Kiel, 1846); Schwarz, *Weiterbildung d. Theismus,* in *Zeitschr. f. Philosophie* (Halle, 1847), vol.18; id. *Gött, Natur u. Mensch* (Hanov. 1857); Von Schaden, *Geqensat d. theist. u. pantheist. Standpunkts* (Erlangen, 1848); Mayer, *Theisnus u. Pantheismus* (Freiburg, 1849); Schenach, *Metaphysik* (Innspruck, 1856); Eckart, *Theistische Begründdurn d. Aesthetik* (Jena, 1857); Hoffnann, *Theismus u. Pantheismus* (Wurzburg, 1861); Ulrici, *Gött u. die Natur* (Leips. 1861); Bowne, *Studies in Theism* (N.Y. 1879). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Thela'sar

(2 Kings 19:12). *SEE TAL-ASSAR.*

Theler'sas

(θελερσάς v.r. θελσάς), a Greek form (1 Esdr. 5, 36) of the name Hebraized (Ezra 2, 59) TELHARSA *SEE TELHARSA* (q.v.).

Theman, or Theeman

(θαιμάν), the Greek form (Baruch 3, 22, 23) of the Heb. name TEMIAN *SEE TEMIAN* (q.v.).

Themistians

an early school of theorists which took its name from a deacon, Themistius. An answer given him by the patriarch Timothy led him to

conclude that if the body of Christ was corruptible (subject, that is, to the decay arising from the wear and tear of life), then he must also have been so far subject to the defects of human nature that his very knowledge of the present and the future was imperfect, and there were, therefore, some things of which he was ignorant. The patriarch himself repudiated this conclusion, but a school of theorists grew up under the leadership of Themistius, and became known as AGNOETE *SEE AGNOETE* (q.v.).

Thenius, Otto

doctor of theology and philosophy, was born in 1801 at Dresden, where he also died, Aug. 13, 1876. Although Thenius occupied the pulpit for more than twenty years, yet his main renown is as an exegete, and as such he will always hold an honorable position among scholars. He published, *Erklarung der Bücher Samuels* (Leips. 1842; 2nd ed. 1864),: —*Erklarung der Biicher der Kinige* (ibid. 1849; 2nd ed. 1873), with an Appendix, which was also published separately, *Das vorexilische Jerusalem und dessen Tempel Erklarung der Klagelieder Jeremiad* (ibid. *1855*): —*De Loco Joh.* 13:21-28 *Dissertatiuncula* (Dresdae, 1837): *Quis Ps. 51 Auctor fuisse videatur* (ibid. 1839): — *Die Grdber der Kinige von Juda,* in Illgen's *Zeitschrift fur die historische Theologie, 1844*: — *Ueber die Stufenpsalmen, in Studieln ind Kritiken,* 1854, vol. 2. Thenius's works will always be consulted for textual criticism. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 419; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol. 2,* 1323; *Theologisches Universal-Lex. s.v.* (B. P.)

Theoc'anus

(θεωκανός v.r. θοκανός *and* θωκα νος), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:14) for the Heb. name (<151015>Ezra 10:15) TIKVAH *SEE TIKVAH* (q.v.).

Theocatagnostae

a name used by John of Damascus apparently as a general term for heretics who held unorthodox opinions about God, and therefore "thought evil" (κατάγνωσις) respecting him.

Theocracy

(θεοκρατία, *rule of God*), a form of government such as prevailed among the ancient Jews, in which Jehovah, the God of the universe, was directly recognized as their supreme civil ruler, and his laws were taken as the statute-book of the kingdom. This principle is repeatedly laid down in the

Mosaic code, and was continually acted upon thereafter. *SEE KING*. Moses was but the appointee and agent of Jehovah in giving the law and in delivering the people from Egypt; and throughout the Exode the constant presence of God in the pillar and the cloud, as well as upon the mercy seat, was on every occasion looked to for guidance and control. So, likewise, Joshua and the Judges were special "legates of the skies" to perform their dictatorial factions. Even under the monarchy, God reserved the chief direction of affairs for himself. The kings were each specifically anointed in his name, and prophets were from time to time commissioned to inform them of his will, who did not hesitate to rebuke and even veto their actions if contrary to the divine will. The whole later history of the chosen people is but a rehearsal of this conflict and intercourse between the Great Head of the kingdom and the refractory functionaries. Under the New Economy, this idea passed over, in its spiritual import, to the Messiah as the heir of David's perpetual dynasty, and thus Christ becomes the ruler of his Church and the hearts of its members. See Spencer, *De Theocratia Judaica* (*Tüb.* 1732); Witsius, *De Theocratia Israel.* (Lugd. 1695); Blechschmidt, *De Theocratiac Populo Sancto Instituta*; Deyling, *De Israeli Jehova Domino*; Goodwin, *De Theocratia Israelitarum* (Ultraj. 1690); Hulse, *De Jehova Deo Rege ac Duce Militani in Prisco Israele*; Dannhauer, *Politica Biblica*; Conring, *De Politia Iebsrceorum* (Helmst. 1648); Michaelis, *De Antiquitatibus AEconomnic Patriarchalis*; Schickard, *Jus Regium Hebraeorum, culm* animadversionibus et notis Carpzovii (Lips. 1674, 1701); Abarbanel, *De Statu et Jure Regio,* etc., in Ugolino, *Thesaurus,* vol. 24. *SEE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN*.

Theodemir

a Goth who was abbot of Psalmodi, in the diocese of Nismes, at the beginning of the 9th century. He was reputed to be very learned, so that even bishop Claudius of Turin (q.v.; comp. Illgen, *Zeitschr. fliu die hist. Theologie,* 1843, 2, 39 sq.) dedicated many of his commentaries to him. Theodemir wrote a letter to Claudius, in which he mentioned the approval, which the writings of the latter received, especially from the Frankish bishops; but he subsequently discovered expressions in the commentaries, particularly those on Corinthians, which he regarded as being questionable and erroneous, the principal objection being raised against the treatment of the subject of image and relic worship. Claudius thereupon wrote an *Apologeticum* (see Claud. *Taur. Episc. Ined. Operum Specinensa,* etc., exhibuit A. Rudelbach [Havn. 1824]; Peyron, *Tull. Ciceronis Orationum*

Fragmenta Inedita [Stuttg. 1824], p. 13), to which Theodemir replied. The dispute was ended by the death of Theodemir about A.D. 825 (see Gieseler, *Lehrb. der Kirchengesch.* Vol. 2; Neander, *Church Hist.* 3, 433). —Herzog, *Real Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodicy

(*vindication of the divine government,* from θεός, *God,* and δίκη, *justice*). This word dates back, in the sense in which it is now currently employed, no farther than the celebrated essay by Leibnitz, whose first edition appeared at Amsterdam in 1710. It designates the attempt to justify God with reference to the imperfections, the evil, and especially the sin, which exist in the world, or, in other words, any attempt to show that God appears in the creation and government of the world as the highest wisdom and goodness, despite sin, evil, and apparent imperfections.

Leibnitz preceded such evidence with a *Discours de la Conformite de la Foi avec la Raison,* because a theodicy must evidently proceed on the assumption that reason and revelation do not contradict each other, and that the former has the ability to recognize the facts presented by the latter, whether in nature or in history. As the aim of theodicy is to refute by reason the objections of superficial reasoners against the wisdom and goodness of God, the work necessarily demands agreement between faith and reason. It is consequently the primary object of Leibnitz to show that such agreement exists, or that it must be presumed to exist so soon as a correct view of the idea and nature of reason is entertained. Reason is the "rightful combination" of truths, which we recognize, either directly or by means of revelation and there can be no conflict between it and the truth, which God reveals. There are two classes of truths, and, so to speak, two forms of reason. In a *narrow* meaning of the word, reason has to do only with such truths as it derives from itself or recognizes without assistance from without; and in this character it contrasts with experience, and also with faith in so far as the latter is based on authority and forms a sort of empirical certainty. Its truths are "eternal and necessary truths," in no wise dependent on sense-perception, and, *a priori,* such as reason alone can apprehend and formulate, because they are founded on logical, metaphysical, or geometrical necessity. Another class of truths presents to view definite facts, e.g. the laws of nature (*verites defait*), such as come immediately within the province of experience and faith. This class of truths likewise involves *necessity,* and is *so* far set forth within the domain

of reason also; but this necessity is physical, instead of logical or metaphysical. The contrary to such truths is not logically impossible and unthinkable, but cannot be because its existence would be an imperfection, a fault. This physical necessity is thus shown to be at the bottom a moral necessity, founded in the attributes of God as the highest wisdom and goodness; and as moral necessity it appertains also to the doctrines of the faith, being ascertainable by reason, and forming ground on which to comprehend and accept such doctrines.

With respect to the creation of the world, Leibnitz teaches that it was the free act of God, performed that he "might most effectually, and in a manner most worthy of his wisdom and goodness, reveal and impart his perfection." He could create only a *relative* perfection, however; the creation of absolutely perfect beings, i.e. gods, was not possible, and the world and its inhabitants were accordingly created relatively imperfect. This condition of things may be denominated *metaphysical evil,* whose existence was directly conditioned in the will of God by which was determined the creation of limited and imperfect beings. Physical evil, or suffering, and moral evil, or sin, on the other hand, are not directly willed by God, but only indirectly, as serving to promote the good and secure the attainment of a higher perfection of the "whole," though themselves evil as respects the individual. The ground of metaphysical evil was, therefore, the *good* which God willed to secure in the creation of limited beings, while that of physical and moral evil is "the better" which could only thus be secured.

To the objection that God might have created a world in which physical and moral should have no place, or that he might have altogether refrained from the work of creating, Leibnitz replies that physical evil may serve to help the world to achieve a higher degree of good; and that moral evil, which is possible because God has endowed man with powers of volition, is likewise so wonderfully controlled as to increase the beauty of his universe as a whole. To the further objection that God thus becomes the author of sin, he replies that sin has no positive cause in so far as it is actualized in consequence of the imperfections of the creature, but only a *causa deficiens,* which, moreover, does not work sin directly and of its own motion, but *only par accident* by reason of the existence of a 'higher good than sense can recognize or desire. The final objection, that as God foreknew all that is future, and consequently inaugurated a causal connection, which must inevitably lead to whatever may come to pass,

including sin; the latter is unavoidable and its punishment unjust, is met by Leibnitz by formulating a distinction between predestination and necessity. No volitional act need be performed by man unless he will. Foreordination is not compulsion; and the intervention of foreordained events serves only to influence the will with motives, and not at all to constrain the will with force.

The review of Leibnitz's work shows that it is far from satisfying the demands of the problem with which it deals. The reason for its failure lies in the philosophical views which that author laid at the basis of his scheme, his ideas of the monads, of God as the primitive monad, of the relations between reason and the will, of freedom and necessity, respecting which see the art. Leibnitz. Nor is this the place to attempt a new and independent solution of the problem of theodicy, which necessarily must involve the development of an entire system of philosophy. Suffice it to say that the general method of Leibnitz must ever be regulative to those inquirers who approach this problem from the standpoint of Christian theism, and that the main attempt must be to separate more clearly between the conceptions of physical and moral evil and connect the former more intimately with morality and the moral consummation of the world-to show more clearly the profound reasons for the necessity by which the possibility of sin is included in the concept of human freedom, and the existence of the latter is involved in the idea of the *Food* and, finally, to tone down certain theological exaggerations of the power of evil, and present freedom and morality in their gradual development out of the natural life and human naturalness, as well as in decided negative contrast with nature.

Most of the philosophers of more recent times who have treated this subject have approximated more or less closely to Leibnitz, and have endeavored by criticism or modification, either avowedly or silently, to correct the faults of his essay. We can only name a series of the older writers, e.g. Balguy, *Divine Benevolence Vindicated* (2nd ed. Lond. 1803, 12mo); Werdermann, *Versuch zur Theodicae*, etc. (Dessau and Leips. 178493); Benedict, *Theodicea* (Annaburg, 1822); Blasche, *Das Basen,* etc. (Leips. 1827); Wagner, *Theodicea* (Bamberg, 1810); Erichson, *Verhutn. der Theod. zur spekulitiv. Kosmologie* (Greifswald, 1836); Sigwart, *Problem des Basen,* etc. (Tüb. 1840); Von Schaden, *Theodicea* (Carlsruhe, 1842); Maret, *Theodicea* (Paris, 1857); Young, *Evil and God, a Mystery* (2nd ed. Lond. 1861). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodora (1)

the wife of the emperor Justinian was the daughter of Acacius, who had charge of the wild beasts of the Prasini at Constantinople. The decease of her father and remarriage of her mother obliged her to earn her living as an actress, and she also became a notorious courtesan. She accompanied Ecebolus as his mistress to Pentapolis when that wealthy Tyrian was appointed praefect of that government, but was soon deserted by him and obliged to return in poverty to Constantinople. She then altered her mode of living and sought to earn a virtuous name; and while living in retirement she won the favor of the imperial prince Justinian, and so excited his passion that on the death of the empress he persuaded the reigning emperor, Justin, to suspend a law which stood in the way of his marriage with Theodora (see *Cod. Just.* lib. 5, tit. 4; "De Nuptiis," 1, 23). They were married in A.D. 525; and on Justinian's accession, in 527, Theodora was publicly proclaimed empress and coregent of the empire. Her influence over him became unbounded, and continued even after her decease.

Theodora participated actively in the Monophvsite controversy, lending her influence secretly to the propagation of that error, and endeavoring to win her consort from the orthodox view. Colloquies instituted between bishops of the two conflicting parties in 531 accomplished no substantial result; but the empress succeeded, in 535, in promoting the Monophysite bishop Anthims to the patriarchate of Constantinople, and afterwards, through the assistance of Belisarius, the famous general, in advancing Vigilius to the same position. She was twice visited with the ban of the Church, but was not thereby intimidated to such a degree as to prevent her intervention in the controversy of the Three Chapters. She died, however, before the dispute wags determined, at the early age of forty years. Historians describe her as having been proud and tyrannical; but no charge is raised against her chastity after her marriage with the emperor. She bore the latter one child, a daughter, who died early.

Literature. — Procopius, *Hist. Arcnat*; id. *Aquee. c.* 9, 10; id. *De Aedif*: 1, 11; Nicephorus Callistus, 16:37; Mansi, *Collatio Cathol. cum Severian.* a. 531, 8:817 sq.; id. *Joannis Episc. Asice*, in Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 2, 89; *Acta Syn. Const.* a. 536, in Mansi, 8:873 sq.; Evagrius, ch. 4; *Liberal. Breviar.* p. 21 sq.; Anastasius, *Vitae Pontif.*; Vigilii *Epist. ad Justin. et ad Mennam*, in Malasi, 9:35,38; Wernsdorf, *De Silverio et Vigilio*; Gregor. Nazian. *Epist.* 9:36; Theophanes, *Chronicles* p. 350; Vict. Tununens.

Chronicles; Ludewig, *Vita Justiniani Imp. et Theodorce* (Hal. 1731, 4to); Invernizzi, *De Rebus Gestis Justisniani* (Romn. 1783); Gibbon, *Decline and Fall, ch.* 40; Walch, *Ketzergesch.* pt. 6:7; Gieseler,; *Monophys. Wett. Variceide Cristi.* etc. (Gött. 1835-38); and the Church histories. Also Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v., and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodora (2)

wife of the emperor Theophilus, who succeeded his father, Michael II, on the throne in A.D. 829. She obtained the regency of the empire on the death of her husband, in 842, and hastened to restore the worship of images, which had until then been savagely repressed. She banished John Grammaticus, the patriarch of Constantinople, and gave his place to Methodius, who was in sympathy with her plans, and then called a synod which decreed the restoration of image worship throughout the empire. To commemorate this event she ordained an annual "festival of orthodoxy." Not content with having thus ended a dispute which had agitated the empire during 150 years, she inaugurated a persecution of the Paulicians (q.v.), and thereby occasioned a succession of wars in which entire provinces were devastated and depopulated by the allied Paulicians and Saracens (see Cedrenus, p. 541 sq.; Zonaras, *Chronicles* 16:1; Petr. Siculi *Hist. Manich.* p. 70 sq.; Photius, *Contra Manich. 9*:23; Constantin. Porphrog. Continuator, 4:16, 23-26).

A more creditable work was the conversion of the Bulgarians, which was accomplished by the Thessalonian monks Cyril and Methodius in 862. The empress, however, was not permitted to see this success. Her son Michael III compelled her to resign the regency, and incarcerated her in a convent, where she died of grief in A.D. 855 (see Dalleus, *De Imaginibus* [Lugd. 1642.]; Spanheim, *Hist. Imaginumu Restituta* ibid. 1686]; id. *Opp.* vol. 2; Schlosser, *Gesch. der bIderstirm. Kaiser,* etc. [1812]; Marx, *Bilderstrait deir byzant. Kaiser* [1839]; Walch, *Ketzergesch.* pt. 10:11; Schröckh, *Christl. Kirschengesch.* vol. 20; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* [4th ed.], 2, 1, 9). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop* S v.

Theodore (Theodorus), St.

of the 4th century, was a Syrian or Armenian, or of Amasea as some more definitely state. Gregory of Nyssa relates that Theodore joined the Roman army (thence called *tiro*) when Maximin and Galerius were persecuting the Christians, but was himself denounced. His youthful appearance won for

him three days respite, at the end of which he was to die unless he should recant. While engaged in earnest prayer, a Christian disguised as a soldier, named Didymus, approached and exhorted him to flee, which he did. Didymus was thereupon seized as a Christian and condemned to decapitation. Theodore returned and steadfastly endured horrible tortures until he died by fire. His body was rescued by Christians, and is reported to have been brought to Brindisi in the 12th century, while his head is said to be still preserved at Gaeta. Gregory pronounced a eulogy in his memory. The Greek Church dedicates to him Feb. 17, the Latin, Nov. 9. See *Greg. Nyssce Opp.* (Par. 1615), 2, 1002 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury

succeeded Deusdedit, who died in the year 664. When the elected Anglo-Saxon presbyter Wigheard died in Rome, where he had gone to receive ordination, pope Vitalian declared that he intended to-send a worthy substitute. The Roman abbot Hadrian, a native of Africa, refused to be elected, and called attention to Theodore of Tarsuis as a man well qualified in every respect for that position. In March, 668, he left Rome for his new post, and was accompanied by Hadrian, who was to act as his adviser, but who, in fact, was to see that nothing of the Roman ritual was replaced by the Greek. Theodore acted in the spirit of Rome; he founded monasteries and schools, and died Sept. 19, 690 in London. His corpse was the first buried in St. Peter's at York. He left a penitential book and a collection of canons (reprinted in the collection of Latin penitential books of the Anglo-Saxons by Kunstmamu [Mayence, 1844]). See the *Introduction* to Kunstmann's collection; Baxmann, *Politik der Perspste,* 1, 180, 184; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon,* s.v. (B. P.)

Theodore, surnamed Graptus

a monk of St. Saba who is somewhat prominent among the monkish martyrs of iconolatry. He was born at Jerusalem, attained to the rank of presbyter, and was sent by the patriarch Thomas of Jerusalem to Constantinople about 818 to labor in defense of the images. In the execution of this purpose he remonstrated so vehemently to the emperor's face that Leo the Armenian caused him to be scourged and transported to the coast of Pontus. Three years later he was pardoned but again imprisoned and banished, this time by Michael the Stammerer. The next emperor, Theophilus, caused him to be scourged and carried to the island

of Aphusia. Having returned after several years and renewed his passionate advocacy of image-worship, he was threatened and tortured, and finally banished as incorrigible to Apamea. But few writings are ascribed to him; among them are a disputation of the patriarch Nicephorus, given in Combefis, *Orig. Constantinople* p. 159: —a letter by John of Cyzicum narrating the sufferings endured under Theophills, also in Combefis: —a manuscript, *De Fide Orthodoxa contsra Iconomachos,* from which a fragment is given in Combefis, p. 221. See *Vita Theod. Gr.* in Combefis, p. 191, Latin by Surius, Dec. 26; and comp. the notices in Cave, and Walch, *Gesch. d. Ketzereien, 10*:677, 717. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodore Lector (The Reader)

a Church historian in the East, was reader in the Constantinopolitan Church in or about the year 525. He furnished an abstract of the history from the twentieth year of Constantine to the accession of Julian, taken from the works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, which is known under the name *Historia Tripartita,* and is still extant in manuscript form. Valesius published so much of its contents as was found to vary from Theodore's sources. A second and more important work begins an independent record at the point where the history of Socrates ends, and carries it forward to the year 439. Neither of these works can be regarded as a completed whole, and between them is an untouched space of seventy years. The latter history, which was contained in two books, has been lost; but extended fragments have been preserved in John of Damascus, Nilus, and especially Nicephorus Gallistus, and published by Robert Stephens and Valesius. These remains show that the histories of Theodore contained mulch important matter. in relation to politics and the progress of the Church. Comp. the literary notices in Cave, Fabricius. Hamberger, and Staudlin-Hemsen, *Gesch. u. Lit. d. Kirchengesch.* p. 76. Editions: Stephanus, Ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας θεοδώρου ἀναγνώστου ἐκλογαί, *cum Eusebio* (Par. 1544); Reading, *Excerpta ex Eccl. Hist. Theod. Lect. et Fragmenta alia H. Valesio Interpr. cum Theod. Historia* (Cantabr. 1720). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Theodore of Mopsuestia

bishop, and leader in the so-called theological school of Antioch, was born at Antioch about the year 350. He studied philosophy and rhetoric, the latter in company with John Chrysostom at the school of the famous

Libanius. Stimulated by Chrysostom to a fervor of Christian enthusiasm, he renounced his proposed secular career in order to devote himself to Christian studies and monastic asceticism; and though affection for a lady named Hermione interrupted his course, he was recalled to it by the zealous efforts of his friend, and, through the influence of his teacher, Diodorus of Tarsus, who introduced him to the study of sacred literature, was confirmed in it for life. Two of Chrysostom's letters to Theodore in relation to this subject are yet extant. He became a presbyter at Antioch and rapidly acquired reputation, but soon removed to Tarsus, and thence to Mopsuestia, in Cilicia Secunda, as bishop. In 394 he attended a council at Constantinople, and subsequently other synods. When Chrysostom was overtaken by his adverse fortunes, Theodore sought to aid his cause, but without success. Theodore himself enjoyed a notable reputation throughout the Church, especially in the Eastern branch. Even Cyril of Alexandria deemed him worthy of praise and esteem. He was accused, indeed, of favoring the heresy of Pelagius, but died in peace in 428 or 429, before the Christological quarrel began between the schools of Antioch and Alexandria, in which his character for orthodoxy was so seriously impaired. After his death, the Nestorians appealed to his writings in support of their opinions, and at the Fifth (Ecumenical Council Theodore and his writings were condemned. His memory was revered among the Nestorians, and his works were held in repute in the churches of Syria.

The theological importance of this father grows chiefly out of his relation to the Christological controversies of his time, and, in a lower degree, out of his exegetical labors. He was an uncommonly prolific writer, and expended much effort on the exposition of the Scriptures; but of his exegetical works only a commentary on the minor prophets in Greek has been preserved intact to the present time. Other expositions of minor books, e.g. the Pauline epistles, which had been published in Latin by Hilary of Poitiers, have lately been recognized as the property of Theodore. Fragments of still other exegetical labors by this father are scattered through the compilations of Wegner, Mai, and Fritzsche (see below). Theodore's method was that of sober, historical exposition, although his results are not always satisfactory; and to this he added independent criticism of the canon. He distinguished the books of the Bible into prophetical, historical, and didactic writings, the latter class including the books of Solomon, Job, etc., whose inspiration he denied.

In Christology Theodore was opposed to Augustinianism and thus naturally approximated to Pelagianism, though his position was intermediate. Adam was created mortal. The human will, in its earthly environment, would necessarily be drawn into sin. Adam's sin was riot transmitted, and Christ's work had for its object the enabling of a created and imperfect nature to realize the true end of its being rather than the restoration of a ruined nature. All intelligent beings were included in this purpose, and it would consequently appear that Theodore taught the impossibility of eternal punishment.

The works of this author which are still extant are, *A Commentary on the Minor Prophets* (*Wegner* [Berol. 1834]; Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* [Romans 1832], vol. vi), and *Fragments,* in Mai, *Nov. Patr. Bibl.* 1854, vol. 7. The Greek fragments are more completely given in Fritzsche, *Theod. Mops. in N. Test. Comm.* (Turici, 1847). Pitra, *in Spicil. Solesm.* (Par. 1854), vol. 1, has Latin versions of Theodore's commentaries on Philippians, Colossians, *and* Thessalonians. See also Mercator, *Opp.* ed. Baluz., on the councils growing out of the controversy of the Three Chapters. etc.

Literature. —Dupin, Nouv. Bibl. vol. 3; Cave, *Script. Eccl. Hist. Lit.* p. 217; Tillemont, *Memoires,* vol. 12; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* 9:153 sq. (ed. Harl. 10:346); Norisii *Diss. de Synodo Quinta,* in his *Hist. Pelag. Pat.* 1673, and *per contra* Garner in his *Liberaltus*; the Church histories; Fritzsche, *De Theod. Mops. Vita et Script.* (1836); Klener, *Symbol. Lit. ad Theod. Mops. Pertin.* (Gött. 1836). Also, with reference to exegetical questions, Sieffert, *Theod. Mops. Vet. Test. sobrie Interpr. Vind.* (Regiom. 1827.); Kuhn, *Theod. Mop. u. Jun. Africanus als Exegeten* (Freib. 1880); and the histories of interpretation. With reference to doctrines, the literature of the Pelagian controversy, and especially Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch.* vol. 2. —Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.*; and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodore I

pope, was a Greek by birth, and reigned from 642 to 649. He excommunicated Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, in 646, for holding Monothelite views, and recognized in his stead the banished patriarch Pyrrhus, who had recanted his Monothelite errors while at Rome. Pyrrhus, however, returned to his heretical opinions, and Theodore thereupon pronounced the ban against him. Shortly before his death, in 649, this pope

convened a synod at Rome which rejected the *Typos* promulgated by the emperor Constans II; and he also sent a vicar, in the person of the bishop of Dore, to Palestine in order to dismiss all bishops who should be found to hold the Monothelite heresy, and thus stamp out the sect's adherents. He wrote *Epistola Synodica ad Paulun Patr. Const., and Exemplar Proposit. Constantinople Transmisse adv. Pyrrhum.*

Theodore II

pope, a native Roman, reigned only twenty days in 897.

Theodoret

(θεοδώρητος ; also THEODORITUS) was one of the most eminent ecclesiastics of the 5th century. He was born of reputable, wealthy, and pious people at Antioch in 386 (Garnier) or 393 (Tillemont, *Memoires, 20*:869). His mother was especially devout, and susceptible to the influence of a number of hermit monks, one of whom had relieved her of an apparently incurable affection of the eyes, and another of whom announced to her, after thirteen years of sterile wedlock, that she should give birth to a son. In obedience to their directions, Theodoret was dedicated to the service of God. At the age of seven years he entered the monastery presided over by St. Euprepius, near Antioch; and there he remained for twenty years engaged in theological study. The works of Diodormus of Tarsus, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia formed his mind, and it appears that the latter was the chief of his actual teachers. In time he was appointed lector in Antioch, and afterwards deacon; and in the latter office he acquired such reputation that he was, against his will (*Ep.* 81), consecrated to the bishopric, 420 or 423.

The diocese entrusted to his care had for its seat the impoverished town of Cyrus, or Cyrrhus, the capital of the Syrian district of Cyrrhestia, two days journey to the westward of Antioch, and it included eight hundred parishes. His life as bishop was exemplary, and characterized by charity, public spirit, thorough unselfishness, successful guidance of his clergy, and great zeal for the faith. Though great numbers of Arians, Macedonians, and especially Marcionites were found in his diocese, he succeeded by 449 in regaining them all to the Church. He reports the baptism of no less than ten thousand Marcionites alone. These labors he prosecuted often at imminent risk to his life, and always without invoking the aid of the temporal power.

The quiet tenor of Theodoret's life was interrupted by the Nestorian controversy, whose progress and results embittered his later career. Garnier states (in *Life of Theodoret, 5,* 350) that Nestorius had been Theodoret's fellow-pupil in the monastery of St. Euprepius, and charges the latter with holding, in fact, the views which caused the ruin of the former representative of the Antiochian school. It appears, however, that Theodoret was concerned rather to resist the intolerance of Cyril of Alexandria and combat his errors, opposite to those of Nestorius, than to advocate the views of the latter. With his school, he opposed the unification of the two natures in Christ, and taught that the Logos had assumed, but had not become, flesh. He denied that God had been crucified, and thereby implied that God had not been born, and that the term θεοτκόος could not, in any proper sense, be applied to Mary. It was, of course, impossible that while holding such views he should become an avowed antagonist of Nestorius. In 430 Theodoret addressed a letter to the monks of Syria and surrounding countries in which he charges Cyril with having promulgated Apollinarism, Arianism, and other similar errors in the twelve *Capitula.* In 431, at the Synod of Ephesus, he urged delay in the transaction of business until the Eastern bishops could arrive; and when that advice was disregarded, he united with those bishops in a synod which condemned the proceedings of the council and deposed Cyril. He also headed, with John of Antioch, the delegation which the Orientals sent to the emperor with their confession of faith, whose rejection closed the series of incidents connected with the Ephesian synod. After his return from that mission, Theodoret wrote five books on the incarnation (Πενταλόγιον Ἐνανθρωπώσεως), with the intent of setting forth his views and exposing the heretical tendency of Cyril's tenets and the unjust conduct of his party in the proceedings at Ephesus. Of this work only a few fragments remain, which are derived from the Latin version of Marius Mercator, a bigoted adherent of Cyrillian views. He also wrote a work in defense of the memory of his master, Theodore of Mopsuestia, against the charge of having originated Nestorianism (see Hardouin, *Act. Cone.* 3, 106 sq.). He was however, induced to yield to the pressure brought to bear by John of Antioch on the opponents of the policy of the emperor, and to acknowledge the orthodoxy of Cyril. He also submitted, under protest; to the deposition bf Nestorius. But when the Nestorians were treated with extreme severity in 435, he renounced the idea of peace, and once more stood forth the decided opponent of Cyril.

With *the* accession of Dioscurus as the successor of Cyvril, Theodoret's position became more unfavorable. He opposed Eutychianism, as Cyril's doctrine now came to be called, with inflexible energy; and the new patriarch, in 448, procured an order which forbade him, as a mischief-maker, to pass beyond his diocese. Theodoret defended himself in several letters addressed to prominent personages (*Ep.* 79-82), and wrote repeatedly also to Dioscurus; but the latter responded with publicly anathematizing the troublesome bishop, and finally with causing him to be deposed, in 449, by a decree of the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus. Theodoret now invoked the assistance of the see of Rome, which was readily granted by Leo I; and he also applied to other Occidental bishops (*Ep.* 119). In the meantime he had been sent to the monastery of Apamea, where he was subjected to rigorous treatment until the emperor Theodosius died, in 450, and Pulcheria, with her husband, Marcian, ascended the throne. The imperial policy now changed, and the deposed bishops were set at liberty. Theodoret appeared before the ecumenical synod of Chalcedon in 451 as the accuser of Dioscurus and as a petitioner for the restoration of his bishopric. In this synod he found himself charged with being a Nestorian, and was prevented from making any explanation of his views until he consented to pronounce an anathema on Nestorius. He was thereupon unanimously restored (Hardouin, *Cone.* 2, 496). This action has been very generally condemned by students of history as the one blot upon an otherwise spotless career; but there are not wanting apologists to defend even this (see Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol s.v.* "Theodoret"). It would undoubtedly have been more creditable to him to have resisted the clamor of his enemies at that time. He left the synod with a crusty "farewell," and returned to his bishopric, where he died in 457. The Eutychians anathematized his memory at their synods of 499 and 512, and his name was involved in the controversy of the Three Chapters. *SEE CHAPTERS, THE THREE*.

Theodoret was the author of many works in exegesis, history, polemics, and dogmatics, the exegetical being of chief consequence. He was generally free from the disposition to allegorize, and had a taste for simple and literal exposition. His method is partly expository, partly apologetic and controversial. On the historical books of the Old Test. he rather discusses difficult passages than presents a continuous commentary. He treated the first eight books, and also Kings and Chronicles, on the plan of simply stating and meeting the difficulties they present to the thoughtful

mind, without entering into a consecutive commentary of the several books; but upon other books he wrote expositions in the usual form. His commentaries on Psalms, Canticles, and Isaiah exist no longer save in fragmentary extracts. He wrote also on the remaining prophets, the Apocryphal book Baruch, and the Pauline epistles; and Schröckh preferred Theodoret's commentary on the latter to all others, though it is very defective as regards the statement of the doctrinal contents of the several books. The apologetical work Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτική Παθημάτων, etc., was intended to exhibit the confirmations of Christian truth contained in Grecian philosophy, and affords evidence of the author's varied learning, as do also his ten discourses on Providence. His dogmatico-polemical works are, a censure of Cyril's twelve heads of anathematizaration : — *Franistes, seu Polymorphus,* containing three treatises in defense of the Antiochian Christology, and directed against Eutyches, in 447, one year before the condemnation of that heretic at Constantinople: —a compendium of heretical fables, whose statements are evidently inexact and very superficial; this work contains so harsh a judgment of Nestorius as to lead Garnier to deny its authenticity: twenty-seven books against Eutychianism, an abstract of which is supplied by Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 46). The historical works are two in number. A *History of the Church,* in five books, extending from 325 to 429, which serves to complement Socrates and Sozomen: —and a very much inferior Φιλόθεος Ἱστορία, or *Religiosa Historia,* which contains the lives of thirty celebrated hermits, and is rather the work of a credulous ascetic than of a learned theologian.

There are only two complete editions of Theodoret's works, the first by the Jesuits Sirmond and Garnier (Paris, 1642-84), in five volumes. The last volume was added after Garnier's death by Hardouin. The other edition, by Schulze and Nosselt (Halle, 1769-74, 5 vols. in 10 pts. 5vo), is based on the former, and contains all that is good, while it corrects much that is faulty in its predecessor. For an account of editions of separate works, see Hoffmann, *Lex. Bibl. Script. Graec.*

See Garnier, *Dissertationes,* in vol. 5 of Schulze's ed.; Tillenont, *Mensoires,* vol. 14; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* s.v. "423," p. 405 fol. ed. Basil.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca, 7*:429; 8:277; Schulze, *De Vita et Scriptis Theod. Dissert.* prefixed to vol. 1 of his edition; Neander, *Gesch. d. christl. Rel. u. Kirche,* vol. 2 passim; Schröckh, *Christl. Kirchengesch. 18*:365 sq.; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccl.* Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.*; Herzog, *Real Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodorus

SEE THEODORE; *SEE THEODULUS*.

Theodosians

a sect of dissenters from the Russo-Greek Church, who separated some years since from the Pomoryans, partly because they neglected to purify by prayer the articles which they purchased from unbelievers. They are noted for their honesty and strict observance of the Sabbath. An early Protestant sect bearing this name was formed in Russia in 1552 by Theodosius, one of three monks who came from the interior of Muscovy to Vitebsk, a town in Lithuania. These monks condemned idolatrous rites, and cast out the images from houses and churches, breaking them in pieces, and exhorting the people, by their addresses and writings, to worship God alone, through our Lord Jesus Christ. The inhabitants renounced idolatry, and built a church, which was served by Protestant ministers from Lithuania and Poland.

Theodosius I

Picture for Theodosius

Roman emperor, whose services to the State and the Church earned for him the title of “the Great,” was descended from an ancient family, and born about A.D. 346 at Cauca or at Italica, in Spain. His father was Comes Theodosius, the soldier who restored Britain to the empire. He was trained in the camp of his father, and entered on a military career, approving his talents in a campaign in Moesia in 374, where he defeated the Sarmatians; but he renounced his brilliant prospects when the emperor Gratian caused the elder Theodosius to be beheaded at Carthage in 376, and retired to his estates, where he engaged in agricultural pursuits. The incursions of the Goths soon rendered his services necessary in the field. Gratian called him to fill the place of his colleague Valens, who had fallen at Hadrianople, and he was proclaimed Augustus Jan. 19, 379. He received the government of the East. His conduct of the war was distinguished by the prudence with which he handled the dispirited troops, so that victory was gained without the fighting of pitched battles. On his return he passed through a severe sickness, and, in the belief that his end was near, received baptism at the hands of Ascolius, the orthodox bishop of Thessalonica. His baptism was followed, Feb. 28, 380, by an edict which imposed the Nicene Creed on his

subjects as the faith of the land. Other laws, having regard to the improvement of morals and the welfare of the State, followed on his restoration to health. The Goths were subdued in successive campaigns, and admitted into the empire as allies.

At the time of the accession of Theodosius, Constantinople was the principal seat of Arianism. Demophilus, the Arian prelate, preferred to resign his dignities rather than subscribe the Nicene Creed, and Gregory of Nazianzum was invited to become his successor. He declined the place, but induced the emperor to deprive the Arians of the possession of all churches and other property, and to expel them from the metropolis. The Eunomians experienced similar treatment. The Manichaean heresy was made punishable with death after the Second AEcumenical Council had, in 381, confirmed the Nicene Creed and condemned all heretics. Theodosius also exempted bishops from obedience to the civil tribunals; and to his reign belongs the infamy of first establishing inquisitors of the faith. Measures were also taken to prevent the sacrifice of bloody offerings and the practice of augury among the adherents of heathenism, which induced such votaries to Satire from the cities to more distant and unimportant places. This gave rise-to the terms *pagan* and *paganism* in popular usage when speaking of the polytheistic religions.

In the year 385 the princess Pulcheria died, and soon afterwards the empress Flacilla, panegyrics being pronounced in their honor by Gregory of Nyssa; and in the following year Theodosius married Galla, the sister (f Valentinian II, emperor of the West. The latter with his mother, was expelled from Italy in 387 by Maximus, the usurper who ruled in Spain, Gaul, and Britain; and Theodosius, after he had heard that Maximus favored the pagans, marched against and defeated him. He entered Rome on June 13, 389. In 391 occurred the famous incident inwhich Ambrose, the archbishop of Milan, forbade the emperor to enter his church, and required of him the acknowledgment of his guilt in having delivered over to death 7000 (chiefly innocent) inhabitants of Thessalonica, in retaliation for the murder of his governor, Boteric. The emperor laid aside the insignia of his rank, and entreated pardon for his great sin before the congregation in the Church of Milan; and he issued an edict by which an interval of thirty days was fixed between every severe sentence and its execution.

The affairs of the Western Empire were at length settled, and Valentinian re-established on the throne, so that Theodosius was at liberty to return to

his own capital. On the way, he delivered Macedonia from the robbers who lurked in its forests and swamps, and entered Constantinople in November, 391. Valentinian, however, was slain on May'15, 392, probably at the instigation of Arbogastes, a soldier of Frankish race, whose influence with the army made him more powerful than his lord. Eugenius, a learned rhetorician and skilful courtier, the mere instrument of Arbogastes, became emperor. Theodosius met the usurper in the plains of Aquileia, and achieved a victory which destroyed both Eugenius and Arbogastes, and secured the submission of the West. Four months later Theodosius died, Jan. 17, 395, of dropsy. His body was brought to Constantinople, and buried in the mausoleum of Constantine the Great.

See Zosimus, *Hist.* lib. 4 *passim*; Claudian, *L. Seren.* 50 sq.; *De IV Cons. Hororii*, etc.; Pacatus, *Panegyr. Theod. Aug.*; Themistius, *Oratt.* 5, 6, 16, 18; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 5, 7; Socrates, lib. 5; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 5; Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. 22:29; Jerome, ad an. 379, and *De Viris Illustr.* 133, 103; Ambrose, *Epp.* 17, 21, 27, 28, 51, 67, etc.; id. *De Obitu Theod.* passim; Idathius, *Chronicles p.* 10 sq., and *Fast.* p. 110; Orosius, lib. 7; *Cod. Theod.* passim; Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 5; Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.*'II, vi; Prosper, *Chronicles*; Cedrenus, p. 552 sq.; Greg. Naz. *Carm.* p. 21; *id. Orat.* 25; Theophanes, p. 105 sq.; Libanius, *Orat.pro Templis*, ed. Reiske; Symmachus, *Epist. 10*:17 sq.: Greg. Nyss. *Opp.* tom. 3, ed. Paris; Evagrius, *Hist. ccl. 1*, 20; Eunap. AEdes, c. 4, p. 60 sq.; Paulin, *Vita Ambros. c.* 24; Philostorgius, II, 11; Ambrose, *De Valent. Obitu Cons.* p. 1173. Also Flechier, *Hist. de Thiodose le Grand* (Paris, 1680, 8vo; Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, vol. 5; Gibbon, ch. 4 and 5; Baumgarten, *Allgem. Wfelgesch.* (Halle, 1754) vol. 14; Muller [P. E., *Comment. Hist. de Theodos.* (Gött. 1797 sq.); Rödiger, *De Statu Paganorum sub Imp. Christianis*; Suffken, *De Theod. M.* etc. (Lugd. 1828); Pauly, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*; Ullmann, *Gregory Naziam* (Darmst. 18-25); Olivier, *De Theod. M. Constitutionibus* (Lugd. Bat. 1835); Schröckh, *Christl. Kirchengesch.* vol. 7; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* vol. 1; Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theodotians

a name given to the MONARCHIANS *SEE MONARCHIANS* (q.v.), from their founder, Theodotus (q.v.).

Theodotion

is the name of one of the Greek translators of the Old Test. after the time of the Septuagint (q.v.). According to Epiphanius (*De Pond. et Mens.* c. 17, 19), he was a native of Sinope, in Pontus, and for a time sided with the Marcionites, but left them afterwards and became a Jew. Irenaeus, however, calls him *Ephesitus,* i.e. a native of Ephesus; while Jerome and Eusebius call him an Ebionite, or semi-Christian. Bleak thinks it most probable that Theodotion was a Judaizing heretic, a semi-Christian and Ebionite, according to Jerome's prevailing description of him. His reasons for thinking it probable that he professed to belong to the Christian Church are these two *at.* "We find no trace of the Jews ever making use of his translation, and still less of its having been held in esteem by them: much more was this the case in the Christian Church, which accepted his translation of Daniel for ecclesiastical use. b. He has translated a clause in ²³²⁵Isaiah 25:8, Κατεπόθη ὁθάνατος εἰς νῖκος, precisely as in ⁴⁶¹⁵⁴1 Corinthians 15:54, but thoroughly deviating from the Sept... This concurrence is probably not purely accidental, but is to be explained by Theodotion having appropriated to himself the Pauline translation of the passage; and this, again, makes it extremely probable that he was a Christian at the time of making the translation."

As to the time when this translation was made, ace cording to Epiphanius it was published under the emperor Commodus (A.D. 180-182), which, as Keil remarks, "is not impossible, and can perfectly well be reconciled with the mention of him by Ireensus; yet it is by no means certain. In any case, his translation is not so ancient as that of Aquila, but more ancient than that of Symmachus" (q.v.).

As to the character of the translation, if we receive the testimony of those who had the version in their hands, it approached the Sept. very nearly in sense and phraseology. The mode of translation adopted by Theodotion holds an intermediate place between the scrupulous literality of Aquila and the free interpretation of Symmachus. The translator appears, indeed, to have made the Alexandrian version the basis of his own, and to have abided by it as long as it represents the Hebrew faithfully; departing from it and freely translating for himself *only* where it inadequately expresses the sense of the original. His object was rather to supply the defects of that version than to give a new and independent one; hence the additions found only in the former reappear in his work. From the remaining fragments, it may be

inferred that his knowledge of Hebrew was not great. He has retained Hebrew words not very difficult or obscure, expressing them in Greek letters from ignorance of their meaning: "Praetor alia minus docti interpretis signa quse erudito lectori exploranda remittimus, persaepe illa verba Hebraica, quorum interpretatio non'ita difficilis erat ut vertendi molestiam declinaret, Graecis literis expressit" (Monfaucon, *Prceliminaria,* VII, 3, 129, ed. Bahrdt). Thus, <2302424>Isaiah 3:24, "lygytp=φθιλίλ; 19:15, ^wmga=ἀγμών; 43:20, ynt=θεννίν; <2902917>Joel 2:17, µlwah=οὐλαμ; <1810811>Job 8:11, wja=ἀχύ. But Jahn (*Einleitung,* 1, 178 sq.) conjectures that they were used among the Ebionites, and therefore retained by him — a supposition as improbable as that of Owen, that they were left so for particular reasons, such as the honor of the Jewish nation (*Inquiry into the Present State of the Sept. Version,* p. 108). Among Christians the version of Theodotion was held in higher estimation than that of Aquila and Symmachus; and Origen, in his *Hexapla,* supplied the omissions of the Sept. chiefly from it. At a later period his version of the book of Daniel was universally adopted in the Greek Bible among Christians, instead of the Alexandrian version. According to Bleek, this change occurred some time between the age of Origen and that of Jerome. The latter says, in his *Praef. 3 Daniel.* "Dauielem juxta LXX interpretes Domini Salvatoris ecclesiae non legunt, utentes *Theodotionis* editione, *et cur hoc acciderit nescio.* Sive enim quia sermo Chaldaicus est, et quibusdam proprietatibus a nostro eloquio discrepat, noluertunt Septuaginta interpretes easdem lingume lineas in translatione servare; sive sub nomine eorum a nescio quo non satis Chaldaicam linguam sciente editus est liber, sive aliud quid causse exstiterit ignorans; hoc unum affirmare possum, quod *multum a veritate discordet, et recto judicio repudiatus sit.*" Delitzsch (*De Habacuci Prophetce Vita atque Etate Conzmentatio Historico-isagogica* [Grimae, 1844], p. 28) says, "Quapropter ego (donec proferantur argumenta contrarii) versionem Daliielis Theodotionianam ab ecclesia non prius adoptatam esse censeo, quam ab origene tanquam castigata Alexandrinse editio in Hexapla recepta et ab Eusebio et Pamphilio, cum ex his textum septuagintaviralem ederent, septuagintavirali substituta est." Credner thinks that the Christians were so long under the pressure of contradictions, assaults, and mockeries, from Jews and heathens combined, that finally (though, to be sure, not in general before the end of the 3rd century) they gave up their Greek translation of the Sept., and set that of Theodotion in its place. From a passage by Jerome on <2402917>Jeremiah 29:17, "Theodotion

interpretatus est *sudrinas*; secunda *pessima*; Symmachus *novissimas*," it has been conjectured that there also existed a second edition of Theodotion's version; but Hody (*De Bibliorum Textibus*, p. 584) thinks that the text of Jerome here is corrupt, and that after *sudrinas* we should insert *Aquilae prina editio.*

Besides the literature given in Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 420 sq., see also Davidson, *Biblical Criticism*, 1, 217 sq.; Keil, *Introduction to the Old Test.* 2, 232 sq.; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften* (Berlin, 1877), 4:87; Kaulen, *Einleitung in die heil. Schrift* (Freiburg, 1876), p. 78; Delitzsch, *op. cif.*, p. 28 sq.; Ginsburg, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (Lond. 1861), p. 497 sq. *SEE GREEK VERSIONS*. (B.P.)

Theod'otus

(θεόδοτος, *God-given = Johanan*), one of the, three messengers sent by Nicanor to Judas Maccabseus to negotiate peace (2 Macc. 14:19). B.C. cir. 162.

Theodotus the Fuller

(ὁ σκυτεύς) was a leather dresser who went from Byzantium to Rome about the end of the 2nd century, and there taught Ebionitish doctrines; but the Romish bishop Victor is said to have excommunicated him from the Church. Theodotus maintained that Jesus, although born of the Virgin according to the will of the Father, was a mere man, and that at his baptism the higher Christ descended upon him. But this higher Christ Theodotus conceived as the Son of him who was at once the supreme God and Creator of the world, and not (with Cerinthus and other Gnostics) as the son of a deity superior to the God of the Jews. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 54) associates him with the Aloji. He must not be confounded with another heretical Theodotus (ὁ τραπεζίτης or ἀργυραμοιβός) ivho was connected with a party of the Gnostics, the Melchisedekites. See Neander, *Hist. of Christ. Church*, 1, 580; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 1, 308.

Theodromi

(θεόδρομοι), a term applied to couriers in the early Church. It was their duty to give private notice to every member where and when the Church assemblage was to be held (Baronius, *Anal.* 58, n. 108). See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 8 ch. 7:§ 15.

Theodulph

termed *Aurelianensis,* probably a Goth, was one of the men whom Charlemagne invited to France for the advancement of learning. He was in Gaul as early as 781, and in his classical tendency resembled Alcuin, whose commendation he received. He was, in fact, one of the foremost representatives of the peculiar renaissance poetry called into being by Charlemagne's forcible promotion of culture. His poems are not without value to an understanding of the social condition is of his time. As a theological writer he is less important, his works being limited to tracts — De *Odine Baptismi, De Spiritu Sanctmo-fragments* of sermons, and *Capitula* addressed to the presbyters of his parish. The *Capitula* reveal his care for his clergy, and especially his concern for the establishing, by the clergy, of popular schools throughout the diocese. Charlemagne gave him-the abbey of. Eleury and the bishopric of Orleans, and employed him in affairs of state. In 794 Theodulph was present at the Council of Frankfort. After the death of Charlemagne, he appears to have at first connected himself with the party of Louis the Pious, but afterwards to have desired a more powerful ruler. The complaint laid against him at Aix-la'-Chapelle accused him of conspiring with Bernard of Italy, and he was imprisoned in the monastery of Angers. He was pardoned by Louis, but was soon afterwards snatched away by death, in 821.

Literature. —Hist. Lit. de la France, 4,: 459; Tiraboschi, *Soria della Lett. Ital.* III, 2, 196; Bahr, *Gesch. d. rom. Lit. in Carol. Zeitalter* (Carlsruhe, 1840), § 34, 35, 139; Guizot, *Cours d'Histoire Moderne,* 2, 334, Brussels ed, 2, 334; id. *Hist. de la Civilisation en France,* 2, 197204. Theodulph's poems were collected by Sirmond (Paris, 1646, 8vo). Also in *Bibl. Patr. Max.* (Lugd. 1677), 14:28; and in *Migne, Patrol.* 105. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Theoduilus (or Theodorus)

the name of three bishops who at different times presided over the see of Valais in Switzerland.

1. THEODORUTS was the first bishop of the Church of Valais. He was present at the Synod of Aquileia in 381, which condemned the Arian bishops Palladius and Secundianus, as directed by the command of the emperor Gratian; and his zeal for orthodoxy was such that he refused to recognize Palladius as a Christian and priest. He was especially meritorious

in enhancing the welfare and glory of his own Church, where he is said to have established orthodoxy on an assured basis, and to have discovered the relics of the Thebaic martyrs, in whose honor he subsequently built a church near where the Church of St. Maurice now stands. The influx of pilgrims to this church caused him to devise an appropriate cult, and thereby to give occasion for the organization of a monastery. Theodorus also forwarded relics to Vitricius of Rouen and Martin of Tours, for which thanks are rendered by the former in his *De Laudibus Sanctorum*; and he furnished Isaac, bishop of Geneva, with information respecting the discovery of the famous relics which became the basis of the legend written by Eucherius. Theodorus I thus appears to have been the actual apostle of the country, as he was its first consecrated bishop, and also the founder of the Church of Valais and of the cult which became its boast. His name appears in the oldest liturgical manuscripts of the country, the very ancient *Missale Aledenum,* an ancient *Martyrology* preserved in tie Castle of Valeria in Sion, and in the *Martyrol. Gallic.* . His name occurs also among those of the ten bishops who wrote to pope Siricius from Milan in 390.. After this he disappears, and is accordingly supposed to have died about 391. See the ancient *Acta Conc.*; S. Eucheri *Passio Agaunesium Martyr.*; ancient martyrologies; *Vita Theodul. Episc.* in the Bollandists, ad Aug. 16, 3, 278-280. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

2. THEODULUS or THEODORUS II, bishop of Valais, is mentioned in the spurious articles of endowment by king Sigismund to the Convent of St. Maurice, and was evidently confounded by the author of that document with Theodorus I, as he is made to urge the erection of a new convent and an appropriate endowment, on the ground that the bones of the Thebaic martyrs were yet unburied; all this so late as A.D. 515. Despite the doubts raised by this anachronism, he must be supposed to have existed, as his name occurs in the ancient and trustworthy list of Agaunensian bishops, and in all subsequent lists as well. He is also mentioned by an anonymous contemporary, in the life of abbot Ambrose of St. Maurice, as having raised collections in behalf of the new church edifice, and as having assisted in the collection of relics for its endowment. A new bishop, Constantius, appears in the Synod of Epaon in A.D. 517; the death of Theodorus was accordingly prior to that date. See Bolland, ad Aug. 27.

3. THEODORUS III, preferably called THEODULUS, the most famous, but also the most imperfectly authenticated, bishop of Valais of this name, is reputed to have lived in the time of Charlemagne. The only source for

the assumption that he lived is the legend of St. Theodulus, by Ruodpert, which runs as follows: Theodulus, of the noble family of Grammont, in Burgundy, was invited by Charlemagne to a general council which was to devise means for restoring his peace of mind. All the bishops responded to the monarch's tears with the promise of twenty, and even more, prayers and sacrifices, but Theodulus promised only a single one. His prayer was continued day and night and followed with the mass, so that God sent an angel who revealed to Theodulus the emperor's crime, and assured him that it was forgiven. Thus attested, the emperor could not doubt the bishop's assurance, and rewarded the latter with the praefecture of his country, that he might be able to control the rude inhabitants, while exempting the clergy from the civil authorities. A later addendum to this legend relates that Theodululs had revealed to him by an angel that the pope intended to spend a night in the embraces of a concubine. While thinking upon this revelation, the devil drew near in female form. Theodulus seized him, leaped on his shoulders, and compelled him to serve as a medium of transportation to Rome, where he was able to prevent the papal sin. The Bollandists add to the above a miracle, through which Theodulus filled all obtainable vessels with the juice of a single grape which he had blessed at a time when the vintage had failed. This miracle elevated him to the rank of patron saint of the country, in which character he is still commemorated with great rejoicings on Aug. 16. No martyrologies or similar documents mention this Theodulus. Rudpert is clearly a mythical personage. The bishop under consideration is imaginary, and probably developed out of the fact that donations to the Church of Valais were made *in honorem S. Marice* or *S. Theodori* (*Theoduli*), and the other fact that Charlemagne had a court bishop named Theodore, who dedicated the Church of Zurich. See Gelpke, *Kirchengesch. d. Schweiz,* 1, 91 sq., 120 sq.; 2, 95 sq.; Briguet, *Vallesia Christiana* (1744), p. 48 sq., 95 sq.; Rivaz. *De la Legion Thebenne* (1779), p. 37, etc.; *Comment. Previous* Gulielmi Cuperi, etc. —Herzog, *Real Encyklop. s.v.*

Theognostus

A person of this name is said by Philip of Sida (see Dodwell, *Dissert. in Iren.* [Oxon. 1689], p. 488 sq.) to have presided over the catechetical school of Alexandria in the second half of the 3rd century. Photius calls him an Alexandrian and an exegete; and he was unquestionably an Origenist, in the strict sense. Photius also expressly states that Theognostus shared the errors of Origen with respect to the Trinity, and termed the Son

Icri aycc (comp. Dionys. Alexand., and see Athanasius, *De Blasph. in Spirit. Sanctum*; also Origen, *De Princ.* 1, 3, 7, 63). Theognostus wrote seven books of *Hypotheses,* which, according to Photius, constitute a doctrinal work constructed in the order of *loci*-(1) of God the Father as the exclusive originator of the world (against an assumed eternity of matter); (2) of the Son; (3) of the Holy Spirit; (4) of angels and demons; (5 and 6) of the incarnation; (7) of the world-order. The brief extracts from this work which were preserved by Athanasius in *De Decret. Nic. Synod. §* 25, and a fragment from that father's work *On the Blasphemy of the Holy Ghost* (Athan. *Ep.* 4 *ad Serap. §* 11) may be found in Ronth, *Relig. Sacr.* 3, 221 sq. See Galland, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* 3; Guericke, *De Schola Alexand.* (Halle, 1824), 1, 78; 2, 325 sq.

Theogony

(θεογονία), the name given in ancient Greece to a class of poems recounting the *genealogy of the gods.* Musaeus is said to have written the earliest Theogony; but his work, as well as the theogonies of Orpheus (q.v.) and others, have perished; that of Hesiod being the only one that has come down to us. This has been translated by Thomas Cook (Lond. 1728, 2 vols. 4to).

Theologal

The third Lateran Council, held in 1179, ordered that teachers should be appointed to the various churches and-monasteries who should instruct the clergy, and be rewarded for their labors with suitable benefices. The fourth Lateran Council repeated this ordinance, and provided in Canon 10 that only capable men should be appointed in cathedrals and convent churches, who should, in their capacity of masters, assist the bishops in preaching, hearing confessions, imposing ecclesiastical penalties, and otherwise promoting the welfare of Christians. Canon 11 provided, in addition, that, where the means of a church permitted, a good teacher of grammar should be appointed; while metropolitan churches should appoint a theologian, whose business it should be to instruct the clergy and other religionists in the knowledge of Holy Scripture and all other matters which are important to the care of soils. This teacher should be allowed the income from a prebend so long as he continued to perform the functions of his office, but should not rank as a canon; and it was to such instructors that the name of *theologal* was given. The Council of Basle ordered the more general

employment of *theologals.* See *Fortgesete Samml. v. alten u. neuen theol. Sachen* (Leips. 1721), p. 968; Mansi, *Sacr. Cone. Nova et Ampliss. Collectio* (Venet 1778), 22:998 sq. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Theologia Germanica

(the German title is *Büchlein von der deutschen Theologie*) is the title of the famous theological work, by an unknown author, which was discovered by Luther and published for the first time by him in 1516. The title implies merely that it is a German theological work, and is not to be understood as asserting the spirit of exclusiveness to which Poiret objected, in any degree.

The contents of the book are entirely in harmony with the writings of Tauler, Suso, and other mystics connected with the *Friends of God* of the 14th century. Its object is to teach self-renunciation, the laying-aside of our own and the accomplishing of the Divine will. It declares that only our self-will separates man from God, the perfect one; it was self-will that changed angels into devils, and it is this alone which feeds the flames of hell. Haughty and opinionated minds, it asserts, aim at perfection in other ways than that of humility and obedience. In this their conduct resembles that of the devil, and they can accordingly end only in ruin. Communion with God is to be had only when the soul passes through repentance and is purified from sin and selfishness, thus attaining to enlightenment. Love and the practice of virtue are also requisite to true enlightenment, as is, in addition, a cheerful endurance of trials and temptations. Thus enlightened, a soul attains to union with God and enters into unending perfection.

The book has been attributed to various authors, e.g. Eblendus, Tauler, etc., but without authority. Luther's preface declares that it was written by a priest and custos in the "Deutschherrn" house at Frankfort-onthe-Main. A manuscript copy, discovered by Dr. Reuss of Wtirzburg, calls it simply *Der Frankfurter.* Hamberger, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.,* thinks that the priest Heinrich of Rodelheim has been shown beyond controversy to be its author. The question of authorship is a difficult one, because the writer, who was associated with the *Friends of God,* intentionally followed the custom of those mystics in writing anonymously.

The fact that Luther first gave publicity to the work caused it to be regarded in time as the special property of Protestants. The Romish Church at first paid no attention to it, though it gave occasion to the Bavarian

bishop Pirstinger to write a *Tewtsche Theologey* from his point of view. In March, 1621, however, the *German Theology* was placed on the *Index.* A recent Romish theologian, Gunther, has charged it with pantheistic tendencies; but this is evidently malicious, since it strains the language of a book which does not pretend to a strictly scientific character further than the case will warrant. Luther's edition of 1516 was incomplete; but the second edition comprehended the whole work, and was accompanied with a preface from his pen. Numerous editions followed in rapid succession, Luther himself adding five to those already mentioned. The most desirable edition is perhaps that of Johann Arndt, who supplements Luther's preface with an excellent one by himself (1631). The manuscript discovered by Dr. Reuss was edited by Dr. Pfeiffer, of Vienna (2nd ed. 1855). This version is more complete than Luther's, particularly in the first third and near the end of the work. Repeated translations have been made into Low-German, Flemish, English, Latin, and French; the best known English version being that of Miss Susanna Winkworth, with preface by Rev. C. Kingsley, and introduction by Prof. Stowe (Andover, 1856).Lisco, *Heilslehre des Theologia Germanica,* etc. (Stuttgart, 1857), and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theologian

one who treats of theology, or the science of things divine. The most ancient Greeks used the latter term in the sense of *narratio de deo,* and those who wrote the history of the gods, their works and exploits, were called θεολόγοι. Moses is called by Philo θεολογεῖν when he gives the history of the creation. Among the Romans, from the time of Numa Pompilius to that of the emperors the knowledge and worship of the gods were made subservient to the interests of the State. Thus, according to Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, 6:1), there were three kinds of theology — the *poetical,* or that of the poets; the *physical,* or that of the philosophers; and the *political,* or that of the legislators. The Greek Christians originally designated any deep philosophical apprehension of the truths of religion by the term *Gnosis* (knowledge), which was opposed to *Pistis* (faith). First, during the 3rd and 4th centuries, the word theology came into use especially in connection with such of the fathers as defended the doctrine of the deity of the Logos. In this sense the evangelist John and Gregory of Nazianzum were termed theologians. During the same period, the word theology was applied to the doctrine of the Trinity. In the century following, Theodoret widened its application by applying it to the whole

circle of theoretical instruction in: religion. Finally, in the 12th century, Abelard, in his *Theologia Christiana,* gave the word that comprehensive signification it still bears, as expressive not only of a theoretical, but also of a practical, exposition of religious truth. In general, therefore, theology is the knowledge of God carried to the highest degree of perfection in respect to correctness, clearness, and evidence of which it is susceptible in this world.

Theology is divided into two great branches —

(1) *Natural,* or that which relates to such disclosures of himself as God has made in the outward world; and

(2) *Revealed,* or such as he has made through his spoken and written word. Eminent writers in the latter department of theology, as Schleiermacher, Hagenbach, Pelt, Godet, and others, present different methods of arranging the different subjects embraced in this study. *SEE THEOLOGY*. The arrangement adopted by Dr. J. M'Clintock is given in the article METHODOLOGY *SEE METHODOLOGY* (q.v.). The different branches are discussed under their several heads. *SEE APOLOGETICS*; *SEE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY*; *SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY*; *SEE ETHICS*; *SEE POLEMICS*, etc.

Theologus

is the title of a clerical instructor of the clergy associated in chapters, etc., who was appointed, by the authority of several councils, to teach the Holy Scriptures; the *Theologal* (q.v.).

Theology

(from θεός, *God,* and λόγος, *discourse*). is not to be interpreted simply as its etymology requires, as *the doctrine of God,* nor yet historically, as the doctrine of the Trinity, but is to be understood with reference to a definite range of life which it is to bring into the consciousness and apprehend both theoretically and practically. Theology is not, consequently, the doctrine of the Christian religion, nor of the self-consciousness of God in man, as speculative theology is wont to speak, nor yet of the feeling of the Absolute. It is primarily the shaping of a life in man; in the language of Steenstrup, the Danish divine, it is an internal habit, which lies deeper than the intellect. This has been conceded since the time of Schleiermacher with reference to both religion and theology. Rudelbach describes it as a science

of divine things mediated by the Spirit of God. Vilmar teaches that true theology is esoteric in form, because truly scientific; but also practical, because it involves piety and the entire contents of religion. It sustains to the practical life; however, only the relation of idea to practice. The heart of the Christian life is, moreover, not religion, but the kingdom of God, or God's organic revelation to the world-the Church (see Storr, Schleiermacher, Baumgarten-Crusius, and many Romish theologians; also Kling, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 12:600-606). Theology thus becomes the science of the unfolded, objective self-manifestation of the Divine Spirit in the phenomenal kingdom of God a *practical* science which develops progressively and side by side with that kingdom. But it is nonetheless a *positive* science also through its relation to the kingdom. Schleiermacher (*Kurze Darstell.* etc.) describes Christian theology as the comprehension of all that scientific knowledge and those scientific methods without whose possession and use a harmonious direction of the Christian Church, i.e. a Christian Church government is not possible. This definition is, however, too external; for in the material of theology all truth finds its goal, and that fact should be expressed in its definition. Both the object and the scientific character of theology will be retained if the latter be defined as the scientific self-consciousness of the Church with reference to its development through the Holy Spirit, or, more briefly, its self-consciousness with respect to its self-edification.

From this definition theology branches out into particular departments. The self-consciousness has for its *first* task the apprehension of the Church in actuality by determining its *historical* origin, development, and present state. *Historical theology* is the history of the kingdom of God consciously apprehended. It subdivides into the three special branches of Sacred History, Ecclesiastical History, and Ecclesiastical Statistics.

The determination of sources and portrayal of the outworking and development of the leading principles by which events are governed are of primary importance in historical study. The first source here is wholly unique, being the *might of the Divine Spirit.* The source for the beginnings of the Christian Church is, at the same time, a regulative guide and vivifying principle to the Church. By the side of other sources it affords knowledge respecting the time of the origin of the Old Covenant, and its development until it became the New, and it possesses unquestionable authority as the earliest witness to the operative power of the Divine Spirit

in the world, and consequently as its mediating principle, or as the *Bible*, the only sacred book.

The first part of historical theology is consequently a knowledge respecting the Bible (Biblical theology, in the wider meaning). It is all-important to determine what books belong to the Bible, and this is the business of the *Canon.* The whole Bible is to be authenticated both in its parts and its text; to accomplish this is the work of historical and textual *criticism. Introduction* to the books of the Old and New Tests. (*Isagogics*), or, more exactly, *the History of the Canon and of Biblical Literature,* presents the collective material to view, and is followed by *philological* and *theological* exposition. The scientific conception of this expository work is *Hermeneutics,* or the art of interpretation. The history of the Word of God, the Divine Revelation, and the presentation of its contents which have attained to their development are given in Sacred History (and Archaeology) and in Biblical Dogmatics and Ethics-usually termed, in Germany, Biblical Theology of the Old and New Tests.; the latter being the final and gradually developing phase of the Divine Revelation, whose central point is the establishing of the kingdom of divine grace through Jesus Christ. This science is theologico-historical, and therefore deals largely with details, e.g. the particular doctrinal contents of separate Old-Test. books, etc.

Personal convictions are of great importance in this connection. Without being rooted in the Divine Revelation, no apprehension of its meaning is possible. The contents of the Revelation as appropriated both by the individual and the Church must accordingly be received into the scientific consciousness, which indicates the task *of scientific theology.* The latter, however, does not derive its contents directly from the Bible, but through numerous intermediate agencies, to contemplate which is the work of Ecclesiastical History, and, in so far as they belong to the present age of the Church, of Ecclesiastical Statistics.

Ecclesiastical History portrays the history of the kingdom of God in time from the founding of the Christian Church on the day of Pentecost to the present day, having the end of prophecy continually in view as its goal. It directs its attention more prominently either to the outward development of that kingdom in the Church and the life as renewed and inspired by Christianity (Church History), or to the consciousness of that development and its contents the History of Doctrines and the connected History of

Christian Ethics, Literature, and Art. The study of Sources, Geography, Chronology, etc., likewise involves much that is peculiar, and requires the separate theological treatment of those branches, in consequence of which originate Patristics, Ecclesiastical Archaeology, History of Liturgies, etc.

The present not only forms the limit of development at which the kingdom of God has arrived, but also the ground on which we stand. The description of this ground is the work of Ecclesiastical Statistics. It includes both external and internal conditions, both of the faith and the life, and gives rise, on the one hand, to Statistics of Churches in different countries and of different denominations and sects, and, on the other, to Historical Symbolics.

Inquiry into, the faith and morals of different denominations leads from Statistics over to *Systematic Theology*. The nature of the latter is determined by the nature of the Christian consciousness as based on a new life in the individual and the race. The development of that consciousness into scientific knowledge requires, first, an assured recognition of the principles which underlie the kingdom of God as manifested in Christianity; next, an unfolding of the contents of such principles in systematic form; and, finally, a recognition of the relation of this knowledge to the universe of human knowledge. In this way is obtained a science of the principles and the particular phenomena of Christianity as they are given in its history (the science of Christian principles or fundamentals), a science of their doctrinal and ethical contents generally, and also in the particular confessions (thetical theology), and a philosophy of Christianity (parallel to the philosophy of law in a different field of ethics).

As Systematic Theology does not proceed from the Christian convictions of the individual, but from those of the entire Church or of one of its subordinate parts, it provides room for Ecclesiastical Tradition. The starting-point is the idea of the kingdom of God which rests on the Word of God as objectively presented to us in the Canon, as approved in the heart in the character of Christ, and as given in Tradition in the forms of faith, custom, constitution, and methods. The consummation is in the Dogma, in which God’s kingdom is the object of the scientific consciousness of the general Church, or, under historical limitations, assumes a definite form in the particular denomination (Denominational Principles or Systematic Symbolics). At this point the doctrinal consciousness discovers its variation from the systems of other

denominations and of morbid apparitions within the Church to which it belongs. The latter observation gives rise to Polemics, or, better, the Discussion of ethical and doctrinal excrescences in the Church (analogous to pathology in medicine).

The ground has thus been prepared for the founding and establishing of Thetical Theology, the confessional Dogmatics and Ethics as traditionally determined on the basis of the underlying faith. Here the dogma, in its character of scriptural truth subjectively apprehended and handed down in the Church by authoritative tradition, attains to its complete development; and here the various doctrines are combined into a system through the labors of critical, religiously ethical, and systematic scholars. The true relation is accurately indicated by the oxymoron in the phrase “the science of the faith.” Unquestionable certainty is given in the faith, but the mind transmutes this successively and partially into knowledge.

This dogmatico-ethical process begets a system of knowledge respecting God and divine things. This constitutes Speculative Theology, the last result of a philosophy of Christianity which was conceived in mysticism, unfolded in theosophy, sifted by criticism, and formed by speculation, and now presents Christianity with the science of it as the center and goal of all culture and as the crown of the scientific labors of the entire human race. Christianity is here presented as a religion, and as the highest manifestation of religion, and also as the complete realization of the kingdom of God on earth through a progressive development, which reaches down to the final consummation; and in this light Christianity is presented as the central feature in the philosophy of human history.

The duty of the Church to insure its own edification through the power of the Holy Spirit comes into prominence here, as it does in the historical department. That edification is Ecclesiastical Praxis, and the scientific understanding of its foundations and methods constitutes Practical Theology, the third principal branch of theological science. The starting-point of this science is the energy of the Christian life, which is to be perfected. Practical theology is the science of human operations within the kingdom of God and as enabled by the Holy Spirit, to the end that that kingdom may be fully developed. Only through God can we arrive at God, in knowledge as in feeling or in practice.

The setting forth of these fundamentals, and of the methods by which the organism of God’s kingdom, particularly in the Church, is to be erected on

them, is the work of the science of Ecclesiastical Foundations, otherwise the science of the principles of Practical Theology, which finds its completion in the science of Church organization. We next discover a separate department of Church law, which constitutes the *second part* of Practical Theology, and subdivides into Church law and Church government (in a restricted sense, Church polity; in an unrestricted, the care of souls). The process of self-edification under the Holy Spirit's influence, moreover, gives rise to a recognition of the means through which this is achieved, and thereby originated a *third* technical part. covering the theories of art methods in the different Christian churches, which are known, with reference to the shaping of the external forms of worship so that they may represent the worship of the inner man, as Liturgics; with reference to the proclamation of the Word of God, as Homiletics or Keryktics; with reference to the training of the young, as Christian Pedagogics and Catechetics; with reference to the conversion of heathen and other false religionists, as Halieutics and Theory of Missions, and with reference to the organization of scientific instruction for the Church, as Ecclesiastical Paedeutics, which has to do with the Christian organization of institutions of learning, as the placing of theological faculties in universities, the founding of theological seminaries, etc. Theological literature cannot, of course, be brought within any rule, but may be classified in conformity with its manner of entering upon the arena of the Christian and the Church life. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.* *SEE THEOLOGIAN*.

See Pelt, *Theol. Encyklop.* (Hamb. and Gotha, 1843), with whose theory the above article is substantially agreed. *SEE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THEOLOGY*, with the literature there referred to.

Theology, Biblical.

SEE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

Theology, Dogmatical.

SEE DOGMATICAL THEOLOGY.

Theology, Exegetical.

SEE EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

Theology, Natural.

SEE NATURAL THEOLOGY.

Theology, New England

including “New Divinity,” “Edwardean Divinity,” “Hopkinsianism,” etc.

I. *Origin and Development.* —The original theology of New England was the strict Calvinism of the Reformed standards. In 1648 the Westminster Confession was formally adopted by the synod convened at Cambridge, and it remained the standard of faith for all “the New English churches” until 1680, when “the elders and messengers of the churches in the colony of the Massachusetts in New England” substituted the confession drawn up by the Congregationalists of the mother country, and known as the “Savoy Confession.” In 1708 the Connecticut churches made the same change. This substitution was in neither case demanded by a changed theological sentiment in the churches, the Savoy Confession being almost word for word identical with the Westminster, except on points connected with Church polity. Its Calvinism was equally strict. Not long after this, however, strong and independent minds began to appear in the ranks of the New England ministry, whose philosophical acumen and practical earnestness could not rest satisfied with a theological system which to them seemed palpably inconsistent in parts, and morally paralyzing as a whole. These, prompted partly by their own subjective difficulties, and partly by the exigencies and influences of the period which witnessed the rise of New England Unitarianism, the introduction of Universalism, the visits of Charles Wesley and George Whitefield the planting of Methodism, the Revolutionary War, the abolition of slavery in the New England states, the defection from orthodoxy of Harvard College and the largest churches of Massachusetts, the end of the compulsory support of religion by taxes, the fall of the Lockean and the rise of a transcendental school of philosophy, the extension of the Baptist and of the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches over all the New England States, the foundling of the noble missions of the American Board — not to mention remoter and less important events — commenced a series of modifications in the traditional Calvinistic system of doctrine designed to render it more rational, more palatable to the believer, and more easily defensible against the assailant. The process has been going forward with a good degree of steadiness ever since the days of president Edwards. One has suggested change in one

part, another in another; one has brought forward a metaphysical novelty, another a theological one, a third an ethical; liberal and progressive influences have become incorporated in organs and institutions; free pulpits have popularized the various innovations; new generations have grown up under the influence of the improved doctrination; in short, an almost complete theological revolution has gradually taken place. In their earliest development, the more generally received of these new views were styled'" New-light Divinity;" then "New Divinity," afterwards "Edwardean;" sometimes "Hopkintonian" or "Hopkinsian." From the fact that Edwards, Hopkins, West, and Catlin resided in Berkshire County, the system was at one time called "Berkshire Divinity." When embraced in Great Britain by Andrew Fuller, Dr. Ryland, Robert Hall, Sutcliffe, Carey, Jay, and Erskine, it was called "American Theology," to distinguish it from the European systems. In this country it has often been denominated "New England Theology," in order to discriminate it from systems that have prevailed in other parts of the land. This term, however, is far from satisfactory, partly because the New England theology of to-day is very different from the New England theology of a hundred and fifty years ago, and partly because, in speaking of the New England theology of recent times, the term must be used in a sense sufficiently wide and vague to include differing types of doctrine historically associated with various individual divines and with the Andover, New Haven, and East Windsor (now Hartford) schools.

The precise relation sustained by the elder Edwards (1703-58) to this theological development has long been, and still remains, a subject of controversy. The advocates of the most advanced -new views are anxious to claim him as the real father of the whole movement, while the Old-school writers, with equal zeal, endeavor to guard the good man's memory from so "slanderous" an allegation. The former appeal to the "Ten Improvements in Theology," enumerated by the younger Edwards (*Works,* 1, 481) as having been "made by his father," and claim that such a list entitles their author to the very first rank among the innovators upon New England orthodoxy. The latter find in this enumeration of the younger Edwards only an effort on the part of its author to magnify the number and character of his father's theological novelties, in order the better to prepare the way for the introduction of his own more radical and dangerous ones. One writer (in *Princeton Rev.* Oct. 1858) has attempted to show that president Edwards's only deviations from the current Calvinism of his age

were confined to two points-viz., he held to *mediate* instead of *immediate* imputation; and, secondly, advocated "an eccentric philosophical theory of virtue." The true state of the case would seem to be that Edwards, without intending to initiate, or even to occasion, such a grand revolution, really advanced principles and made statements which afterwards suggested, and almost logically necessitated, the peculiar views and even phraseology of his successors (see Park, *On the Rise of the Edwardean Theory of the Atonement*).

To present a complete delineation of New England theology, it would be necessary to write a critical history of New England speculation. Contributions and modifying influences have come from so many sources that even then it would be exceedingly difficult to apportion to each of the original elaborators his precise due. This difficulty is greatly enhanced by the intimacy of the relations, which subsisted among them. So close were those relations that in some instances it is next to impossible to determine the real authorship of important modifications. Edwards. Bellamy, and Hopkins, the "great triumvirate of New England theologians," were not merely contemporaries, they were confidential friends, reciprocal teachers and learners, mutual givers and receivers, allied investigators of divine truth: Each had peculiarities of belief, each held fast to the substance of the old Calvinistic system; but there was substantial agreement in much that was new and revolutionary. For many years they enjoyed the most favorable opportunities for the interchange of sentiments, mutual stimulation, and influence. Their relations to the generation succeeding were also intimate. The first was father of Dr. Edwards, the second his theological teacher, the third was his most valued counselor, and was intimately associated with him in the examination of his father's MSS. West was a confidential companion of Bellamy and Hopkins, intimate also with Drs. Edwards, Smalley, and Emmons. Through Dr. Edwards the spirit of the triumvirate was transmitted to his pupils Dwight and Griffin, to his friends Backus and Smalley. Smalley was a pupil of Bellamy, the instructor of Emmons, the friend of Hopkins and West. To ascertain the exact contribution of any one of these to the actual development is evidently a task of the greatest difficulty.

About the year 1756 there were four or five clergymen whose views had come to be popularly distinguished as "Edwardean." In 1773 the number had increased, according to Dr. Stiles, to about forty-five. During this year Dr. Hopkins published his *Inquiry into the Nature of True Holiness*,

elaborating the Edwardean theory more perfectly than Edwards had done; and, in a voluminous appendix, defending it against the objections which Mr. Hart and others had published against it. Thenceforth the Edwardeans were generally denominated “Hopkinsians.” This new term, though first applied to the New Divinity with special reference to its doctrine of the utter sinfulness of all acts preceding regeneration, was soon used to designate all Calvinistic divines who favored the doctrines of general atonement, natural ability, the active nature of all holiness and sin, and the justice of God in imputing to men none but their own personal transgressions. Their number in 1796, according to Dr. Hopkins, was upwards of a hundred. Dr. Stiles enumerates as among the champions of the new system in 1787 the two Edwardses. Bellamy, Hopkins, Trumbull, Smalley, Judson, Spring, Robinson (father of Dr. Edward Robinson), Strong, Dwight, Emmons. In 1799 Hopkins appended the names of West, Levi Hart, Backus, presidents Balch and Fitch. A later pen has added the honored names of Dr. Catlin, president Appleton, and Dr. Austin. At the present time the peculiarities of New-school New England theology have very general prevalence in the orthodox Congregational churches of the New England and Western States, and are favored by many in other Calvinistic bodies. They are taught in the theological seminaries of Andover, New Haven, Bangor, and Chicago. They are disseminated by quarterly and other organs of marked ability, among which the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and *The New-Englander*, hold the first rank. They have affected the current theological teachings of the Baptist churches not a little; and the great schism which divided the Presbyterian Church in 1837 was chiefly traceable to their influence in that communion. *SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES*.

II. *Relation to Original Calvinism.* —The metaphysical and ethical principles accepted by the New-school representatives of modern New England theology, and fundamental to their system of doctrine, are the following:

(1.) There is a radical distinction between necessity and certainty.

(2.) All sin is of an active and voluntary nature; the same is true of all holiness.

(3.) Although in every exercise the human will possesses the natural power of contrary choice, still, as a matter of fact, it is invariably

determined by motives. In other words, although the will always *can* choose the least apparent good, it always *will* choose the greatest apparent good.

(4.) Natural ability must in all cases equal obligation. (5.) Moral character or deserts are in no case transferable. In logically adhering to these principles and such as these in all their theological applications, the Edwardean divines have deviated from the old Calvinistic system in the following important theological, anthropological, and soteriological points:

1. *Predestination.* —They do not teach that God decrees the violations of moral agents in such a sense as to make those volitions necessary, but only that he has determined so to make and place men that they will act just as they do. In this manner God's decrees secure the certainty of men's choices, but do not secure their necessity. He predetermines all that lies back of the volition — the sensibilities of the agent and whatever may act on these — which predetermination enables him to foresee the result. At the same time, the agent is able in any case to choose otherwise than he actually does; and ought to make a holy choice even where God foresees that the choice will be sinful, and actually decrees to do that which will in fact result in the sinful choice or to omit that which would prevent it.

2. *Original Sin.* —Denying that there can be any ill desert prior to personal transgression, they repudiate the old Calvinistic doctrine respecting the imputation of Adam's guilt to his posterity, both in its mediate and immediate forms, with their realistic and diathetic justifications or theodicies. In its place they maintain that, in consequence of Adam's transgression, all men are so made and placed that they will uniformly, certainly, but freely, choose wrong rather than right. This constitution is not sin, but merely the sure occasion of it.

3. *The Atonement.* —

(1.) As to its *nature,* they teach that the sufferings of Christ were a satisfaction, not to the distributive, but only to the general, justice of God. He suffered not the exact penalty of the law, but pains substituted for that penalty and answering its purpose in the securement of the ends of the moral government.

(2.) As to *the ground of its necessity*. The necessity for an atonement was governmental, not arbitrary or ontological.

(3.) *Fruits*:

(a) simply release from the curse of the law, and thus mediately the blessings to the reception of which that curse was a bar (Emmons), or

(b), all blessings whatsoever (Griffin and the main body).

(4.) *Extent.* The atonement was not designed for the elect alone, but was made for all men as truly as for any.

4. *Justification* does not consist in any real or hypothetical transfer of the righteousness of Christ to the believer, but in pardoning his sins for Christ's sake and treating him as if innocent (Emmons), as if holy (main body).

5. *Regeneration.* —Objecting to old Calvinistic descriptions of this work, the New England theologians define it

(a) as a divine communication of a new spiritual taste or relish (elder Edwards, Dwight, etc.); or

(b), as a spiritual illumination (Bellamy); or

(c), as a (human) change of governing purpose under the influences of the Holy Spirit (Taylor, Finney, etc.); or

(d), as a gradual conversion by the moral suasion of the Holy Spirit (peculiar to Gilbert and his sympathizers); or

(e), as that radical change of the soul which is produced by the interposition of the Holy Spirit, and which consists in a change in the balance of the sensibilities and a change of preference from wrong to right (Prof. Park); or

(f), as a restoration of that life-communion with which God was lost by sin (Bushnell). Professor Park would apply the term regeneration to the work instantaneously wrought by the Holy Spirit on the nature of the soul, and the term conversion to the first holy act of the soul itself, the work of God preceding the free act of the soul in the order of nature, though not of time. By some the soul in this change is called wholly active (Emmons, Spring,

Pond); by others, wholly passive (Smalley, Burton); by others, both active and passive (Park).

6. *Perseverance.* —The elect can fall away after regeneration, even totally and finally, but never will. This is maintained by most on purely Biblical, as distinguished from psychological, grounds.

Other points might be adduced on which original Calvinism and the new tenets are far from accordant; but these are the most fundamental, and the differences above indicated will be found a key to the whole system. Perhaps nothing better illustrates the spirit of the two than their respective views of the final end of God in creation and providence. According to Old Calvinism, that end — the end to which all minor ones are subordinated — is the manifestation of God's character, particularly his justice and mercy, to intelligent creatures; according to Dr. Taylor, of New Haven, as understood by many, it is the production of the largest amount of *happiness* possible, holiness being simply a means thereto; according to Andover, and perhaps the main body of New England Calvinists of the New School, it is the securement of the largest amount of *holiness,* the highest happiness being simply a natural consequence. (But see a somewhat different representation of Taylor's views by president Porter in *The New-Englander* for 1860, p. 726-773.)

The controversy respecting the "Doings of the Unregenerate" has been quite too prominent in the history and development of this New Divinity to be passed over in silence. There have been three theories:

(1.) That man is under obligation to repent at once, and that all moral choices before repentance are sinful and must be utterly forbidden (Emmonis, Spring, Park).

(2.) That man is under obligation to repent immediately, but lie may perform preliminary acts which are neither sinful nor holy, and hence are not forbidden (Taylor).

(3.) (Corresponding with the Old-school theory) That while all acts of choice are sinful before repentance, it is still right to exhort men to the performance of certain acts before repentance, as this is the most probable method of securing their repentance (Dwight).

III. *Relation to Original Arminianisn.* —The representatives of old-fashioned Calvinism have often charged that the modifications introduced

by the Edwardean divines have simply brought about a substitution of the Arminian system for the Calvinistic one of the primitive New England churches. The teachings of New England theology with respect to the absolute dependence of individual salvation upon individual divine election, as also with respect to "special" grace and to human ability considered apart from the gracious aids of the Holy Spirit, do not sustain this charge; but in almost every other principle and doctrine the allegation is, in our view, susceptible of the fullest substantiation.

1. Take the "five points" of the original Arminian controversy. The Calvinists affirmed and the Arminians denied

(1) that the decrees of God respecting the eternal salvation or damnation of individual men are irrespective of the use they may make of their own freedom;

(2) that in the divine purpose and by divine decree the benefits of the atonement are limited to unconditionally elected individuals;

(3) that in consequence of original sin all persons naturally engendered from Adam are in such a condition of spiritual death that without that effectual calling and supernatural renovation which is by divine decree limited to the elect they can do absolutely nothing either towards the fulfillment of God's law or towards an effectual appropriation of the benefits of redemption;

(4) that those gracious influences of the Holy Spirit which are adapted and sufficient to lead a sinner to true repentance and salvation are restricted to a portion of the race, namely, to the unconditionally elect; and

(5) that true believers cannot, by any possibility, totally and finally fall from grace. In every one of these memorable issues of the Remonstrant and Contra-Remonstrant parties the representatives of New England theology stand with the original Arminians.

2. The same *metaphysical* and *ethical principles un*derlie the two systems. We will review them in the order before given:

(1.) Certainty as distinguished from necessity. This was a favorite Arminian distinction (see Arminius, 1, 280, 281; 3, 402, 411, 416, 423, 425; *Epistolae Theologicae,* epist. 19:72 [Arminius]; Curcellaets, p. 774, etc.).

(2.) Active and voluntary nature of sin and holiness, universally maintained by the Arminian divines (see, for instance, Episcopius, 2, 92 b; Curcellseus, p. 136, 137, 902, 904; Limborch, II, 23:15; III, 4:8; V, 3, 2).

(3.) Self-determination in view of motives. According to New school New England theology, the will invariably chooses the greatest apparent good. This may be deemed incompatible with Arminian principles. Properly explained, however, it does not seem to be so. The theory is not that the will invariably chooses the greatest *real* good proffered for choice, nor even the greatest *apparent* good as estimated by the cool exercise of judgment, but simply that it chooses that good which appears to the subject, organized, circumstanced, and disposed as he is, as most desirable. It is only saying, in other words, that a man invariably chooses just as under the circumstances at that moment the state of his mind prompts him to choose. But,

(a), the Arminian authorities *never denied* this position. They denied that the mere absence of co-action constituted liberty (Episcopius, 1, 356,357 a); but New England divines do the same. They denied that mere spontaneity is liberty in its full sense (ibid. p. 198 b; Curcellaeus, p. 158,159); but the New England divines do the same. They denied, as did Leibnitz, that the decision of the will is invariably determined "ab ultimo judicio rationis practico" (Episcopius, 1, 209 b sq.; Curcellaeus, p. 985; Limborch, p. 131, etc.); but in the form propounded to them, the divines of New England would ill like manner repudiate it. They denied that the will is necessarily determined by motives; but this doctrine is rejected with equal explicitness by champions of Newschool New England theology.

(b.) The will in all rational choices invariably acts in view of a good (Episcopius, 1, 202 b, et al.).

(c.) The will is able to choose the least apparent good. This follows from the Arminian doctrine of power to the contrary. It is also illustrated in choices between objects of equal apparent desirableness. "Si paria offerat, quorum alterum talltumn eligendum est, libertas plenaria locum habebit" (ibid. p. 207).

(d.) In all deliberate choices men *ordinarie* follow the decision of the judgment; when not, it is because "alia quaedam causa impediat" (ibid. *De Libero Arbitrio*, VIII, 9).

(e.) They will never choose evil as evil, or "sub ratione mall" (ibid. 1, 215 b, 318 sq.).

(f.) Though the will does not invariably choose the greatest good according to the decision of the judgment, it does in all rational choices invariably choose thatgood which seems the most desirable to the whole man. This doctrine seems to be clearly implied in cap. 10 of Episcopius, *Examen Sententiea Cameronis.* The apparent contradiction found in cap. 8 of his *Responsio ad Defensionem Cameronis* is easily solved by observing that according to the doctrine of Episcopius, as according to that of the New England divines, the will does not invariably follow the dictate of reason, nor invariably follow the dictate of the *natura appetitiva,* both which maintenances are perfectly consistent with the doctrine in question — to wit, that the will invariably chooses the good which to the whole man under the inward, and outward conditions seems the most desirable. On this point, then, so far is the doctrine of the Newschool divines of New England from being incompatible with Arminian teachings that, on the contrary, that doctrine finds in Remonstraint literature some of its earliest and most carefully guarded enunciations.

(4.) Obligation cannot transcend ability-an axiom with the Arminians (see Arminius, *Declaratio,* passim; Curcellaeus, p. 96 b; also VII, 2, *passim*; Limborch, III, 4:7, etc.). Here we may remark that the distinction between *natural* and *moral* ability is much older than its emergence in New England theology, being clearly laid down in several of the elder Arminian divines (see Episcopius, 2, 94 a; Curcellaeus, p. 156, 421).

(5.) Intransferableness of moral character and deserts, strongly asserted by Episcopius, 2, 151 b; by Curcellaeus, p. 131-137, 424, 470, 896-902; by Limborch, V, 77, 18; III, 3, 11, etc.

3. In positive *theological, anthropological,* and *soteriological teachings* the two systems are in marked accord.

(1.) *The Decrees of God.* —The New-school divines of New England hold to a universal foreordination, absolute as respects all divine acts, effectual as regards all consequences of those acts. One of the consequences of those acts is the establishment and maintenance of human freedom. What said Arminian theology?

(a.) All divine acts are absolutely decreed--" Deus nihil facit, nisi prius apud se id decreverit facere" (Curcellaeus, p. 82).

(b.) God foreordains (positively or permissively). whatsoever cometh to pass" Nihil absque ipsius permissu ant directione evenit" (ibid. p. 87).

(c.) God decrees to do things which he knows will occasion sinful choices on the part of men, and to abstain from acts which, if wrought, he knows would prevent sinful choices. This also is clearly involved in what is laid down by Arminius (3, 418-429), Episcopius, Curcellaeus, and Limborch on *Permissio, Exccecaiio,* and *Induratio.*

(d.) God decrees to do that which he knows will occasion sin, for a specific end, and that end is the best possible (Arminius, 3, 419).

(e.) A decree to do that which will as a matter of fact occasion sin does not in any wise necessitate that sin (Curcellieus, p. 382, 1021).

(2.) *The Constitution of Men not Sin, but the Invariable Occasion of Sin.* —No New England divine has produced all abler exposition and defense of this view than are found in Curcellaeus, *Dissertatio de Peccato Originis,* and in Limborchb III, 4.

(3.) *The Atonement.* —The identity of the Edwardean theory of the atonement with the Dutch Arminian, as respects the nature of the atonement, ground of its necessity, and its extent is articulately proven in art. 3 of the *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1860.

(4.) *Justification.* —Arminius's definition of justification could be subscribed to by the whole body of New England divines with perhaps the exception of Emmons. "Justification is a just and gracious act of God as a judge, by which, from the throne of his grace and mercy, lie absolves from his sins man, a sinner, but who is a believer, on account of Christ and the obedience and righteousness of Christ; and considers him righteous [*justum*], to the salvation of the justified person, and to the glory of divine righteousness and grace" (2, 116).

(5.) *Regeneration.* —By the elder Arminius, Calvinistic, and Lutheran divines this operation of the Spirit is not sharply and definitely distinguished from sanctification, but in the definitions of the representative New England divines there is nothing to which Arminius or his disciples would have objected.

(6.) *Perseverance.* —

(a.) The regenerate *can* fall away. This is universally maintained by the Arminians.

(b.) The regenerate in point of fact never *do* fall away. Arminius did not decide. He says, "At no period have I asserted that believers *do* finally decline or fall away from faith and salvation" (2, 281). Like New England Calvinists, he asserted the *possibility*, but not *thefact*, of a total and final defection of the elect.

From the foregoing it is evident that the evangelical New England reaction against Calvinism, while remarkably indigenous and original, resembles in a most striking manner the earlier Arminian reaction. The Remonstrants repudiated no part of standard Calvinism which these New England theologians do not repudiate; they revolted from traditional tenets from the same honorable motives; they anticipated by two centuries nearly every favorite idea of their New England successors, and would perhaps have anticipated every one explicitly, had it not been for the backwardness of the psychological and ethical sciences. Nevertheless, there ever remains this radical difference, that according to New England theology, as according to original Calvinism, the real reason why one man is saved and another is not, is always in the last analysis to be found in the different foreordinations of God respecting the two, and this difference of foreordinations is referable solely to the sovereign good-pleasure of God.

IV. *Variations and Side-issues.* —Several noteworthy views and speculations, to which their respective authors owed no small share of their reputation, are either not adopted: or positively repudiated by the great mass of recent New England Calvinists. For example:

1. The Edwardean notion of human liberty. President Edwards is generally understood to have accepted the definition of Locke and of the sensational school, making the liberty of the human will "the power, opportunity, or advantage that any one has to *do* as he pleases ;" in other words, one's ability freely to *execute* volitions philosophically or *coactively necessitated.* The inadequacy of this definition is now universally admitted. *SEE EDWARDS.*

2. Hopkins's doctrine of disinterested benevolence. This was at one time the most vital and essential element in the New Divinity. With Hopkins it was the corner-stone of systematic theology. *SEE HOPKINS*.

3. Emmons's hypothesis of God's efficient causality of ever moral act of man. Emmons held that God was the efficient originator of every volition of the human mind, good or evil, holy or sinful. He has had but few adherents, and doubts are expressed as to whether he has been correctly understood by many on this point (Park, *Memoir*, p. 385 sq.). *SEE EMMONS*.

4. Nathaniel W. Taylor's view of the non-preventability of sin, his doctrine of the basis of virtue, and his metaphysical explanation of the Sacred Trinity. *SEE TAYLOR*.

5. The perfectionism of Prof. Finney. *SEE CHRISTIAN PERFECTION*; *SEE OBERLIN THEOLOGY*.

6. Dr. Edward Beecher's doctrine that all the descendants of Adam have enjoyed an equitable probation in a previous state of being, and that they are born under the curse of original sin on account of having sinned in that pre-existent state. See his *Conflict of Ages and Concord of Ages*. *SEE PRE-EXISTENCE*.

7. Dr. Horace Bushnell's view of Christ and of the Sacred Trinity, of revelation, sin, and the atonement. See literature below.

V. *Literature.* —

1. *In General.* —*A Memoirs and Works* of the Edwardses, Bellamy, Hopkins, Stephen and Samuel West, Samuel Spring, John Smalley, Emmons, Dwight, Leonard Woods, N. W. Taylor, Benlnet Tyler; Lynman Beecher, Horace Bushnell, and others above mentioned; Park, *Essay on the Development of the Edwardean Theory of the Atonement* (prefixed to his collection of *Discourses and Treatises on the Atonement* by Edwards, Smalley, Maxcy, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks); Woods, *Old and New Theology* (from an Old-school Presbyterian standpoint); Hodgson [Meth.], *New Divinity Examined*; Fisk [Meth.], *The Calvinistic Controversy*; Ellis [Unit.], *Fifty Years of the Unitarian Controversy*; Fiske [Cong.], *New Eng. Theol. in Bill. Sac. 22*:477, 568;. Lawrence, in *Amer. Theol. Rev.* May, 1860; *Bibl. Sac.* and *Princeton Bibl. Repertory*, 1851-52, *and passim*; *The Church Review*, 2, 89; 5, 349; Smith, *Church History*

in Tables, p. 78; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philippians* (Amer. ed.), 2, 443-460; Sherman, *New England Divines*; *Sprague, Annals.*

2. *The Pre-Edwardean Period.* —See Sprague, *Annals*, vol. 1; *SEE COTTON, JOHN*; *SEE DAVENPORT, JOHN*; *SEE MATHER, COTTON, SEE INCREASE*, and *SEE RICHARD*; *SEE STODDARD, SOLOMON*; *SEE WIGGLESWSORTH, EDWARD*.

3. *Jonathan Edwards and his Theology.* —Reviews of his work on the *Will* by Dr. James Dana (1770), J. Day (1841), A. T. Bledsoe (1845), D. D. Whedon (1859); Oliver Wendell Holmes's art. in the *International Rev.* July, 1880. The *Bibliotheca Sacra* will give some of Edwards's yet unpublished manuscripts in 1881. One on Trinity and Redemption, ed. by Smyth, N. Y. 1880. *SEE EDWARDS.*

4. *Hopkins and Hopkinsianism. —Memoir and Works*, 3 vols.; *Bibl. Sac. 9*:174 sq.; 10:63 sq.; 19:633; Ely, *Calvinism and Hopkinssianism. SEE HOPKINS, SAMUEL*.

5. *Emmons and Emmonsism. —Memoir and Works, 6.* vols.; abstract of his theology in *Bibl. Sac. 7*:254 sq., 479 sq.; see also 9:170 sq., and 22:467 sq.; Smith, *Faith and Philosophy*, p. 215-263.

6. *Taylor and Taylorism. —Memoir and Works, 4* vols.; *Bibl. Sac. 17*:355 sq., 452 sq.; Lord, in the *Evang. Mag.* 1832-36; Tyler, *Letter to Dr. Hawes*; essays in *Christian Spectator* and *Spirit of Missimos*, passim; Pigeon, *New Haven Theology*, in *Lit. and Theol. Review*, 5, 149 sq.; 6:121, 280, 557; Fisher, *Discussions in History and Theology* (1880), p. 285 sq.; Thasher, *Taylorism Examined* (1834,12mo); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1860, 1862; *New-Englander*, 1859, 1860.

7. *Bushnell and Bushnellism. —Life and Letters*; *Works*, especially *God in Christ*; *Forgiveness and Law* : *—Vicarious Sacrifice*; Turnbull, *Review of Bushnell's Theories*; Hovey, *God with Us, an Exam. of Bushnell's Vic. Sac.*; Bartol, *Principles and Portraits*, p. 366 sq.; *The New-Englander*, 2, 309,440; 5, 6; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1866.

8. *New Divinity in the Presbyterian Church.* —Memoirs and writings of Rev. Albert Barnes; Beman, *On the Atonement*; Duffield, *Regeneration*; Whelpley, *Triangle*; E. S. Ely, E. D. Griffin, etc.; Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*; *Bibl. Sac. 20*:561. *SEE PRESBYTRIAN CHURCH, NEW-SCHOOL*.

9. *The "Old School" in New England Theology. Tyler, Memoir and Lectures*; *Woods, Works* (6 vols.); Burton, *Essays*; Fisher, *Discussions in History and Theology*, p. 227 sq.; *Bibl. Sac.* 20:311 sq.; 30:371 sq.; Parsons Cooke, *New England Puritan*; *Recorder*, etc. (W. F. W.)

Theology, Practical.

SEE PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Theology, Scholastic.

SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.

Theology And Science.

SEE SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Theology, Speculative.

This title has come into use, particularly in Germany, to designate that method in systematic theology which, availing itself of all the helps subsidiary to theology, collects its material under the guidance of a philosophical, or speculative, survey of the field, and combines it into a systematic whole.

1. The necessity for such a term is shown by the fact that neither systematic theology nor Christianity itself can be compressed within the compass of a system of practical doctrines only. Christianity is designed to benefit the entire man, his intellect as well as his feelings and will Indeed, Christian piety is based on *the truth*; and Christianity is the revelation of the truth and the *absolute religion.* To attain a direct objective knowledge of God, as distinct from the indirect knowledge obtained from the contemplation of his works, etc., is evidently the work of speculation; and the same is true of that defense of Christianity which not only undermines the arguments of assailants, but establishes the reasons for Christianity in truth.

2. The material of speculative theology is gathered from the realm of experience everywhere, mundane and super mundane, and more directly still from the Christian faith. The *task* of speculative theology is to combine the experimental facts of the religious life into a harmonious system in which thought and scientific knowledge are the other elements. Its *method* is to seize on the historical facts connected with Christianity and trace them up until it arrives at the great central fact — the divine life incarnated in the

person of Jesus Christ. Faith, by which we mean an immovable footing on the truths and realities of Christianity, is therefore a prerequisite for this science; but this can never become fanaticism, because the science is equally based on the safe ground of known historic fact.

Christianity is specially adapted for speculative treatment by reason of its possessing a point of internal unity which combines both idea and fact, God and man, and therefore concentrates in itself the power to overcome all contrasts. The ancient Church correctly fixed that point in the incarnation of the Logos (Ignatius, Irenius, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa). The dangers of speculation in theology are well illustrated in the intellectualism of contemplation as displayed in the Eastern Church. The more practical and ethical tendency of the West served to complete, and, to some extent, correct the Eastern intellectualism. Tertullian and Augustine gave themselves to practical speculation; but Anselm was the father of genuine Christian speculation (*Cur Deus Homo ?*). Aquinas and Duns Scotus, though inferior to him, rendered good service in the same field. The Reformation was concerned rather with the distinctively religious than the speculative interests of Christianity, though Auselm's ideas were carried forward and established in its progress. Not until after fundamental inquiries into the philosophy of knowledge and into the facts connected with God and the world which we possess had been made 'was it entirely possible to utilize, for speculative purposes, the treasures of Christianity for defense, attack, and positive development. The fruitage of such investigations may be seen in the works of Schleiermacher, Damib, Marheinecke, Rothe, Martensen, etc. *SEE PHILOSOPHY*.

Upon the whole subject consult Baur, *Chrisfl. Gnosis* (1835); Ritter, *Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie* (*1841-51,* 6 vols.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Theomancy

(θεός, *God,* and μαντεία, *divination*), a kind of divination drawn from the responses of the oracle among heathen nations.

Theonas, or Theon

(see the extract from Philostorgius given by Photius), was bishop of Marmarica, in Cyrenaica, n the 4th century, and one of the most devoted adherents of Arius. The synodal circular given in Athanasius, 1, 398 sq.

(ed. Montfaucon), from bishop Alexander, which mentions the earliest measures taken against Arius, contains the names of Theonas and his colleague and neighbor Secundus of Ptolemais. The circular referred to indicates that both Theonas and Secundus had been deposed; but it would seem that; the deposition was not enforced, since they appeared at the Council of Nice in the character of qualified members. They achieved notoriety in that synod by resisting the *Homoousion* more firmly even than did their leaders, Eusebius and others; and as they refused to unite in the condemnation of Arius, they were again deposed and banished. Philostorgius (1, 2, 1) states that Theonas was recalled by the emperor Constantine; but he would seem to have taken no further part in the ecclesiastical conflicts of the time. His name occurs no more in the lists of combatants. See Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 7 sq.; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 9 (*Decrees of Nice*); Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69. 8, and comp. 68, 6, and 69, 11; Tillemont, *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire Eccls.* (Brussels, 8v-o ed.), 6:2; *Hist. Abrgee des Ariens,* art. 6:7; and *History of the Council of Nice,* art. 6:11. —Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* s.v.

Theopaschites

(from θεός, *God,* and πάσχω, *to suffer*). This term was applied to those persons in the ancient Church who pronounced in favor of the formula that God had suffered and been crucified, and occurs for the first time in the letters of Isidore of Pelusium (q.v.) (*Epp.* 1, 102,124). The addition of the clause θεὸς ἐσταυρώθη to the *Trisagion* by Peter Fullo (q.v.) gave greater currency to its use (Theophanis, *Chronographia,* p. 97, 184), and formed an element in the Monophysite disputes. Fulgentius Ferrandus and Fulgentius of Ruspe declared in favor of the formula "One belonging, to the Trinity has been crucified" (see Gieseler, 1, 2, 365; Schröckh, 18:582), which was subsequently approved by the Fifth (Ecumenical Synod of Constantinople in 553 (Anathema 10). Fillo's addition to the *Trisagion* was in use among the Catholics of Syria until its rejection by the *Concilium Quinsextum* in 692 (Canon 81), after which only Monophysites and Monothelites continued its use. The Catholics, in the meantime. had reached the conclusion that every addition to the *Trisagion* involved a quaternary. Theopaschitism is a very general conception of the popular mind, even in Protestant countries, and has found support in many hymns which have been admitted into use in the churches. It is also most intimately connected with the conception which underlies the expression "Mother of God;" for if it may be said that God was born of Mary, it may

with equal propriety be said that God was crucified. See the Church Histories; Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines, §* 102; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theopathetics

a designation of those mystics who have resigned themselves, more or less passively, to an imagined divine manifestation. Among these may be mentioned Tanchen, who appeared in the 12th century, and announced himself as the residence of Deity; Gichtel, who believed himself appointed to expiate by his prayers and penance the sins of all mankind; and Kuhlmann, who traversed Europe the imagined head of the fifth monarchy, summoning kings and nobles to submission.

Theopathy

(θεός, *God,* and πάθος, *feeling*), a word used by Dr. Hartley as synonymous with piety or a sense of Deity.

Theophanes of Byzantium

the designation of two early ecclesiastical characters.

1. A historian who is supposed to have lived at Constantinople at the close of the 6th century. He wrote a history of the war waged with Persia from 567 to 573, and also, it is said, a history of the reign of Justinian. Photius mentions both works, and quotes from the former (*Cod.* 64). See Labbeus, *Excempta Legationum* (Paris, 1647).

2. The chronographer, confessor, and saint. Of this man an ancient biography, said to be the work of Theodore Studita (q.v.), relates that he was born in or about the year 578, and that the emperor Constantine Copronymus became his guardian. The monastic impulse led him to bind himself to a life of continence on the eve of his marriage with the daughter of a wealthy patrician chosen to be his bride by the emperor himself, and subsequently to separate himself from his wife altogether. Leo IV called him to court, laid upon him official responsibilities, and placed him over the public buildings in Mysia; but, in Irene's reign, Theophanes became a monk in Lesser Mysia, and in time abbot of the monastery of Ager, which he had built. He was a zealous image-worshipper, and present as such at the second Council of Nice in 787. In 813 Leo the Armenian sought to persuade him to renounce the worship of images, and punished his.

obstinate refusal with imprisonment and banishment to the island of Samothrace, where Theophanes died about 816. A *Chronography* by him is extant, which records both ecclesiastlcal and secular matters from the first year of the reign of Diocletian to the first year of Leo the Armenian. It lacks many excellences, and has been attributed, though without sufficient reason, to other authors; but its statements possess considerable value as sources for the Iconoclastic troubles. The best edition is that of Classen (Bonn, 1839, 2 vols.), preceded by a Greek *Vita* and an *Officium S. Patris Nost. Theophanis*, etc., of March 12. See Vossius, *De Hist. Gr.* 2, 24; Cave; Oudin; Fabr., *Bibl. Gr.* 6:151 (old ed.), etc. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Theophanes,

styled CERAMIEUS, archbishop of Tauromemium, between Syracuse and Messina, in the firmer half of the 11th century (? see his own *Homily* 26, and Leo Allatius; but comp. Scorsus, *ut infra*). He also bore, it would seem, the name of Gregory, which occurs in several MSS. He wrote *Homilies*, sixty-two of which were publisher in 1644 by the Jesuit Scorsus at Paris, with notes and two proems setting forth the life, teachings, and literary qualities of Theophanes, etc. The *Homilies* are written in Greek, and the style is flowing and easy, but vitiated by an excessive tendency to allegorize. Image-worship and invocation of the Virgin are taught everywhere. Consult Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 2, 132, and see Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Theophany

The ancient Greeks were accustomed, during a certain festival named τὰ θεοφάνια, *to* display at Delphos before the public gaze the images of all their gods. θεοφάνεια denoted the apparition of one or more gods. The term thus understood was applied by ancient Christian writers to the manifestations of God under the Old Covenant and to the incarnation of Christ;. in the latter instance with reference to the birth, the baptism, and the second advent of Christ. ῾Η ἐπιφάνεια was, however, a usual substitute for its employment as respects his birth. *SEE EPIPHANY*. Later usage has given to the term a doctrinal meaning, by which it is made to designate a special form of the divine revelation, to determine which form it is necessary to examine the entire series of modes of the divine manifestation (see Bretschneider, *Systemat. Entwicklung.* p. 196). Without

delaying to undertake a survey of this kind, we sketch the scriptural view of the theophany in the following paragraphs.

1. The theophany is never an immediate revelation of the super mundane Deity itself (<430118>John 1:18; <540616>1 Timothy 6:16). God reveals himself only in Christ (<401127>Matthew 11:27). The theophany is therefore more accurately defined as a Christophany, or an epiphany of God in Christ; and all nature is a storehouse of signs of the divine presence, which uniformly point to Christ (<450120>Romans 1:20; <510116>Colossians 1:16). *SEE LOGOS*.

2. The theophany, regarded as a Christophany, is developed in three great stages: (1) under the Old Test.; (2) in the incarnation; (3) in Christ's second advent. In that 'advent the theophany, or revelation of the divine glory, will reach its consummation (<560213>Titus 2:13). The first advent was also a revelation, of the kindness and love of God (3, 4) and of his grace and truth (<430114>John 1:14-17; 14:9); and with that revelation corresponded the fact that Christ *saw* the Father in all his work, even as the future manifestation of Christ shall be accompanied with the blessed vision of the saints (<620302>1 John 3:2). Our attention is, however, confined by dogmatics to the modes of manifestation which occurred under the Old Test. prior to the advent of Christ, or under the New as accompanying or representing his presence. *SEE ADVENT*.

3. The theophany or Christophany of Scripture is the epiphany of the coming Christ, mediated through the angel of the Lord (<011607>Genesis 16:7, etc.), of the face (<023314>Exodus 33:14; <230309>Isaiah 3:9), or of the covenant (<390301>Malachi 3:1). This angel was not a created being. His symbolic sign was the pillar of cloud and fire; his attribute the display of the glory or majesty of God (δόξα,d/bK); his later Rabbinical and theological designation the *Shechinah* (q.v.).

4. The manifestation of God in Christological theophany begins with the *voice* or the miracle of hearing (the voice of God and of heaven being identical, but different from the Bath-Kol of the later Jews), and progresses towards apparition proper, which is a miracle addressed to the eye, and in which the angel of the Lord appears escorted by actual angels, at first only two, but in later instances myriads in number. *SEE BATH-KOL*.

5. Theophany, the objective mode of revelation, never takes place without being accompanied in the mind of the observer with an ecstatic vision. This connection with the theophany distinguishes the vision from the ordinary

historical occurrence (<12067>2 Kings 6:17; <43202>John 20:12; <44007>Acts 9:7; comp. 22:9; 12:11). On the other hand, no vision is without its element of theophany, which fact distinguishes it from mere subjective hallucination (<23601>Isaiah 6:1 sq.; the book of Daniel; Zechariah; <44103>Acts 10:3). *SEE VISION*.

6. The various modes of manifestation can be distinguished, therefore, only when the predominantly objective facts of the theophany are compared with the predominantly subjective facts of the vision. *SEE PROPHECY*.

7. Theophanic Christophany enters fully into earthly conditions by being incorporated in elements of nature and of soul life. It completes itself in one direction by the apparition of angels, and in the other by symbolical representations of an earthly nature (<01324>Genesis 3:24; <02046>Exodus 4:16; <19811>Psalm 18:11; 104:4; <23602>Isaiah 61:2; <39207>Malachi 2:7); but most of all by the Urim and Thummim (q.v.).

8. Vision takes place in the way of a momentary vacating of the body or an ecstasy (<47204>2 Corinthians 12:4). It expands in an abundance of symbolical and allegorical visions (Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, Rev.), and finds its completion in the prophetic dream. The latter is conditioned in a higher determination of the ordinary life of the person chosen, and occurs chiefly where the common life has not been developed to any considerable extent, as with the Old-Test. Joseph; or where it is involved *with* a secular calling, as in the case of the New-Test. Joseph. *SEE DREAM*.

9. The life of Christ combined into a higher unity all the fragmentary features of pre-Christian theophanies (πολυτρόπως, <58101>Hebrews 1:1). His personal life revealed God to the world, and the entire universe became for him, in turn, a theophanic environment attesting himself; because his whole inner life became an incessant subjective vision, in which the contrast between ecstasy and ordinary consciousness of the world no longer exists. Consult Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*; Buttstedt, *De Adparitionibus Deorum Gentilium* (Ger. 1744); Millies, *De Variis Generibus* θεοφανειῶν (Hal. 1802); *Stud. u. Krit.* 1859, No. 2. *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*.

Theophilanthropists

(Gr. *lovers of God and man*), the name assumed by a party of French deists during the Reign of Terror to indicate their adherence to a natural or

theistic religion and worship which were intended to supersede Christianity. In February, 1795, freedom of religious opinion, and with it of religious worship, was allowed; and it was clear that neither Christianity nor Catholicism in its usual forms had been driven out of the hearts of the people. The civil authorities were much concerned lest the old political sympathies for royalty should revive with Catholicism. Still, a felt consciousness of the necessity of some religion led may to adopt a form of worship adapted to a natural religion. The foundation of this new religion was laid in 1796 by five heads of families, who, having declared themselves Theophilanthropists, met together every week for united prayer, to listen to moral remarks, and to sing hymns in honor of God. In the same year a kind of catechism or directory for public or social worship was published at Paris under the title of *Manuel des Theantrophiles.* This breviary was based on the simple fundamental articles of a belief in the existence of God and'in the immortality of the soul. In 1797 Lareveillere-Lepaux stood at the head of the society; the Directory assigned ten parish churches to the rapidly growing association, and the new worship soon spread over the provinces. As to their mode of worship, there was a simple altar-whereon flowers and fruit, according to their season, were placed as thank-offerings-and a rostrum for the speaker. The walls were adorned with moral mottoes, such as, "Children, honor your parents and respect your elders;" "Husbands and wives, be kind to one another." Instead of the traditional festivals, there *now* occurred those of nature, arranged according to the seasons of the year; in the place of sacraments, there were arbitrary and highly sentimental ceremonies, which took place at the birth of a child, at the reception of new members, at celebrations of marriage, at distribution of prizes to children, and at funerals. They had four special festivals, in honor of Socrates, St. Vincent de Paul, Jean Jacques Rousseau, and Washington. As religious feeling began to revive, the Theophilanthropists began to decline. They and their sentimental trumpery were turned out of the churches; the Revolutionary government forbade them, Oct. 4, 1801, to use even the three churches which were left in their hands; and when their petition for holding their services elsewhere was refused, the Theophilanthropist religion soon died of inanition, despised by the infidel party as well as by those who still remained Christians. An attempt to revive it after the revolution of 1830 utterly failed. See Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World, s.v.*; Gregoire, *Histoire des Sectes Religieuses*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries, 2,* 435.

Theophilestati

(θεοφιλέστατοι, *most dear to God*), a title of respect given to bishops in the early Church. This title frequently occurs in the emperor's rescript in the civil law, and was of such common use in those times that Socrates (*Proem.* ad lib. vi) thinks himself obliged to make some apology for not giving it to the bishops that were then living. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 2, oh. 10:§ 6.

Theoph'ilus

(θεόφιλος, *friend of God*), the name of two men associated with sacred history, one of them being mentioned in the New Test. and the other by Josephus..

1. The person to whom Luke inscribes his Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles (⁴²Luke 1:3; ⁴⁴Acts 1:1). A.D. cir; 56. The important part played by Theophilus as having immediately occasioned the composition *of* these two books, together with the silence of Scripture concerning him, has at once stimulated conjecture, and left the field clear for it. Accordingly we meet with a considerable number and variety of theories concerning him.

r. Several commentators, especially among the fathers have been disposed to doubt the personality of Theophilus, regarding the name either as that of a fictitious person or as applicable to every Christian reader. Thus Origen (*Hom.* 1 *in Luc.*) raises the question, but does not discuss it, his object being merely practical. He says that all who are beloved of God are Theophili, and may therefore appropriate to themselves the gospel which was addressed to Theophilus. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 2, 429) speaks doubtfully: εἴτ ουν τινὶ θεοφίλῳ τότε γράφων ἔλεγεν, ἢ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ θεὸν αγαπῶντι. Salvianus (*Epist. 9 ad Salonium*) apparently assumes that Theophilus had no historical existence. He justifies the composition of a work addressed *Ad Ecclesiam Catholicam,* under the name of Timotheus, by the example of the evangelist Luke, who addressed his gospel nominally to a particular man, but really to "the love of God" "Nam. sicut Theophili. vocabulo amor, sic Timothei honor divinitatis exprimitur." Even Theophylact, who believes in the existence of Theophilus, takes the opportunity of moralizing upon his name: καὶ πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος θεοφιλής, καὶ κράτος κατὰ τῶν παθῶν ἀναδειξάμενος θεόφιλός ἐστι κράτιστος, ὃς καὶ ἄξιος τῷ ὄντι ἐστὶν ἀκούειν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου (*Argum. in Luc.*). Among modern

commentators, Hammond and Leclerc accept the allegorical view; Erasmlus is doubtful, but, on the whole, believes Theophilus to have had a real existence.

2. From the honorable epithet κράτιστε applied to Theophilus in <40103>Luke 1:3, compared with the use of the same epithet as applied by Claudius Lysias and Tertullus severally to Felix, and by Paul to Festus (<442326>Acts 23:26 24:3; 26:25), it has been argued with much probability, but not quite conclusively, that he was a person in high official; position. Thus Theophylact (*Argum. in Luc.*) conjectures that he was a Roman governor, or a person of senatorial rank, grounding his conjecture expressly on the use of κράτιστε. (Ecumenius (*Ad Act. Apost.* 1, 1) tells us that he was a governor, but gives no authority for the assertion. The traditional connection of Luke with Antioch has disposed some to look upon Antioch as the abode of Theophilus, and possibly as the seat of his government. Bengel believes him to have been an inhabitant of Antioch, "ut veteres testantur." The belief may partly have grown out of a story in the so-called *Recognitions of St. Clement* (lib. 10), which represents a certain nobleman of Antioch of that name to have been converted by the preaching of Peter, and to have dedicated his own house as a church, in which, as we are told, the apostle fixed his episcopal seat. Bengel thinks that the omission of κράτιστε in Acts 1, 1 proves that Luke *was* on more familiar terms with Theophilus than when he composed his gospel.

3. In the Syriac lexicon, extracted from the *Lexicons Heptaglot* of Castell, and edited by Michaelis (p. 948), the following description of Theophilus is quoted from Bar-Bahlul, a Syrian lexicographer of the 10th century: "Theophilus, primus credentium et celeberrimus apud Alexandrienses, qui cum alis AEgyptis Lucam rogabat, ut eis evangelium scriberet." In the inscription of the Gospel according to Luke in the Syriac version, we are told that it was published at Alexandria. Hence it is inferred by Hase (*Bibl. Bremensis Class.* ch. 4 fasc. 3, diss. 4, quoted by Michaelis, *Introd. to the New Test.* [ed. Marsh], vol. 3, ch. 6:§ 4) and by Bengel (*Ordo Temporum* [2nd ed.], p. 196) that Theophilus was, as asserted by Bar-Bahlul, a convert of Alexandria. This writer ventures to advance the startling opinion that Theophilus, if an Alexandrian, was no other than the celebrated Philo, who is said to have borne the Hebrew name of Jedidiah (hydydy, i.e. θεόφιλος). It hardly seems necessary to refute this theory, as Michaelis has refuted it, by chronological arguments.

4. Alexander Morus (*Ad Quaedam Loca Nov. Fced. Notae*: *ad Luc. i, 1*) makes the rather hazardous conjecture that the Theophilus of Luke is identical With the person who is recorded by Tacitus (*Annals.* 2, 55) to have been condemned for fraud at Athens by the court of the Areopagus. Grotius also conjectures that he was a magistrate of Achaia baptized by Luke. The conjecture of Grotius must rest upon the assertion of Jerome (an assertion which, if it is received, renders that of Morrs possible, though certainly most improbable), namely, that Luke published his gospel in the parts of Achaia and Boeotia (Jerome, *Comm. in Matthew Procem.*).

5. It is obvious to suppose that Theophilus was a Christian; but a different view has been entertained. In a series of dissertations in the *Bibl. Bremensis*, of which Michaelis gives a *resume* in the section already referred to, the notion that he was not a Christian is maintained by different writers and on different grounds. Heumann, one of the contributors, assuming that he was a Roman governor, argues that he could not be a Christian, because no Christian would be likely to have such a charge entrusted to him. Another writer (Theodore Hase) believes that the Theophilus of Luke was no other than the deposed high-priest Theophilus the son of Ananus (see below). Michaelis himself is inclined to adopt this theory. He thinks that the use of the word κατηχήθης in Luke 1, 4 proves that Theophilus had an imperfect acquaintance with the facts of the gospel (an argument of which bishop Marsh very properly disposes in his note upon the passage of Michaelis), and further contends, from the ἐν ἡμῖν of Luke 1:1, that he was not a member of the Christian community. He thinks it probable that the evangelist wrote his gospel during the imprisonment of Paul at Caesarea, and addressed it to Theophilus as one of the heads of the Jewish nation. According to this view, it would be regarded as a sort of historical apology for the Christian faith.

In surveying this series of conjectures, and of traditions which are nothing more than conjectures, we find it easier to determine what is to be rejected than what we are to accept. In the first place, we may safely-reject the patristic notion that Theophilus was either a fictitious person or a mere personification of Christian love. Such a personification is alien from the spirit of the New-Test. writers, and the epithet κράτιστε is a sufficient evidence of the historical existence of Theophilus. It does not, indeed, prove that he was a governor, but it makes it most probable that he was a person of high rank. His supposed connection with Antioch, Alexandria, or Achaia rests on too slender evidence either to claim acceptance or to need

refutation; and the view of Hase, although endorsed by Michaelis, appears to be incontestably negatived by the Gentile complexion of the third gospel. The grounds alleged by Heumann for his hypothesis that Theophilus was not a Christian are not at all trustworthy, as consisting of two very disputable premises; for, in the first place, it is not at all evident that Theophilus was a Roman governor, and, in the second place, even if we assume that at that time no Christian would be appointed to such an office (an assumption which we can scarcely venture to make), it does not at all follow that no person in that position would become a Christian. In fact, we have an example of such a conversion in the case of Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:12). In the art. *SEE LUKE, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO*, reasons are given for believing that Theophilus was not a native of Palestine… not a Macedonian, nor an Athenian, nor a Cretan. But that he was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome, is probable from similar data." All that can be conjectured with any degree of safety concerning him comes to this, that he was a Gentile of rank and consideration, who came under the influence of Luke, or (not improbably) under that of Paul, at Rome, and was converted to the Christian faith. It has been observed that the Greek of Luke, which elsewhere approaches more nearly to the classical type than that of the other evangelists, is purer and more elegant in the dedication to Theophiilus than in any other part of his gospel. From all these circumstances, and especially from the fact that both the gospel and the Acts were dedicated to Theophilus-both, therefore, being written, in all probability, about the same time, and that time being Paul's imprisonment at Rome, where the latter ends-we may reasonably infer that Theophilus was one of the apostle's converts in the imperial city during the two years sojourn of Paul there, for a part, if not the most, of which Luke was his companion, and hence likely to be acquainted with, and interested in, the noble convert. *SEE LUKE*; *SEE PAUL*. Monographs in Latin have been written on Theophilus by Heumann (in the *Bibl. Bremensis,* 4:483). Osiander (Tüb. 1659), Stoltze (Viteb. 1693), and Schelvig (Ged. 1711).

2. A Jewish high-priest, the son of Annas or Ananus, brother-in-law to Caiaphas, *SEE ANNAS*; *SEE CAIAPHAS*, and brother and immediate successor of Jonathan. The Roman prefect Vitellius came to Jerusalem at the Passover (A.D. 37), and deposed Caiaphas, appointing Jonathan in his place. In the same year, at the feast of Pentecost, he came to Jerusalem, and deprived Jonathan of the high-priesthood, which he gave to Theophilus

(Josephus, *Ant.* 18:4, 3; 5, 3). Theophilus was removed; from his post by Herod Agrippa I after the accession of that prince to the government of Judaea in A.D. 41, so that he must have continued in office about five years (*ibid.* 19:6, 2). Theophilus is not mentioned in the New Test., as no events occurred during his pontificate in which the apostles were specially involved. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

Theophilus of Alexandria

a bishop in the latter part of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century, is distinguished for his persecution of the Origenists; for his hostility to Chrysostom, and as being one of the most violent and unscrupulous even among the ecclesiastics of the 5th century. He succeeded Timotheus as bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 385, and soon after secured the favor of the emperor by a characteristic maneuver. When the fate of the empire was suspended on the battle which was to decide between Maximus and Theodosius (388), he sent his legate, Isidore, to Rome provided with letters to both, the one or the other of which he was to deliver with certain presents, according to the issue of the battle. He was also very zealous against heathenism, and in 391 obtained the emperor’s consent to use severe measures against the pagans in his district, which resulted in the most of them being driven out of Egypt. His behavior to the different sects of Christians was marked by the same unscrupulous inconsistency. He appears to have passed a part of his early life among the monks of Nitria, some of whom were Origenists and others Anthropomorphites. At first he declared himself decidedly against the latter, and, in opposing them, he sided openly with the Origenists, drawing his arguments from the works of Origen. When, however, it became evident that the majority of the Egyptian monks were Anthropomorphites, Theophilus went over to them about 399, condemned the writings of Origen, commanded all his clergy to burn them, and commenced a cruel persecution of all who opposed the Anthropbmorphites, while he himself continued to read the works of Origen with admiration. In 401 he issued a violent letter in which he condemned the writings of Origen and threatened. the latter’s adherents; in the following year he sent forth another of like character, to the unbounded delight of Jerome. Theophilus was subsequently called to Constantinople by the empress Eudoxia, and secured the deposition and banishment of Chrysostom (q.v.) in 403. During the tumult which followed, Theophilus escaped and returned to Alexandria, where, in 404, he issued a third Paschal letter against the Origenists, and where he died in 412. The works

of Theophilus mentioned by the ancient writers are, Προσφωνητικὸν πρὸς τοὺς φρονοῦντας τὰ Ὠριγένους, quoted by Theodoret (*Didl.* 2, 1291); and which Gennaldius (33) calls "adversus Origenem unum et grande volumem," *Letter to Porphyry, Bishop of Antioch*, quoted in the *Acta Concil. Ephes.* pt. 1, c. 4: the three *Paschal Letters* already mentioned and one more: —and some other unimportant orations, letters, and controversial works. The *Paschal Letters* are still extant in a translation by Jerome, and are published in the *Antidot. contra Dicers. Omnium. Sceculorum laeresias* (Basel, 1528 fol.); and the whole of his extant remains are contained in Galland, *Biblioth. Patr. 7*:603 fol. Cave, *Hist. Lift.* s. a. 385, p. 279, 280; Murdock, note to Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist. 1,* 444 (Engl. ed.). —Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Latin Biog.* s.v.

Theophilus of Antioch

a writer and bishop of the primitive Church, was educated a heathen; and afterwards converted to Christianity. He was ordained bishop of Antioch, succeeding Eros, about A.D. 170, and governed the Church twelve or thirteen years, at the end of which he died. Having been converted from heathenism by the study of the Scriptures, he wrote an apology for the Christian faith, addressed in the form of a letter to his friend Autolycus. The work shows much learning and more simplicity of mind. In its general structure it resembles the works of Justin Martyr and the other early apologists; but it contains a more detailed examination of the evidence for Christianity, derived both from Scripture and from history. The three books of Theophilus to Autolycus were first published in the collection of the monks Antonius and Maximus entitled *Sententiarum sive Cajitum, Theologicorum prcecipue, ex Sacris et Profanis Libris, Tomi Tres.* There have been a number of editions, the most complete being that of Johann Christoph Wolf (Hamb. 1724, 8vo), and an English translation by Joseph Betty (Oxford, 1722, 8vo). Theophilus was the author of several other works which were extant in the times of Eusebius and Jerome. Among them were works against the heresies of Marcion and *Hermogenes*: —*Commentary on the Gospels* (still extant in Latin, and published in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* [Paris, 1575, 1598, 1609, 1654, etc.]). Jerome refers to his *Commentaries on the Proverbs.* See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. s.v.*; Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* 7:101-106; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Theophilus of Caesarea

a bishop who presided over the Council of Caesarea in Palestine, and signed the letter of that council, which appears to have been drawn up by himself, on the Paschal controversy, A.D. 198.

Theophilus of Cilicia

So often mentioned in legend, is said to have originally been the administrator of the Adana bishopric. Out of modesty, he declined the episcopal see, and was deprived of all his honors by the new bishop. He now applied for help to a Jewish sorcerer, who brought him into a nightly convention of devils. Here help was promised to him provided he would deny Christ and Mary and would assign his soul. He was restored to his former position; but, regretting what he had done, he prayed as a penitent to Mary, and through her intercession Christ took the assignment away from the devil and placed it upon his breast while asleep in the church, tired out by prayer. He now openly confessed his sin and died three days later. The author of the legend is said to have been a Greek cleric, Eutychianus; while a Neapolitan priest, Paulus (9th century), made it known in the West. In the *Acta. SS.* for Feb. 4 we find this legend in a poetical dress, by the bishop Marbod of Rennes. See. Jubinal, *Euvres de Rutebeuf,* vol. 2; Pfeiffer. *Marienlegenden* (Stuttgart, 1846); Blomaert, *Theophilus* (Ghent, 1836); Hoffmann von Fallersleben, *Theophilus* (Hanov. 1853-54); Meyer, *Radewins Gedicht über Theophilus* (Munich,'1873; edited after a Munich MS. of the 13th century). (B. P.)

Theophilus of the Indies

bishop of the Homerites, was born in the isle of Diu. When yet a youth he was brought as a hostage to Constantinople, where he became a Christian (Arian). He was made deacon, and finally bishop for the Arabic mission about 350. Being supplied by Constantius with rich presents for the princes at home and with money for the building of churches, he converted the king of the Homerites, and built churches at Taphar, Aden, and Hormulz. The large number of Jews, however, residing in tile country prevented a further propagation of Christianity. In the year 356 Constantius appointed him bishop of the Ethiopic Church. From the isle of Socotra he went to Axum, but was soon obliged to leave the place. See Le Quien, *Oriens Chrislianus,* 2, 644; *Theolog. Universal-Lexikon,* s.v. (B. P.)

Theophori

(θεοφόροι, *God-bearers*), a name assumed by some of the early Christians, signifying that they carried about with them the presence of God. St. Ignatius gives himself this title in his inscriptions to his epistles, both of which begin Ἰγνάτιος ὁ καὶ θεο φόρος ; and explains his meaning in his dialogue with Trajan, "Theophorus is one that carries Christ in his heart." "Dost thou, then," said Trajan, "carry him that was crucified in thy heart?" Ignatius answered, "Yes; for it is written, 'I will dwell in them and walk in them.'" Anastasius Bibliothecarius, indeed, gives another reason why Ignatius was called *Theophorus* (θεόφορος, *God-borne*) because he was the child whom our Savior took and placed in the midst of his disciples, laying his hands upon him; and, therefore, the apostles would never presume to ordain him by imposition of hands after Christ. But, as bishop Pearson and others observe, this is a mere invention of the modern Greeks. Vincentius Bellovacensis and others advance this ridiculous reason: that Ignatius was so called because the name of Jesus Christ was found written in golden letters in his heart. 'But against these traditions we have the fact that the title was not peculiar to Ignatius, but common to all Christians. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 1, ch. 1, § 4.

Theophylact

archbishop of Achridia and metropolitan of all Bulgaria, an eminent ecclesiastical writer, was born and educated at Constantinople. He was bishop in 1077, and perhaps some years later. The date of his death is uncertain, but probably about 1112,'or later. After he was made bishop. he labored diligently to extend Christianity in his diocese, but met with much opposition, of which he complained in his epistles. The works of Theophylact are: *Commentaria in Quatuor Evangelia* (Paris, 1631, fol.): —*Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles,* Greek and Latin (Colon. *1568*): —*Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, Greek* and Latin (Lond. *1636,fol.*): —*Commentaries on Four of the* (*Minor Prophets*; namely, Habakkuk, Jonas, Nahum, and Hosea, in Latin (Paris, 1589, 8vo). The *Commentaries* on all the twelve minor prophets are extant in Greek in the library of Strasburg, and have been described by Michaelis in his *Biblioth. Orientalis.* These commentaries are founded on those of Chrysostom; but his exegesis is so direct, precise, and textual, and his remarks are often so felicitous and to the point, that his commentaries have always been highly prized: —Sev*enty-five Epistles,* in Greek, with notes by John Meursius

(Leyden, 1617, 4to), and also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*: —besides several tracts, some of which are rather doubtful. A splendid edition of all his works in Greek and Latin was published by J. F. Bernard Maria de Rubeis (Venet. 1754-63, 4 vols. fol.). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Latin Biog. s.v.*

Theophylactians, a name given to the orthodox Christians of Alexandria by the Jacobites in the 7th century. See Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, 2, 87.

Theosebites

a sect which spread in Palestine and Phoenicia during the first half of the 5th century, and appear to have been similar to, if not identical with, the HYPSISTARIANS *SEE HYPSISTARIANS* (q.v.). The Theosebites exalted the sun, moon, and stars into objects of worship, and yet acknowledged the Supreme Deity over all. Their religion thus appears to have been an adulteration of Christiainity with Magianism. Probably these sects are to be traced to the Therapeutse and Essenes, who worshipped τὸ ὂν *or* Ὕψιστος, kept the Jewish Sabbath, and Jewish observances respecting food. They professed a partial belief in Christ, but were, at the same time, strict Unitarians.

Theosophy

(θεοσοφία, *divine wisdom*), the name given to a so-called sacred science, which holds a place distinct as well from that of philosophy as from that of theology, even in questions where these latter sciences have the same object with it: namely, the nature and attributes of God. In investigating the divine nature and attributes, philosophy employs as the basis of its investigation the ideas derived from natural reason, while theology superadds to the principles of natural reason those derived from authority and revelation. Theosophy, on the contrary, professes to exclude all dialectical process, and to derive its knowledge of God from direct and immediate intuition and contemplation or from the immediate communications of God himself. Theosophy, therefore, so far as regards the science of God, is but another name for mysticism (q.v.); and the direct and immediate knowledge or intuition of God, to which the Mystics laid claim, was, in fact, the foundation of that intimate union with God and consequent abstraction from outer things, which they made the basis of their moral and ascetical system. Theosophy has existed from a very early

date; and within the Christian period we may number among Theosophs the NeoPlatonists, especially Plotinus, lamblichus, and Proclus; the Hesychasts of the Greek Church; all those of the mediaeval Mystics who laid claim to any dogmatical theory; and in later times the Paracelsists, Bodenstein and Thalhauser, Weizel, Jacob Boehme, and Swedenborg.

Below is a brief outline of Theosophy as taught by Boehme (q.v.). Finite existences of every kind are an efflux from the One Infinite Existence, and such an efflux is a necessary attribute of God's own being. All things come from a working will of the holy, triune, incomprehensible God, who manifests himself through an external efflux of fire, light, and spirit. Angels and men are the true and real offspring of God, their life originating in the divine fire from which light and love are generated in them. This triune life in God is the perfection of being, and the loss of it constituted the fall of angels and men. Thus man having been made a living image if the divine nature and endowed with immortality, he exchanged the light, life, and Spirit of God for the light, life, and spirit of the world. He died to the influences of the Spirit of God on the very day of his, transgression, but remained subject to all the external influences of the world; and the restoration of the influence of the Spirit constitutes the work of redemption and sanctification. Christ restored to men the germ of the paradisiacal life, which is possessed by all through new birth and his indwelling. No son of Adam can be lost except by the willful loss of this paradisiacal germ of the divine life; and its development is the development of salvation. In the hands of Law, the theosophy of Boehroe assumed a much more reasonable form than that in which it had been clothed by its author, whose language was a medley of alchemy, obscure analogies, and false etymologies. It was then exhibited as a philosophy of redemption and spiritual life, which only wanted the keystone of sacramental psychology to make it a firm system of truth. For very full information on the subject, see Walton, *Notes and Materials for an Adequate Biography of William Law, comprising an Elucidation of the Scope and Contents of the Writings of Jacob Boehme, and of his Great Commentator Dionysius Andrseas Freher,* etc. (1854). See Blunt, *Dict. of Doctrinal Theology,* s.v. *Chambers Encyclop. s.v.*

Theotokos

(θεοτόκος, *God-bearing*).

1. A title applied by various Romish writers to the Virgin Mary as the "mother of God." *SEE MARTOLATRY*.

2. An ecclesiastical term adopted at the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon to assert the doctrine of the divinity of our Lord's person. The truth which it was designed to teach is that although two natures are united in one Christ, yet there are not two persons, but one. Our Lord was a divine person from all eternity, and upon his incarnation he did not cease to be the person he had been before. There was, therefore, no change or interruption of his identity, for the Godhead became incarnate, not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the manhood into God. Although the nature, which he took of the substance of his, mother was human, the person who was born was divine, and this was the truth declared in the adoption of the term θεοτόκος. It is not, of course, meant that the Virgin was the mother of the Godhead of our Lord, but that the human nature, which he had assumed of her substance, was so united to the divinity that the person begotten of her was God as well as man. In this sense she might be called the mother of God. Equivalent expressions are used by Irenaeus and Ignatius, while θεοτόκος is used by Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Origen, and Gregory Theologus. This doctrine has been the cause of much debate, and of more than one council. *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*.

Therapeutae

(θεραπευταί [*attendants*, i.e. *worshippers*, sc. of God] and θεραπευτρίδες), a Jewish sect in Egypt, which is described by Philo in a separate treatise Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ περὶ περὶ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν, or *De Vita Contemplativa* (*Opp.* [ed. Mangey], 2, 471486). It is strange that no other writer of that period, not even Josephus, knows anything about the Therapeutae; for what we find in ecclesiastical writings about them since the time of Eusebius is nothing but a reproduction of the Philonic narrative; and the erroneous opinion of Eusebius, who regarded the Therapeutae as Christians, has been followed by all Church fathers, with the exception of Photius. Modern critics have, with a few exceptions, identified the Therapeutae with the Essenes, but with this difference, that while the former were only theorists, the latter were men of practical life. Of late the question as to who the Therapeutae were has become superfluous, since some scholars, especially the Jewish historian Gritz, believe Philo's treatise to be spurious, and only an embellishment of

Christian monachism as it began in Egypt. But, before deciding the question as to whether this treatise is spurious or genuine, we must examine first what Philo tells us about the Therapeutae.

I. *Manners and Usages of the Therapeutae.* —The fatherland of the Therapeutae is Egypt, and beyond this country the order has probably not been propagated. When Philb speaks of their diffusion through the whole world (πολλαχοῦ μνὲ ουν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐστὶ τοῦτο τὸ γένος), we cannot take his words in their literal sense, as does Lucius (*Die Therapeuten* [Strasburg, 1880], p. 16 sq.), but ill a more general sense, because we have no notice whatever of the Therapeutae outside of Egypt. What he meant to say is that, outside of Egypt, there were also men of a similar tendency, without believing that they really belonged to this order in Egypt. Keim thinks, therefore, that Philo's words are an exaggeration, or rather that he confuses the hermit life of the Jews with like "phenomena among the Greeks and barbarians." Gratz, however, holds a different opinion, and adduces this as an argument for Christian monks, who were generally diffused at an early age (as early as the time of Eusebius or of Philo ?). "Bt," asks Dr. Keim, "has not Philo compared both the Essenes and Therapeutie with the Gymnosophists and Magi, with the wise man Kalanos, with Anaxagoras and Democritus?" It is evident that Philo, in describing this order, had a certain colony in view near the Lake Mareotis, to the south of Alexandria, where the Therapeutae lived. They dwelt at no great distance from each other, but every man in his own little house, his sanctuary, and his cell. They lived alone for the whole week, not stepping over the threshold, nor looking out (τὴν αὐλεῖαν οὐχ ὑπερβαίνοντες, ἀλλ οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀπόπτου θεωροῦντες).

Simple as was their house, their raiment was equally so, being a cloak of some shaggy hide for winter, and a thin mantle or linen shawl in the summer; and in their religious assemblies they appeared in a white garment. As temperance was regarded as the highest virtue, their mode of living was very simple. None of them took any meat or drink before the setting of the sun because they believed that the work of philosophizing was one worthy of the light, and that the care for the necessities of the body was suitable only to darkness; on which account they appropriated the day to the one occupation, and a brief portion of the night to the other (ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὲν φιλοσοφεῖν ἄξιον φωτὸς κρίνουσιν ειναι, σκότους δὲ τὰς σωματικὰς ἀνάγκας, ὅθεν τῷ μὲν ἡμέ ρας, ταῖς δὲ βραχύ τι μέρος τῆς νυκτὸς ἔνειμαν). Many fasted for three days, several for six. They

ate nothing of a costly character, but plain bread with a seasoning of salt, which the more luxurious of them further seasoned with hyssop, and their drink was water from the spring. For such a simple mode of living they naturally had no need of great earthly possessions; but, as Philo says, they left their possessions to their relatives or friends, and without any property they went out, as if their mortal life had already come to an end, only anxious for an immortal and blessed existence (εἰτα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ μακαρίας ζωῆς ἵμερον τετλευτηκέναι νομίζοντες ἤδη τὸν θνητὸν βίον ἀπο λείπουσι τὰς οὐσίας υἱοῖς ἢ θυγατράσιν, εἴτε καὶ ἄλ λοις συγγενέσιν).

They prayed twice every day, at morning and at evening. When the sun rose, they entreated God that the happiness of the coming day might be real happiness, so that their minds might be filled with heavenly light, The interval between morning and evening was devoted wholly to meditation on, and the practice of, virtue. They took up the Sacred Scriptures and philosophized concerning them, investigating the allegories of their national philosophy, since they looked upon their literal expressions as symbols of some secret meaning of nature intended to be conveyed in those figurative expressions (ἐντυγχάνοντες γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασι φιλοσοφοῦσι τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν, ἀλληγοροῦντες, ἐπειδὴ σύμβολα τὰ τῆς ῥητῆς ἑρμηνείας νομίζουσι φύσεως ἀποκεκρυμμένης, ἐν ὑπονοίαις δηλουμένης). As a canon of such allegorical exposition of Scripture, the real home of which was in Egypt, they used the, writings left *by* the founders of their sect (ἐστὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ συγγράμματα παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν οι τῆς αἱρήσεως ἀρχηγέται γενόμενοι πολλὰ μνημεῖα τῆς ἀλληγορου μένης ἰδέας ἀπέλιπον, οις καθάπερ τισὶν ἀρχετύποις χρώμενοι μιμοῦνται τῆς προαιρέσεως τὸν τρόπον). They also composed psalms and hymns to God in every kind of meter and melody imaginable, which they sang at their meetings. Having thus passed the day, they prayed again that their soul, being entirely lightened and relieved of the burden of the outward senses, might be able to trace out truth existing in its own consistory and council-chamber (ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῆς συνεδρίῳ καὶ βουλευτηρίῳ ἀλήθειον ἰχνηλατεῖν); and many of them, if Philo's statement is to be given credence, are said to have spoken in their sleep, divulging and publishing the celebrated doctrines of the sacred philosophy (πολ λοὶ ουν καὶ ἐκλαλοῦσιν ἐν ὑπνοῖς ἀνειροπολουμενοι τὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς φιλοσοφίας ἀοίδιμα δόγματα).

Women were also received into their order, the greater part of whom, though old, were virgins in respect to their purity, and were animated by the same admiration for, and love of, wisdom, in the exercise of which they were desirous to pass their lives. These women, like the male members of the order, lived separately, performing the same duties; but at the meetings and banquets both sexes were united.

Slave-labor was dispensed with, because they looked upon the possession of slaves as something absolutely and wholly contrary to nature-for nature had created all men free; but the injustice and covetousness of some men who preferred inequality that cause of all evil-having subdued the weaker, had given to the more powerful authority over the vanquished. At their common banquets, therefore no slaves ministered to their wants, but young men who were selected from their order with all possible care, and whose dress was such that nothing of a slavish character could be seen in it, or, to use the words of Philo, ἄζωστοι δὲ καὶ καθειμένοι τοὺς χιτιονίσκους εἰσίασιν ὑπηρετήσοντες, ἕνεκα τοῦ μηδὲν εἴδωλον ἐπιφέρεσθαι δουλοπρεποῦς σχήματος, εἰς τοῦτο τὸ συμπόσιον, *i.e.* they were ungirdled and with their tunics let down, in order that nothing which bears any resemblance to a slavish appearance might be introduced into this festival.

At the banquet they were presided over by a president (πρόεδρος), who addressed them and intoned a hymn, in which enjoined. They sat according to their, age, i.e. according to the length of time they belonged to the order. We must not, however, think that the president: or elders exercised any gubernatorial power, for this is nowhere inferred; their functions were only restricted to the assemblies, in which also ἡγεμόνες and ἔξαρχοι were mentioned, who acted as leaders of the choruses. The seventh day was especially distinguished. They anointed their bodies, and, clothed in white garments, they assembled in the common σημνεῖον. Here they sat down with all becoming gravity, keeping their hands inside their garments, having their right hand between their chest and their dress, and the left band down by their side, close to their flank. Then the oldest of them, who had the most profound learning in their doctrines, came forward and spoke with steadfast look and with steadfast voice, with great powers of reasoning, and great prudence not making exhibition of his oratorical talent like the rhetoricians of old or the sophists of the present day, but investigating with great pains and explaining with minute accuracy the precise meaning of the laws, which penetrated through their hearing into

the soul, and remained there lastingly. Quietly they listened in silence, showing their ‘assent only by nods of the head or the eager look of the eyes. In this sacred assembly the women also shared; but they had their own seats, being separated from the male members by a wall rising three or four cubits upwards, but in such a manner that they could hear the voice of the speaker.

The seventh Sabbath, the πεντηκοστή, was especially distinguished. The number fifty was regarded by them as the most holy and natural of numbers, being compounded of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the principle of the origination and condition of the whole (ἔστι δὲ προεόρτιος μεγίστης ἑορτῆς, ἣν πεντηκοντὰς ἔλαχεν, ἁγιώτατος καὶ φυσικώτατος αριθμῶν, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ὀρθογωνίου τριγώνου δυνάμεως, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τῆς τῶν ὅλων γενέσεως καὶ συστά σεως). Clothed in white garments, they came together to the common feast. Before they partook of the same, they lifted up their eyes and hands to heaven and prayed to God that it might be acceptable to him. After the prayer, they sat down, the men sitting on the right hand and the women on the left, on rugs of the coarsest material. Before the feast commenced, questions were asked and answered. A passage of the Scripture was explained and religious questions were settled. All listened attentively to the speaker, indicating their attention and comprehension by their nods and looks. When the president appeared to have spoken at sufficient length, and to have carried out his intentions adequately, so that his explanation had gone on felicitously and fluently through his own acuteness, and the hearing of the others had been profitable, applause arose from them all as of men rejoicing at what they had seen and heard; and then some one, rising up, sang a hymn which had been made in honor of God, either such as he had composed himself or some ancient one of some old poet. After him others also arose in their ranks, and in becoming manner, while every one else listened in decent silence, except when it was proper to take up the burden of the song and join in at the end. When each individual had finished his psalm, the young men brought in the table on which was the food-the leavened bread with a seasoning of salt, and mingled with some hyssop, out of reverence for the sacred table which was in the holy outer temple; for on this table were placed loaves and salt without seasoning, and the bread was unleavened, and the salt unmixed with anything else.

After the feast they celebrated the sacred festival during the whole night (μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεῖπνον τὴν ἱερὰν ἄγουσι παννυχίδα). All stood up

together, and in the middle of the entertainment two choruses were formed at first, the one of men and the other of women. Each chorus had its leader and chief, who was the most honorable and most excellent of the band. Then they sang the hymns in honor of God in many meters and tunes, at one time all singing together, and at another moving their hands, and dancing in corresponding harmony. When each chorus of the men and each chorus of the women had feasted separately by itself, they joined together, and the two became one chorus-an imitation of that one which, in old time, was established by the Red Sea, on account of the wondrous works which were displayed there before Israel, and where both men and women together became all one chorus, Moses leading the men, and Miriam leading the women. When the sun arose, they raised their hands to heaven, imploring tranquility and truth and acuteness of understanding. After the prayer, each retired to his own separate abode, again practicing the usual philosophy to which each had been wont to devote himself.

II. *Therapeutae and Essenes.* —On account of the manifold similar traits which were found among the Therapeutae and Essenes, it has been inferred that the Therapeutae were but the Egyptian branch of Palestinian Essenism. This hypothesis is seemingly confirmed by what Philo says at the beginning of his treatise on the Therapeutae: “Having mentioned the Essenes, who in all respects selected for their admiration and for their especial adoption the practical course of life, and who excel in all, or what, perhaps, may be a less unpopular and invidious thing to say, in most of its parts, I will now proceed, ill the regular order of my subject, to speak of those who have embraced the speculative life, and I will say what appears to me to be desirable to be said on the subject.” The majority of critics have therefore not hesitated to believe in a causative connection between the two sects, and have thus, on account of Philo’s words, separated the Egyptian Therapeutae, as the theorists, from the Palestinian Essenes, whom they designated the practitioners. In this assumption, there can only be a diversity of opinion as to which of the two sects justly claims the temporal precedence — whether the theory of the Therapeutae or the practice of the Essenes is the original, or, in other words, whether Egypt or Palestine is the fatherland of that tendency within Judaism which is designated by the name of Essenism. The opinion that the temporal precedence belongs to the Therapeutae, and that after Therapeuitsm had been planted on the soil of Judaea the Order of the Essenes originated, is advocated by Grorer (*Kritische Geschichte des Uschrisfenthuis* [Stuttg. 1831], 2, 335 sq.),

Lutterbeck (*Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe* [Mayence, 1852], 1, 275 sq.), Mangold (*Die Irrlehrender Pastor-albriefe* [Marburg, 1856], p. 57 sq.), and Holtzmann (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel und die Entstehungdes Christenthums* [Leips. 1867], 2, 79 sq.). The opposite opinion is represented by Ritschl (*Theologische Jahrbücher* [ed. Baur and Zeller, 1855], p. 343 sq.), Hilgenfeld (*Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* [Jena, 1857], p. 278 sq.), Herzfeld (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel* [2nd ed. Leips. 1863], 3, 406), Zeller (*Geschichte der Philosophie der Griechen* [ibid. 1868], III, 2, 288 sq.), Bellermann (*Nalchrichten aus dem Alterthum liber Essener und Therapeuten* [Berlin, 1821], p. 80, note), and Harnischmacher (*De Essenorum apud Judaeos Societate* [Bonn, 1866], p. 26), who admit a causative connection of both, without deciding the time of the origin. Now, denying, as we do, in opposition to the above-mentioned critics, any connection between these sects, and thus dismissing altogether the question which of the two formed the connecting link for the other, we will, for the sake of justifying our assertion, draw a parallel between the two sects, and first consider those points in which both agree.

Both sects diligently studied the Scripture, and interpreted the same allegorically. Besides the Old Test., both had a high consideration for the writings of the older members of their order. They favored the abolishing of slavery; lived in a very simple manner, and were accustomed to, appear at their religious exercises in white garments. More common traits cannot be proved, excepting, perhaps, the fact that both led an unmarried life. But even this is no proof, because, according to Josephus, at least one part of the Essenes, though perhaps only the minority, married. It cannot also be said that both agreed in leading a life entirely separated from the world. Of the Therapeutae, it is true, this can be said, but not of the Essenes, because, as Josephus tells us, they instructed the youth and took otherwise an active part in the weal and woe of their people, as they did, for instance, in the war against the Romans for the liberty of their country.

But more numerous and important are the differences which exist between the Therapeutae and Essenes. We call attention to the following:

1. The Therapeutae led a monastic, secluded life, given entirely to contemplation. The Essenes, according to the rules of their order, were obliged to work. Their labor was prescribed and regulated by officers

purposely appointed. They cultivated the fields, and were engaged in manual labors as well as in arts.

2. The Therapeutae lived separated from each other in cells, and only came together on the Sabbath and on special occasions. The Essenes, however, wherever they resided, had their common lodges, where they lived and dined together.

3. The Therapeutae, upon entering the order, left everything to their relatives and friends. The Essenes delivered their property to the order for the benefit of all.

4. The Therapeutae did not eat before the setting of the sun; the Essenes enjoyed two meals daily.

5. The Essenes were divided into four classes or graders which were so marked that a member of the upper class had to bathe himself when he touched anything belonging to a lower class. The Therapeutae had no such distinction. Of the Essenes we mare told that the members of the higher degrees had the knowledge of mysteries, which was not communicated to the lower degrees; of the Therapeutae we know nothing of the kind.

6. Each Esseue had to bathe himself daily; such lustrations were not in use among the Therapeutae.

7. The Therapeutae revered, the Temple at Jerusalem and the Levitical priesthood, and were not so far apart from orthodox Judaism. The Essenes, on the contrary, believed their lustrations and their mode of living to be of greater importance than the ordinances prescribed to the priests for the service of the Temple. They furnished no offerings to the Temple at Jerusalem, and thus became guilty of apostatizing from an important part of the Mosaic law. The Essenies were especially addicted to medicine and prophecy; we know nothing of these practices among the Therapeutae.

It is obvious that the differences between the two sects cannot consist in that the one was given to theory and the other to practice, because the supposition of a like ground-principle is not sufficient for explaining so many, and at the same time very important, differences. After all that we know of both these sects, the supposition of a causal connection between the two must appear very hazardous; for if there really were such a connection between them, and if both were essentially one and the same sect, it is surprising that Josephus has not recorded the fact. As little as we

believe with Philo in a real connection between the Jewish Essenes, the seven wise men of Greece, and the Indian Gymnosophists, whom he compares in his book *Quod Omnis Probus Liber*, just as little connection is there between the Essenes and Therapeutae, because Philo divided them into the theorists and practitioners. The Essenes did not originate from the propagation of Therapeutism in Palestine, because, as we know, Alexandrian religious philosophy did not find a fertile soil in Judaea, especially at the time in which both these sects originated. We cannot assume that the reverse should have taken place, otherwise the essential traits of Essenism would have been found again among the Therapeutae. The stamp of both sects is so different that they cannot be identical; and in treating of the Therapeutae no regard is therefore to be paid to the Essenes.

III. *Therapeutae and Christianity.* —Assuming that the Essenes were only consistent Chasidim has led the Jewish historian Gratz to make the assertion that Philo's treatise on the Therapeutae, according to which they were hitherto regarded as an Egyptian offshoot of Palestinian Essenism, could not be genuine. According to the same writer, it is not so much owing to the description of the Essenes by Josephus as to the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν *permv* that those not coinciding with the former's views have arrived at a false result regarding the essence and origin of the Essene sect. Gratz also asserts that a Jewish sect of the Therapeutae never existed, but that they were Christians, ascetics of a heretic tendency, who sprang up by the dozen in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The author of the book which has caused so much confusion is not Philo, but a Christian "who probably belonged either to the Encratico-gnostic or Montanistic party, and intended to write a panegyric on monasticism, the high antiquity of which Philo's authority was to confirm." This is the result at which Gratz arrives; and although he takes it for granted that the attentive reader of the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ must at once adopt the correctness of his assertion, he has nevertheless taken the pains to make good his hypothesis at great length.

This hypothesis of Gratz has been analyzed by Zeller, and the result is that the reasons adduced by the former are not sufficient and acceptable at all. In resuming the question once more, and examining the argument of Gratz in order to establish the Christian character of the Therapeutae, we do so because of its close connection with the essence and origin of the sect-in this we differ with Zeller-and because there are some points to be proved

against Gratz. The latter has denied the existence of a Jewish sect of the Therapeutae, and consequently also the genuineness of the Philonic treatise Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, on the ground of the silence of Josephus and Pliny, who wrote so much about the Essenes; while they know nothing of the Therapeutae, the alleged Egyptian branch of this sect. Against this, Zeller has argued that the silence of Josephus cannot be so remarkable, since the Therapeutae were a branch of the Essenes restricted to Egypt alone, and because Josephus tells very little about the later affairs of the Jews in that country. But if, according to Zeller, the Therapeutae were really an Egyptian branch of the Palestinian Essenes, or had some connection with them, the Essenes in Palestine ought to have known something about it; and even if Pliny's silence could be explained because he only knows *one* Essenic colony living by the Dead Sea, it might be supposed and in this Gratz is correct-that Josephus, who otherwise speaks very fully about the order, ought to have mentioned the Therapeutae. The silence of Josephus can therefore only be explained from the very fact that the Therapeutas had no connection whatever with the Essenes, but that they formed an independent sect within the Egyptian Judaism, the existence of which since its number and activity were less important was entirely unknown to Josephus. What Philo narrates concerning the female Therapeutae (θεραπευτρίδες), Gratz also finds incredible, because Josephus marks it as one of the characteristics of the Essenes to avoid all contact with the opposite sex; hence he believes that these female Therapeutae were nothing else than the sisters (*sorores subintroductae*) whom the Christian ascetics used to have about them for the sake of attaining, by constant temptation, a higher virtue, but who, as is known, have been the cause of great scandals. Against this, Zeller remarks that in this respect the Egyptian Essenes or Therapeutae might have had other institutions than those of the Palestinians, since their principles on the worth of an unmarried state were in the main not affected; and this difference of view does not indicate such a great deviation from the principles of the order as the practice of one branch of the Palestinian Essenes who married. We agree with Grätz that, according to Josephus, the wives of the married Essenes were not, like the female Therapeutae, members of the order. But this actual deviation-that while the Essenes excluded women entirely from the common feasts and meetings, this was not the case among the Therapeutae is only another proof that Essenes and Therapeutae are not, as Zeller believes, one and the same sect. This being the case, it must not be supposed, as Gratz believes, that the Therapeutae,

not being Essenes, were *Christians.* Gratz overlooks the circumstance that while the so-called *sorores subintroductae* lived in very close communication with the Christian ascetics, this cannot be said of the female Therapeutae. For can we safely infer, from the participation of women in the common feasts and meetings, that the Therapeutae really lived each with a female companion? Against such a hypothesis we have also the words of Philo, τὰς μὲν ουν ξ ἡμέρας χωρὶς ἕκαστοι μονούμενοι παρ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς λεχθεῖσι, μοναστηρίοις φιλοσοφοῦσι, who emphasizes the fact repeatedly that they sought solitude and desired to be left to themselves in order not to be disturbed in their contemplative life (ὀχληρὸν γὰρ καὶ δυσάρεστον τοῖς ἐρημίαν ἐζηλωκόσι καὶ μεταδιώκουσιν αἱ γειτνιάσεις). But, above all, we ask, where is the passage in this treatise which indicates, as Gratz tries to prove, that the Therapeutae, like the Christian ascetics, had aimed at a higher degree of perfection by living together with the female members? From the introductory words of the Philonic treatise, Gratz also" infers that it cannot be genuine, since it connects itself with the treatise Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ειναι ἐλεύθερον erroneously, as with a writing on the Essenes. The words in question *are* Ἐσσαίων πέρι δια λεχθείς, ο τὸν πρακτικὸν ἐζήλωσαν καὶ διεπόνησαν βιον ἐν ἅπασιν, κ.τ.λ. Gratz thinks that Philo could not possibly say that *he* "wrote a treatise" on the Essenes (Ἐσσάιων πέρι διαλεχθείς), *when* the passage in question only occupies the twelfth part of the treatise, and he only mentions this sect as one of the many. But against this it must be *argued that* διαλέγεσθαι περι τινος does not mean "*to write* a treatise," but to "*speak* on something," and this, as Zeller remarks, Philo has evidently done concerning the Essenes. Moreover, such an association of topics *is* not comical at all, as Gratz thinks, because by this two Jewish sects which have at least some traits in common were brought into connection. *But* the main point for the spuriousness of the treatise on the Therapeutae and for its being *written by* a Christian, *Gratz* thinks to lie in the *fact* that Christians-so Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 2, 17) and *others* after him recognized the Therapeutae *as* "*flesh* of their own flesh." The holy cells of the Therapeutae are called monasteries. It is evident, argues Gratz, that we *have* here the beginning of the monastic cells, *which* existed even before Anthony of Thebes, the founder of-monasticism.. *But* even if we admit that the entire mode *of* living of the Therapeutae is similar to that of the later Christian monks, we *are* not at all justified to infer that the Therapeutae were *Christian monks.* Why — and herein we agree with Grätz should

there not have been in Egypt, the fatherland and the proper home of monasticism, ascetics even before Anthony of Thebes? And why should this not *have* been possible within the pale *of* Judaism*?* And are the Palestinian Essenes not a similar phenomenon? *To impress on* the Therapeutae the Christian *character because of the word* μοναστήριον*, which the Christian* monks used for their cell, is *not* reasonable, because, as Zeller reminds us, the expressions μοναστήριον, and σεμνεῖον were only used by the Therapeutae for a part, *and* not, as did the Christian monks, for the whole, of the dwelling. The supposition seems to be that the Therapeuta, or rather Philo himself, formed the Words μοναστήριον and σεμνεῖον *,* and that Christian monks *borrowed* this nomenclature from their *Jewish* predecessors. That Philo, who was the first to *use* these expressions, has also-formed the same appears from the fact that he himself explains them when saying, ἐν ἑκάστῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ ἐστὶν ἱερὸν ὃ καλεῖται σεμνεῖον καὶ μοναστήριον, ἐν ᾧ μονούμενοι τὰ τοῦ σεμνοῦ βίου μυστήρια τελοῦνται. The Therapeutae, Gratz goes on *to* argue, had *not only* a common feast, *but* after the feast they *had* a kind of Lord's supper (παναγέστατον σιτίον), consisting of unleavened bread, of which all did not *partake,* but only the better ones. Gratz evidently believes that we have here the difference between the *missa catechumenorum* and the *missa Jidelium.* From the *latter,* which consisted in the celebration of the Lord's supper and in a kind of liturgy, those who were not yet baptized, together with those who were *excommunicated,* were excluded; for, he asks, is this *not* Christian? *But* this question *we must* also answer in the negative. Grätz, as Zeller remarks, has overlooked the fact that the so-called Lord's supper did *not* take place after the common meal, but it was this common meal itself. At this supper not *unleavened,* but *leavened,* bread was eaten (ἄρτος ἐζυμωμένος μετὰ προσοψήματος, ἁλῶν οις ὕσσωπος ἀναμέμικται δὶ αἰδῶ τῆς ἀνακειμένης ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ προνάῳ ἱερᾶς τραπέζης) out of reverence for the unleavened showbread in the Temple at Jerusalem. But, above all, *Grätz* has erred in asserting that this supper was a prerogative of the better ones. Now the words ἵνα ἔφωσι προνομίαν οἱ κρείττονες do *not* refer to the Therapeutae, but to the *Jewish* priests, to whom alone the Therapeutae conceded the use *of unleavened bread* as a special prerogative.

This unquestionably follows from the words of Philo: ὅταν δὲ ἕκαστος διαπεράνηται τὸν ὕμνον, οἱ νέοι τὴν πρὸ μίκροῦ λεχθεῖσαν

τράπεζαν εἰσκομίζουσιν, ἐφ ης τὸ παναγέστατον σιτίον ἐζυμωμένος μετὰ προσοψή ματος ἁλῶν οις ὕσσωπος ἀναμέμικται δὶ αἰδῶ τῆς ἀνακειμένης ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ προνάῳ ἱερᾶς τραπέζης: ἐπὶ γὰρ ταύτης εἰσὶν ἄρτοι καὶ ἅλες ἄνευ ἡδύσματος, ἄζυ μοι μὲν οἱ ἄρτοι, ἀμιγεῖς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἅλες. Προσῆκον γὰρ ην, τὰ μὲν ἁπλούστατα καὶ εἰλικρινέστατα τῇ κρατίστῃ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀπονεμηθῆναι μερίδι, λειτουργίας αθλον, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους τὰ μὲν ὅμοια ζηλοῦν, ἀπεχεσθαι δὲ τῶν ἄρτων, ἵνα ἔχωσι προνομίαν οἱ κρείττο νες. That the Therapeutae were Christians, Gratz also finds in the fact that the presbyters among them occupied the first position; and that they were not presbyters because of their age, but because of their strict observance of the Therapeutic life (πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ οὐ πολυετεῖς καὶ παλαίους νομίζουσιν ἀλλὰ ἔτι κομιδῇ νέους παῖδας ἐὰν ὀψὲ τῆς προαιρέσεως ἐρασθῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας ἐνηβήσαντας καὶ ἐνακμάσαντας τῷ θεωρητικῷ μέρει φιλοσοφίας, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστον καὶ θειότατόν ἐστι). *We* have thus, *Gratz* argues, the presbyters, or ἐπίσκοποι, of the Christian congregations, who held one and the same office in the ante-Nicene time. But this conclusion is the less justifiable, since the office of presbyters was not exactly a Christian institution, but existed even before the Christian era, and was adopted by the Church from Judaism. Even among the Essenes we find such a distinction of rank, and yet Gratz would be the last to call them Christians, although he firmly believes that Christ belonged to the Essenes. The argument which Gratz takes from the vigils, so common among the Therapeutae, for the sake of making them Christians is also of no avail, because fasting was something peculiar to Judaism and was adopted by the Church; and as to the vigils, such nocturnal services existed before the Christian era. It. is therefore not necessary to think, as does Grätz, following Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 2, 17), of Christian rites before Easter Sunday. From the liturgy, the metrical hymns, and typical mode of explaining the prophets, according to Gratz, other arguments for the Christian character of the Therapeutae might be made. But even these alleged Christian traits are purely Jewish. Of the hymns of the Therapeutae. Philo expressly states that they were formed after the hymn of Moses and Miriam (Exodus 15); and as to the allegorical interpretation, it was used among the Alexandrian Jews before the Christian era, and even before Philo. But as to what Gratz understands of the liturgy of the Therapeutae and of its Christian character, he has not fully entered upon this point, nor can anything of the kind be deduced from Philo’s statement. Gratz refers to

Eusebius, and to those after him who regarded the Therapeutae as Christians, but this proof is the least satisfactory. Eusebius regards the treatise Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ as Philonian, and makes the Jewish philosopher a disciple of John Mark, who accompanied Paul on his first missionary tour, and afterwards labored at Alexandria. According to Eusebius, the Therapeutae existed as Christians in the 1st century. The opinion of Grätz that the Therapeutae were a Christian monastic sect of the 2nd or 3rd century of the Christian era has therefore no support in Eusebius. While, however, later Christian writers, with the exception of Photius (*Myriobiblon sive Bibliotheca* [Rothomagi, 1653], ed. Dav. Halschelius, p. 275), identify Therapeutae with monks, and while the writings falsely ascribed to Dionysius Areopagita use both expressions synonymously, Scaliger has called attention to the fact that the designation of Therapeutae for monks depends solely upon the interpretation of Eusebius (Scaliger, *De Emeindatione Temporum*, *6*:252). With the exception of Gratz, no writer has regarded the Therapeut as as Christian heretical sect, and he himself is yet undecided in what series of heretical sects, which sprang up by the dozen within the Church in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, he should place them. According to Grätz, the author of the treatise probably belonged to the Encratico-gnostic or Montanistic party. But he has not tried to state any plausible reason for his hypothesis, which, in fact, would be impossible; and he himself says that this point is outside of his object, and must be left ‘to those critics who make this question their specialty. We ask, however, what reason could there have been for a Christian, even for a heretic, to father upon Philo such a book, for the sake of recommending monastic asceticism? We nowhere hear, except from Eusebius, whose erroneous view concerning the Therapeutae led him to the opinion, that Philo had such a good reputation within the Christian Church, and that Christians appealed to him for their views. And what is the more remarkable is the fact that in the whole treatise neither Christ nor the doctrines of Christianity are once mentioned. Where, then, is the Christian character of the Therapeutae? As for the linguistic character of the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, it entirely agrees with Philo’s mode of representation; and there is no internal nor external argument for denying Philo to be the author of the book. The Therapeutae, as we shall see further on, were Jews.

IV. *Character and Origin of the Sect of the Therapeutae.* — From the manner in which Philo speaks of the Therapeutae, there can be no doubt

that he himself was very much prepossessed regarding them, for the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ is nothing but a panegyric on the sect. This fact alone would lead to the supposition-which, in truth is also supported by the whole character of the sect — that the Therapeutae cultivated and adhered to Jewish religious philosophy, which numbered Philo among its most zealous disciples. It is hardly conceivable, as Gfrorer (*Philo und die jüdischalexaendrüsche Theosophie*, 2. 281 sq.) has indicated, that in a time like that in which Philo wrote, when the religious movement was at a high pitch, and when the most diverse religious parties existed side by side, a man with such peculiar religious views should write such a panegyric on a sect unless it represented his own views.

Now there can be no doubt that the Therapeutae represented a Jewish sect. They based their investigations and researches upon the writings of the Old Test. In their σεμνεῖα they had only the law and the prophets (νόμοι καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν). Philo calls them Μωσέως γνώριμοι, and further says that they gave themselves to philosophical speculation, according to the holy doctrines of the prophet Moses (κατὰ τὰς τοῦ προφήτου Μωσέως ἱερωτάτας ὑφηγήσεις). The Therapeutae strictly observed the Jewish Sabbath, and had great reverence for the Temple at Jerusalem and the Levitical priesthood. Their holy choruses are expressly said to be an imitation of those at the Red Sea. All these traits show that, on the one hand, the Therapeutae strictly adhered to the traditions and views of Judaism, while, on the other hand, they deviated in many particulars; hence they were characterized as a sect.

As to their name, Philo leaves us to choose between two views. They are called Therapeutae either because they profess an art of medicine more excellent than that in general use in cities (thus Therapeutae would be equivalent to “physicians for the soul”), or because they have been instructed by nature and the sacred laws to serve the living God (θεραπεύιν τὸ ῎Ον); thus Therapeutae would signify those who “serve God.” The latter view is probably the more correct, since the Therapeutae, as the true spiritual “worshippers of God,” called themselves the contemplatives κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, and this appellation accords more fully with the whole tenor and character of the sect than the designation “physicians for the soul.” Besides, Philo uses ἱκέται and θεραπευταί, γένος θεραπευτικόν, and γένος ἱκετι κόν synonymously, in order to designate the worship of God in the sense of Alexandrian theosophy, in opposition to the faith and worship of God of the great mass. (*De. Victimas oferentibus*

[Mangey], 2, 258: ἱκέται καὶ θεραπευταὶ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος. *De Monar*; *chi* (2, 425: ἀνδρὸς ἱκέτου καὶ φιλοθέου θεὸν μόνον θεραπεύειν ἀξιοῦντος. *Vita Mosis*, 2, 164: τὸ θεραπευτικὸν αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ θεοῦ] γένος. *De Profugis*, 1, 552: τὸ γὰρ θεραπευτικὸν γένος ἀνάθημά ἐστι θεοῦ ἱερωμένον τὴν μεγάλην ἀρχιερωσύνην αὐτῷ μόνῳ)

From the Greek derivation of Therapeutae, we see that there existed a spiritual relationship between this sect and Jewish Alexandrian religious philosophy; and we are led to this assumption when we consider the object, which formed the basis of their contemplative life. Its purpose was to lead to the knowledge of the Deity. To achieve this it was necessary to suppress the material man and elevate the spiritual. For this reason they lived in a very simple manner, restricting their wants to the smallest measure. Abstinence and moderation they regarded as the foundation of all virtues, because by these man is brought nearer to the simple, which enables him to see the simple essence of the Deity, and to indulge. in the blessed intuition of the same. Therefore the Therapeutae lived secluded from the outside world; they denied themselves everything that could bring them in contact with others, thus living only to themselves and their contemplation. They denied themselves marriage, because they preferred to live together with the divine wisdom; and sought not after the mortal, but the immortal, fruits of a soul loved by God, and which the same only brings forth when she is impregnated by the spiritual rays of the heavenly Father. For this reason slavery was banished from their midst, because, in a community which was animated by such motives, men could not be tolerated who were degraded below the dignity of men. If the entire aim of the Therapeutae accords with the object and time of the Alexandrian religious philosophy, the relationship between the two shows itself more fully in the allegorical exegesis, which, distinguishing between spirit and letter, idea and symbol, endeavored to explain the writings of the Old Test. According to Philo, the Therapeutae had the writings of the ancients, who, as the founders of this tendency, left behind them many memorials of the allegorical system. The same symbolic character we also find in their holy feast. The historical relation with which it connected itself was the exode from Egypt and the going through the Red Sea, as the choruses sung at this feast were in imitation of those songs which Moses and Miriam sang. Now, according to the allegory of the Alexandrians and Philo, Egypt is the symbol of the sensual life in earthly lust and bodily pleasure; the song of Moses

symbolizes the rapture which man feels after he has denied himself every earthly thing and suppressed all sensual lust, and now, as a purely spiritual being, indulges in the intuition of the Deity. Thus the Therapeutae, like Philo and the Alexandrians, held the view that, the body being the seat of sin the flight from a corporeal into a purely spiritual existence ought to be the true and highest aim of life. And Philo himself expressly states that the Therapeutae went into the desert, because they had entirely broken with their earthly life, and intended to lead another, as it were immortal and blessed existence. The Therapeutae thus represent a sect which earnestly strove after carrying out and practicing those principles and views to which the Jewish Alexandrian religious philosophy did homage. At what time, however, this sect, with its ceremonies, originated it is hard to tell, since Philo does not say anything more definite about it. The only indication in the Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ from which we may conclude that the sect existed a long time before Philo, is the notice that the Therapeutae possessed writings of the ancients which the founders had left behind them as memorials of the allegorical system, and which the Therapeutae took as a kind of model. The founding of the sect probably took place at the time when the Jewish Alexandrian theosophy originated and developed itself. We may trace it back to the beginning of the 2nd century before Christ, to Aristobulus, who introduced Jewish doctrines into the Orphic hymns because he believed that Greek philosophers had derived their wisdom from an ancient version of the Pentateuch. Whether we have any traces of a connection of Greek philosophy with Jewish theology in the Septuagint, which, according to Josephus, was commenced in B.C. 285, is at least very doubtful; but certain it is that with the beginning of the 2nd pre-Christian century the conditions were already given for the origin of the sect. That the sect of the Therapeutae was propagated beyond Egypt is not probable, and its number was, perhaps, not very large.

After all, it is very interesting to know that about the time when Christ came into the world, among the Jews in Egypt the desire was felt to come into a nearer relation to the Deity, and to be freed from those relations which were not satisfactory. The Therapeutae endeavored to reach this object by leaving all earthly possessions, and in this respect they resemble the Christian monks, who borrowed from them many traits, as, in fact, Egypt was the real country of monasticism. But, when Christians regarded them for a long time as flesh of their own flesh, they misunderstood the character and tendency of the Therapeutae entirely, because their whole

history shows how far they were still from that goal which alone could satisfy the cravings of the heart, but which human reason and power alone cannot reach.

V. *Literature. — Gfrorer, Philo und die jüdisch-alexandrinische Theosophie* (Stuttg. 1835); D ahne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie* (Halle, 1834); Kuenen, *De Godsdienst van Israel* (Haarlem, 1870), 2, 382 sq. (Engl. transl. by May, *The Religion of Israel* [Lond. 1874 sq.]); Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischem Kinche* (Bonn, 1857), p. 216;. Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Leips. 1863), 3, 496; Delaunay, *Ecrits Historiques de Philon* (Par. 1870), p. 55; id. *Moines et Sibylles* (ibid. 1874), p. 385; Baur, *Drei Abhandlungen zür Geschichte der alten Philosophie* (Leips. 1876), p. 216; Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter* (Tub. 1846), 1, 190; Lutterbeck, *Die neutestanzenitlichen Lehrbegrimfe* (Mentz, 1852), 1, 131, 271; Wegnern, *Ueber das Verhaltniss des Chrisfenthums zum Essenisnus,* in Illgen's *Zeitsch. F. d. hist. Theol.* 1841, 11:2, 1 sq.; Leroux, *Encyclopedie Nouvelle* (Par. 1843), 4:656 sq.; Bauer, *Christus und die C'saren* (Berl. 1879), p. 307 sq.; Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden,* 2nd ed. 3, 464 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums,* 1, 224; Nicolas, *Revue de Theologie* (Strasb. 1868), p. 36 sq.; Derenbourg, *Journal Asiatique* (Par. 1868), p. 282 sqt.; Renan, *Journal des Savants* (ibid. 1874), p. 798 sq.; Clemens, *Die Therapeuten* (Konigsb. 1869); Lucius, *Die Therapeuten und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Askese. Eine kritische Untersuchung der Schrift de Vita Contemplativa* (Strasb. 1880). 'The last writer comes to the conclusion that the Therapeutse were not Jews, and that the treatise bearing the name of Philo was written towards the end of the 3rd century as an apolog for Christian asceticism. (B.P.)

The'ras

(θέρα), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 8:41, 61) of the name Hebraized (<150821>Ezra 8:21, 31) AHANA *SEE AHANA* (q.v.).

Theremin, Ludwig Friederich Franz

a celebrated German preacher and professor, was born at Gramzow, March 19, 1780. He was of Huguenot extraction, his family having emigrated from France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and his father was the pastor of the French congregation in the town where Franz was born. After suitable preparation, the latter was ordained at Geneva in 1805, and

in 1810 was chosen by the French congregation at Berlin to be its pastor. This post he exchanged, Dec. 29,1814, for that of preacher to the court. In 1824 he was made a member of the high consistory and lecturer in the department of instruction of the ministry of worship; and in the same year the degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on him by the University of Greifswalde. In 1839 he added to his former dignities that of extraordinary, and in 1840 that of ordinary, honorary, professor in the University of Berlin. He lectured on homiletics, and established a homiletical seminary in his house, devoting himself to the guidance of the latter with an enthusiasm which increased steadily, in proportion as physical infirmities restricted the range of his activity as a preacher. A cataract formed over one of his eyes, and gave rise to the apprehension that he would become totally blind; but he was relieved from such fear by death, which came to him quietly and gently Sept. 26, 1846. His wife had preceded him into the eternal world by more than twenty years. A son and an unmarried daughter survived him.

Theremit was the representative of a specific homiletical tendency which held that classical antiquity is the true school of eloquence and claimed Demosthenes as its master. Its characteristic was that it devoted exclusive attention to finished perfection of form, and consequently had nothing in common with that rugged German school of eloquence of which Luther is the representative, and whose peculiarity it is that “out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh” and shapes its own forms of expression. Not Luther or Harms, but Massillon, was Theremin’s ideal; for Theremin’s mind was in its structure not German, but French. This peculiarity may partially explain the fact that Theremin did not found a school of pulpit orators in any actual sense; while Reinhard, to whom he was unquestionably superior, had numerous imitators. Theremin’s fundamental principle in homiletics was that eloquence is not an art, but a virtue (see his work *Beredsamkeit eine Tugend*). The idea is evidently faulty, since eloquence is not, like other virtues, a duty; nor is the use of eloquence confined altogether to the promotion of ethical results. As a preacher he was accustomed to use brief texts, and consequently to employ considerable latitude in the handling of his themes, often dragging in extraneous matter, instead of educing it from the text. His bearing in the pulpit was that of quiet dignity; his gestures were few and simple, his voice good, his modulation perfect. The finish of his productions, however, produced the impression of an aristocratic refinement, which, though evidently altogether natural in his case, prevented the achieving of such

popular results as were secured by Luther, Heinrich Miller, Conrad Rieger, L. Hofacker, and others. Ten volumes of his *Sermons* have been published, most of them in repeated editions (Duncker and Humblot, Berlin). Other works of theological and ascetical character emanated from his pen, and have received deserved recognition, e.g. *Lehre orm gott Reiche* (Berlin, 1823): —*Adalhert's Bekenntnisse* (2nd ed. *1835*): —*Abendstunden* (5th ed. 1858). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Theresa, or Teresa, St.

Picture for Theresa

was born at Avila, in Castile, Spain, March 28, 1515. Her full name was *Theresa Sanchez de Cepeda.* From early childhood she was accustomed, with a favorite brother, to read the lives of the saints and martyrs until they both became possessed of a passionate desire to obtain the crown of martyrdom. When they were children eight or nine years old, they set off on a begging expedition into the country of the Moors, in hopes of being taken by the infidels and sacrificed for their faith. Disappointed in this, they resolved to turn hermits; but in this they were also prevented. Theresa lost her mother at the age of twelve, and in a few years became so worldly that her father placed her, at the age of sixteen, in a convent. Here her mind again took a religious turn, and when twenty years of age she obtained her father's consent to take the vow, and entered the convent of the Carmelites at Avila. For nearly twenty years, however, she says, she lived without feeling that repose for which she had hoped when she sacrificed the world. But at length while reading the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, she was led to pray with greater confidence, and her enthusiastic and restless spirit found peace. She remained in the convent in her native town till 1561, when she conceived the idea of reforming the Order of the Carmelites, into which several disorders had crept. In 1562 she laid the foundation of the new monastery at Avila, which she dedicated to St. Joseph, whom she had chosen as her patron saint. The branch of her order which she founded were the "Barefooted Carmelites," and also, after her, the THERESIANS *SEE THERESIANS* (q.v.). It was the principle of Theresa that the convents of the Carmelites, under her new rule, should either have no worldly possessions whatever, and literally exist upon the charity of others, or that they should be so endowed as not to require any external aid. This was a principle from which her spiritual directors obliged her to depart; and yet such was her success that at the time of her death she had founded

seventeen convents for women and fifteen for men. During the latter part of her life Theresa found ample occupation ill traveling from one convent to another to promulgate her new regulations for the government of her order. In 1582 she was seized with her last illness in the palace of the duchess of Alva, but was, by her urgent request, carried back to her convent of San Jose, where she died a few days afterwards. She was beatified by pope Paul V, April 24,1614, and canonized *by* Gregory XV, March 22, 1622, her feast being fixed on October 15. Philip III declared her the second patron saint of the Spanish monarchy after Santiago, a decree solemnly confirmed by the Spanish Cortes in 1812. Her shrine is at Avila, in the -church of her convent. The ascetic treatises and letters of Theresa, in which she describes the internal struggles and aspirations of her heart, are among the most remarkable documents of the mystic literature of the Roman Catholic Church. Five of them are extant: *Discurso ó Relacion de su Vida* (1562): —*El Camino de la Perfeccion,* prepared in 1563 as a guide for the nulls of the reformed order *El Libro de las Fundaciones,* an account of convents founded by her: —*El Castillo Interior, ó las Moradas* (1577): —*Santos Conceptos del Amor de Dios.* The original MSS. of the first four works are preserved in the library of the Escurial, that of the last was burned by order of her confessor; but a copy had previously been taken by one of her nuns. The first complete edition of St. Theresa's *Works* appeared at Salamanca (1587), and a recent one by Ochoa at Paris (*1847*): —*Letters* (Saragossa, 1658). The abbé Migne edited a complete collection of her works in French (Paris, 1840-46, 4 vols.); and pere Marcel Bouix published a French translation from the original MSS. (Le Mans, 1852-56,3 vols. 8vo). For *Lives* of Theresa consult those of Ribera (Salamanca, 1590), pere Bouix (Paris,'1865), Bollandist Vandermoere (Brussels, 1845), and Maria French (Lond. 1875). See Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders, p.* 415 sq.

Ther'meleth

(θερμελέθ), a Greek form (1 Esdr. 5, 36) of the name Hebraized (Ezra 2, 59) TEL-MELATH *SEE TEL-MELATH* (q.v.).

Thesaurarius

the treasurer of a cathedral or collegiate church; the bursar (treasurer) of a college or monastery; the keeper of a shrine house or treasury.

Thessalo'nian

(θεσσαλονικεύς), the designation (<44604>Acts 26:4; 1 *Thessalonians* 1, 1; <52201>2 Thessalonians 2:1; "*of Thessalonica*," <44702>Acts 27:2) of an inhabitant of Thessalonica (q.v.).

Thessalonians, First Epistle To The,

is the eighth in order of the Pauline epistles as found in the New Test., but the first in point of chronological date, and immediately followed by the second bearing a corresponding title.

I. *Authorship and Canonicity.* —The external evidence in favor of the genuineness of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians is chiefly negative, but this is important enough. There is no trace that it was ever disputed at any age or in any section of the Church, or even by any individual, till the present century. On the other hand, the allusions to it in writers before the close of the 2nd century are confessedly faint and uncertain — a circumstance easily explained when we remember the character of the epistle itself, its comparatively simple diction, its silence on the most important doctrinal questions, and, generally speaking, the absence of any salient points to arrest the attention and provoke reference. In Clement of Rome there are some slight coincidences of language, perhaps not purely accidental (c. 38, κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ, comp. 1 Thessalonians 5, 18; ibid. σωζέσθω ουν ἡμῖν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν X. I., comp. ver. 23). Ignatius in two passages (*Polyc.* 1, and *Ephes.* 10) seems to be reminded of Paul's expression ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε (<52517>1 Thessalonians 5:17), but in both passages of Ignatius the word ἀδιαλείπτως, in which the similarity mainly consists, is absent in the Syriac, and is therefore probably spurious. The supposed references in Polycarp (ch. 4 to <52517>1 Thessalonians 5:17, and ch. 2 to ver. 22) are also unsatisfactory. It is more important to observe that the epistle was included in the Old Latin and Syriac versions, that it is found in the canon of the Muratorian fragment, and that it was also contained in that of Marcion and of the Council of Laodicea in 364. With Irenseus commence direct citations (*Adv. Haeres. 5, 6,* I): "On account of this the apostle hath set forth the perfect spiritual man, saying in 1 Thessalonians, 'But the God of peace sanctify you wholly, and may your whole body, soul, and spirit be preserved blameless to the coining of our Lord Jesus. Christ'" (comp. 1 Thessalonians 5, 23). Clemens Alex. (*Pcedag.,1,* 88): "But this the blessed

Paul hath most clearly signified, saying, ‘When we might be burdensome as the apostles of Christ, we were gentle among you, as a nurse cherisheth her children” ‘(comp. 1 Thessalonians 2, 7). Tertullian (*De Resurrect. Carnis,* c. 24): “*What* these times were, learn along with the Thessalonians; for we read, ‘How ye were turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, Jesus, whom he hath raised from the dead’” (comp. 1 Thessalonians 1, 9, 10). This father quotes the epistle more than twenty times. To these citations we may add those by Caius (ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles. 6*:20), by Origen (*Cont. Cels.* lib. 3), and by others of the ecclesiastical writers (Lardner, *2, pl. locc.*).

On the other hand, the *internal* evidence derived from the character of the epistle itself is so strong that it may fairly be called irresistible. It would be impossible to enter into the question of *style* here, but the reader may be referred to the Introduction of Jowett, who has handled this subject very fully and satisfactorily. An equally strong argument may be drawn also from the *matter* contained in the epistle. Two instances of this must suffice. In the first place, the fineness and delicacy of touch with which the apostle’s relations towards his Thessalonian converts are drawn-his yearning to see them, his anxiety in the absence of Timothy, and his heart-felt rejoicing at the good news are quite beyond the reach of the clumsy forgeries of the early Church. In the second place, the writer uses language which, however it may be explained, is certainly colored by the anticipation of the speedy advent of the Lord language natural enough on the apostle’s own lips, but quite inconceivable in a forgery written after his death; when time had disappointed these anticipations, and when the revival or mention of them would serve no purpose and might seem to discredit the apostle. Such a position would be an anachronism in a writer of the 2nd century.

The genuineness of this epistle was first questioned by Schrader (*Apostel Paulus*), who was followed by Baur (*Paulus,* p. 480). The latter writer has elaborated and systematized the attack. The arguments which he alleges in favor of his view are briefly controverted by Linemann, and more at length, and with great fairness, by Jowett. The following is a summary of Baur’s arguments.

(a.) He attributes great weight to the general character of the epistle, the difference of style, and especially the absence of distinctive Pauline doctrines-a peculiarity which will be remarked upon and explained below (§ 3).

(b.) In the mention of the "wrath" overtaking the Jewish people (2, 16), Baur sees an allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem, and therefore a proof of the later date of the epistle. The real significance of these words will be considered below in discussing the Apocalyptic passage in the second epistle.

(c.) He urges the contradictions to the account in the Acts-a strange argument, surely, to be brought forward by Baur, who postdates and discredits the authority of that narrative. The real extent and bearing of these divergences will be considered below (§ 4),

(d.) He discovers references to the Acts, which show that the epistle was written later. It will be seen, however, that the coincidences are subtle and incidental, and the points of divergence *and. prima-facie* contradictions, which Baur himself allows, and indeed insists upon, are so numerous as to preclude the supposition of copying. Schleiermacher (*Einleit. ins N.T.* p. 150) rightly infers the independence of the epistle on these grounds.

(e.) He supposes passages in this epistle to have been borrowed from the acknowledged letters of Paul. The resemblances, however, which he points out are not greater than, or, indeed, so great as, those in other epistles, and bear no traces of imitation.

II. *Date.* —This has been approximately determined in the following way: During the course of his second missionary journey, which began in the year 47, Paul founded the Church of Thessalonica. Leaving Thessalonica, he passed on to Beroea. From Beroea he went to Athens, and from Athens to Corinth (<44170>Acts 17:1 18:18). With this visit to Corinth, which extends over a period of two years or thereabouts, his second missionary journey closed, for from Corinth he returned to Jerusalem, paying only a brief visit to Ephesus on the way (ver. 20,21). There is some uncertainty about the movements of Paul's companions at this time (see below); but, whatever view we adopt on this point, it seems indisputable that, when this epistle was written, Silvanus and Timothy were in the apostle's company (<52001>1 Thessalonians 1:1; comp. <53101>2 Thessalonians 2:1)-a circumstance which confines the date to the second missionary journey, for, though Timothy was with him on several occasions afterwards, the name of Silvanus appears for the last time in connection with Paul during this visit to Corinth (<44180>Acts 18:5; <47019>2 Corinthians 1:19). The epistle, then, must have been written in the interval between Paul's leaving Thessalonica and the close of

his residence at Corinth, i.e. within the years 48-51. The following considerations, however, narrow the limits of the possible date still more closely.

(1.) When Paul wrote, he had already visited, and probably left, Athens (1 Thessalonians 3, 1).

(2.) Having made two unsuccessful attempts to revisit Thessalonica, he had dispatched Timothy to obtain tidings of his converts there. Timothy had returned before the apostle wrote (ver. 2, 6).

(3.) Paul speaks of the Thessalonians as "ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia," adding 'that "in every place their faith to God-ward was spread abroad" (1 Thessalonians 1:7, 8)-language prompted, indeed, by the overflowing of a grateful heart, and therefore not to be rigorously pressed, but still implying some lapse of time at least.

(4.) There are several traces of a growth and progress in the condition and circumstances of the Thessalonian Church. Perhaps the mention of "rulers" in the Church (1 Thessalonians 5:12) ought not to be adduced as proving this, since some organization would be necessary from the very beginning. But there is other evidence besides. Questions had arisen relating to the state of those who had fallen asleep in Christ, so that one or more of the Thessalonian converts must have died in the interval (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18). The storm of persecution which the apostle had discerned gathering on the horizon had already burst upon the Christians of Thessalonica (1 Thessalonians 3:4, 7). Irregularities had crept in and sullied the infant purity of the Church (1 Thessalonians 4:4; 5, 14). The lapse of a few months, however, would account for these changes, and a much longer time cannot well be allowed. For

(5) the letter was evidently written by Paul immediately on the return of Timothy, in the fullness of his gratitude for the joyful tidings (1 Thessalonians 3:6). Moreover

(6), the second epistle also was written before he left Corinth, and there must have been a sufficient interval between the two to allow of the growth of fresh difficulties, and of such communication between the apostle and his converts as the case supposes. We shall not be far wrong, therefore, in placing the writing of this epistle early in Paul's residence at Corinth, a few

months after he had founded the Church at Thessalonica, i.e. during the year 49.

The statement in the subscription appearing in several MSS. and versions that it was written "from Athens" is a superficial inference from 1 Thessalonians 3:1, to which no weight should be attached, as is clear from the epistle itself.

(1.) In 1 Thessalonians 1:7, 8 Paul says that the Thessalonians had become "ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia for from you [says he] sounded out the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to God-ward is spread abroad." Now, for such an extensive diffusion of the fame of the Thessalonian Christians and of the Gospel by them, a much longer period of time must have elapsed than is allowed by the supposition that Paul; wrote this epistle while at Athens; and, besides, his reference particularly to Achaia seems prompted by the circumstance of his being, at the time he wrote, in Achaia, of which Corinth was the chief city.

(2.) His language in 1 Thessalonians 3:1, 2 favors the opinion that it was not from Athens, but after he had left Athens, that he wrote this epistle; it is hardly the turn which one living at Athens at the time would have given his words.

(3.) Is it likely that during the short time Paul was in Athens before writing this epistle (supposing him to have written it there) he should have "over and again" purposed to revisit the Thessalonians, but have been hindered? And yet such purposes he had entertained before writing this epistle, as we learn from 1 Thessalonians 2:18; and this greatly favors the later date.

(4.) Before Paul wrote this epistle, Timothy had come to him from Thessalonica with good tidings concerning the faith and. charity of the Christians there (1 Thessalonians 3:6). But had Timothy followed Paul to Athens from Beroea, what tidings could he have brought the apostle from Thessalonica except such hearsay reports as would inform the apostle of nothing he did not already know? From these considerations it follows that this epistle was not written from Athens. It must, however, have been written very soon after his arrival at Corinth; for at the time of his writing Timothy had just arrived from Thessalonica (ἄρτι ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου, 3, 6), and Paul had not been long in Corinth before Timothy and Silas joined him there (Acts 17:1-5).

Michaelis contends for a later date; but his arguments are destitute of weight. Before Paul could learn that the fame of the Thessalonian Church had spread through Achaia and far beyond, it was not necessary, as Michaelis supposes, that he should have made several extensive journeys from Corinth; for as that city, from its mercantile importance, was the resort of persons from all parts of the commercial world, the apostle had abundant means of gathering this information even during a brief residence there. As little is it necessary to resort to the supposition that when Paul says that over and again Satan had hindered him from fulfilling his intention of visiting Thessalonica he must refer to shipwrecks or some such misfortunes (as Michaelis suggests); for Satan has many ways of hindering men from such purposes besides accidents in traveling. The views of critics Who have assigned to this epistle a later date than the second nissionary journey are stated and refuted in the Introduction of Koch (p. 23, etc.) and of Linemann (*§* 3).

III. *Relation to Other Epistles.* —The epistles to the Thessalonians then (for the second followed the first after no long interval) are the earliest of Paul's writings-perhaps the earliest written records of Christianity. They belong to that period which Paul elsewhere styles "the beginning of the Gospel" (<5D045>Philippians 4:15). They present the disciples in the first flush of love and devotion, yearning for the day of deliverance, and straining their eyes to catch the first glimpse of their Lord descending amidst the clouds of heaven, till in their feverish anxiety they forget the sober business of life absorbed in this one engrossing thought. It will be, remembered that a period of about five years intervenes before the second group of epistles-those to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans — were written, and about twice that period to the date of the epistles of the Roman captivity. It is interesting, therefore, to compare the Thessalonian epistles with the later letters and to note the points of difference. These differences are mainly fourfold.

1. In the general *style* of these earlier letters there is greater simplicity and less exuberance of language. The brevity of the opening salutation is an instance of this. "Paul… to the Church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, grace and peace to you?" (<5D001>1 Thessalonians 1:1; comp, <5D001>2 Thessalonians 1:1). The closing benediction is correspondingly brief: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you" (1 Thessalonians 5, 28; comp. 2 Thessalonians 3, 18). And throughout the epistles there is much more evenness of style; words are not accumulated

in the same way, the syntax is less involved, parentheses are not so frequent, the turns of thought and feeling are less sudden and abrupt, and, altogether, there is less intensity and variety than we find in Paul's later epistles.

2. The *antagonism to Paul* is not the same. The direction of the attack has changed in the interval between the writing of these epistles and those of the next group. Here the opposition comes from Jews. The admission of the Gentiles to the hopes and privileges of Messiah's kingdom on any condition is repulsive to them. They "forbade the apostle to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved" (1 Thessalonians 2:16). A period of five years changes the aspect of the controversy. The opponents of Paul are now no longer Jews so much as Judaizing Christians (Ewald, *Jahrb.* 3, 249; *Sendschr.* p. 14). The question of the admission of the Gentiles has been solved by time, for they have "taken the kingdom of heaven by storm." But the antagonism to the apostle of the Gentiles having been driven from its first position, entrenched itself behind a second barrier. It was now urged that though the Gentiles may be admitted to the Church of Christ, the only door of admission is the Mosaic covenant-rite of circumcision. The language of Paul speaking of the Jewish Christians in this epistle shows that the opposition to his teaching had not at this time assumed this second phase. He does not yet regard them as the disturbers of the peace of the Church, the false teachers who, by imposing a bondage of ceremonial observances, frustrate the free grace of God. He can still point to them as examples to his converts at Thessalonica (1 Thessalonians 2, 14). The change, indeed, was imminent; the signs of the gathering storm had already appeared (Galatians 2:11), but hitherto they were faint and indistinct, and had scarcely darkened the horizon of the Gentile churches.

3. It will be no surprise that the *doctrinal teaching* of the apostle does not bear quite the same aspect in these as in the later epistles. Many of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity, which are inseparably connected with Paul's name, though implicitly contained in the teaching of these earlier letters-as indeed they follow directly from the true conception of the person of Christ-were yet not evolved and distinctly enunciated till the needs of the Church drew them out into prominence at a later date. It has often been observed, for instance, that there is in the epistles to the Thessalonians no mention of the characteristic contrast of "faith and works;" that the word "justification" does not once occur; that the idea of dying with Christ and living with Christ, so frequent in Paul's later

writings, is absent in these. It was, in fact, the opposition of Judaizing Christians insisting on a strict ritualism, which led the apostle, somewhat later, to dwell at greater length on the true doctrine of a saving faith and the true conception of a godly life; but the time had not yet come.

4. This difference appears especially in the *eschatology* of the apostle. In the epistles to the Thessalonians, as has been truly observed, the Gospel preached is that of the coming of Christ, rather than of the cross of Christ. There are many reasons why the subject of the second advent should occupy a larger space in the earliest stage of the apostolical teaching than afterwards. It was closely bound up with the fundamental fact of the Gospel, the resurrection of Christ, and thus it formed a natural starting-point of Christian doctrine. It afforded the true satisfaction to those Messianic hopes which had drawn the Jewish converts to the fold of Christ. It was the best consolation and support of the infant Church under persecution, which must have been most keenly felt in the first abandonment of worldly pleasures and interests. More especially, as telling of a righteous Judge who would not overlook iniquity, it was essential to that call to repentance which must everywhere precede the direct and positive teaching of the Gospel. “Now he commandeth all men everywhere *to* repent, for he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he raised him from the dead” (<44 1730>Acts 17:30,31).

There is no just ground, however, for the supposition that the apostle entertained precipitate expectations as to the Lord’s second coming. His language is suited to every age of the Church. Where an event is certain of accomplishment, but uncertain as regards the precise time, it may be said to be always “at hand” to devout expectation; and this is the aspect which the topic in question, after all that has been written on the subject, wears in Paul’s writings taken as a whole., The task of proving that he was mistaken, and therefore that the gift of inspiration was only partial, is as arduous as one would suppose it must be ungrateful.

IV. *Relation to the Associated History.* —A comparison of the narrative in the Acts with the allusions in this and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is equally instructive with the foregoing comparison. With some striking coincidences, there is just that degree of divergence which might be expected between a writer who had borne the principal part in the

scenes referred to and a narrator who derives his information from others, between the casual half-expressed allusions of a familiar letter and the direct account of the professed historian.

1. Passing over patent coincidences, we may single out one of a more subtle and delicate kind. It arises out of the form which the accusation brought against Paul and his companions at Thessalonica takes in the Acts: "All these do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus" (<44 17 7>Acts 17:7). The allusions in the epistles to the Thessalonians enable us to understand the ground of this accusation. It appears that the *kingdom* of Christ had entered largely into his oral teaching in this city, as it does into that of the epistles themselves. He had charged his new converts to await the coming of the Son of God from heaven as their deliverer (<52 1 10>1 Thessalonians 1:10). He had dwelt long and earnestly (προείπαμεν καὶ διεμαρτυράμεθα) on the terrors of the judgment, which would overtake the wicked (<52 4 6>1 Thessalonians 4:6). He had even explained at length the signs, which would usher in the last day (<53 2 5>2 Thessalonians 2:5). Either from malice or in ignorance such language had been misrepresented, and he was accused of setting up a rival sovereign to the Roman emperor.

2. On the other hand, the language of these epistles diverges from the narrative of Luke on two or three points in such a way as to establish the independence of the two accounts, and even to require some explanation.

(1.) The first of these relates to the composition of the Church of Thessalonica. In the first epistle Paul addresses his readers distinctly as Gentiles, who had been converted from idolatry to the Gospel (<52 1 9>1 Thessalonians 1:9,10). In the Acts we are told that "some (of the Jews) believed… and of the devout Greeks (i.e. proselytes) a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few" (<44 17 4>Acts 17:4). If for σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων we read σεβομένων καὶ Ἑλλήνων, "proselytes and Greeks," the difficulty vanishes; but though internal probabilities are somewhat in favor of this reading, the array of direct evidence (now reinforced by the Codex Sinaiticus) is against it. But even if we retain the common reading, the account of Luke does not exclude a number of believers converted directly from heathendom; indeed, if we may argue from the parallel case at Beroea (<44 17 12>Acts 17:12), the "women" were chiefly of this class; and if any divergence remains, it is not greater than might be expected in two independent writers, one of whom, not being an eye-witness, possessed

only a partial and indirect knowledge. Both accounts alike convey the impression that the Gospel made but little progress with the Jews themselves.

(2.) In the epistle the persecutors of the Thessalonian Christians are represented as their fellow-countrymen, i.e. as heathens (ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν, 2, 14), whereas in the Acts the Jews are regarded as the bitterest opponents of. the faith (<44175>Acts 17:5). This is fairly met by Paley (*Horae Paul. 9*:No. 5), who points out that the Jews were the instigators of the persecution, which, however, they were powerless of themselves to carry out without aid from the heathen, as may be gathered even from the narrative of Luke. We may add, also, that the expression ἴδιοι συμφυλέται *Trat* need not be restricted to the heathen population, but might include many Hellenist Jews who must have been citizens of the free town of Thessalonica.

(3.) The narrative of Luke appears to state that Paul remained only three weeks at Thessalonica (<44172>Acts 17:2); whereas in the epistle, though there is no direct mention of the length of his residence among them, the whole language (<52104>1 Thessalonians 1:4; 2:4-11) points to a much longer period. The latter part of the assertion seems quite correct, the former needs to be modified. In the Acts it is stated simply that for three Sabbath days (three weeks) Paul taught in the synagogue. The silence of the writer does not exclude subsequent labor among the Gentile population; and, indeed, as much seems to be implied in the success of his preaching, which exasperated the Jews against him.

(4.) The notices of the movements of Silas and Timothy in the two documents do not accord at first sight. In the Acts Paul is conveyed away secretly from Beroea to escape the Jews. Arrived at Athens, he sends to Silas and Timothy, whom he had left behind at Beroea, urging them to join him as soon as possible (<44174>Acts 17:14-16). It is evident from the language of Luke that the apostle expects them to join him at Athens; yet we hear nothing more of them for some time, when at length, after Paul had passed on to Corinth, and several incidents had occurred since his arrival there, we are told that Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia (<44185>Acts 18:5). From the first epistle, on the other hand, we gather the following facts: Paul there tells us that they (ριεσιλχ, i.e. himself, and probably Silas), no longer able to endure the suspense, “consented to be left alone at Athens, and sent Timotheus their brother” to Thessalonica (<52301>1 Thessalonians 3:1,

2). Timothy returned with good news (ver. 6) (whether to Athens or Corinth does not appear), and when the two epistles to the Thessalonians were written, both Timothy and Silas were with Paul (1, 1; <5001>2 Thessalonians 1:1; comp. <4701>2 Corinthians 1:19). Now, though we may not be prepared, with Paley, to construct an undesigned coincidence out of these materials, yet, on the other hand, there is no insoluble difficulty; for the events may be arranged in two different ways, either of which will bring the narrative of the Acts into accordance with the allusions of the epistle.

(a.) Timothy was dispatched to Thessalonica, not from Athens, but from Beroea, a supposition quite consistent with the apostle's expression of "consenting to be left alone at Athens." In this case Timothy would take up Silas somewhere in Macedonia on his return, and the two would join Paul in company; not, however, at Athens, where he was expecting them, but later on at Corinth, some delay having arisen. This explanation, however, supposes that the plurals "*we* consented, *we* sent" (εὐδοκήσαμεν, ἐπέμψαμεν), can refer to Paul alone.

(b.) The alternative mode of reconciling the accounts is as follows: Timothy and Silas did join the apostle at Athens, where we learn from the Acts that he was expecting them. From Athens he dispatched Timothy to Thessalonica, so that he and Silas (ἡμεῖς) had to forego the services of their fellow-laborer for a time. This mission is mentioned in the epistle, but not in the Acts. Subsequently he sends Silas on some other mission, not recorded either in the history or the epistle; probably to another Macedonian Church-Philippi, for instance, from which he is known to have received contributions about this time, and with which, therefore, he was in communication (<4709>2 Corinthians 11:9; comp. <5044>Philippians 4:14-16; see Koch, p. 15). Silas and Timothy returned together from Macedonia and joined the apostle at. Corinth. This latter solution, if it assumes more than the former, has the advantage that it preserves the proper sense of the plural "*we* consented, *we* sent," for it is at least doubtful whether Paul ever uses the plural of himself alone. The silence of Luke may in this case be explained either by his possessing only a partial knowledge of the circumstances, or by his passing over incidents of which he was aware as unimportant.

Whether the expected meeting ever took place at Athens is therefore a matter involved in much uncertainty. Michaelis, Eichhorn, De Wette, Koppe. Pelt, and others are of opinion that, at least as respects Timothy, it

did take place; and they infer that Paul again remanded him to Thessalonica, and that he made a second journey along with Silas to join the apostle at Corinth. Hug, on the other hand, supposes only one journey, viz. from Thessalonica to Corinth; and understands the apostle, in 1 Thessalonians 3:1, 2, as intimating, not that he had sent Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica, but that he had prevented his coming to Athens by sending him from Beroea to Thessalonica. Between these two opinions there is nothing to enable us to judge with certainty, unless we attach weight to the expression of Luke, that Paul had desired the presence of Timothy and Silas in Athens ὡς τάχιστα , "as speedily as possible." His desiring them to follow him thus, without loss of time, favors the: conclusion that they did rejoin him in Athens, and were thence sent to Thessalonica. *SEE SILAS*; *SEE TIMOTHY*.

V. *Occasion of the Epistle.* —We are now prepared to consider the circumstances of the Church at Thessalonica which drew forth this letter. These were as follows: Paul had twice attempted to revisit Thessalonica, *and* both times had been disappointed. Thus prevented from seeing them in person, he had sent Timothy to inquire and report to him as to their condition (1 Thessalonians 3:1-5). Timothy returned with most favorable tidings, reporting not only their progress in Christian faith and practice, but also their strong attachment to their old teacher (ver. 6-10). The First Epistle to the Thessalonians is the outpouring of the apostle's gratitude on receiving this welcome news.

At the same time, the report of Timothy was not unmixed with alloy. There were certain features in the condition of the Thessalonian Church which called for Paul's interference, and to which he addresses himself in his letter.

(1.) The very intensity of their Christian faith, dwelling too exclusively on the day of the Lord's. coming, had been attended with evil consequences. On the one hand, a practical inconvenience had arisen. In their feverish expectation of this great crisis, some had been led to neglect their ordinary business, as if the daily concerns of life were. of no account in the immediate presence of so vast a change (1 Thessalonians 4:11; comp. 2 Thessalonians 2:1; 3:6, 11, 12). On the other hand, a theoretical difficulty had been felt. Certain members of the Church had died, and there was great anxiety lest they should be excluded from any share in the glories

of the Lord's advent (<520413>1 Thessalonians 4:13-18). Paul rebukes the irregularities of the former, and dissipates the fears of the latter.

(2.) The flame of persecution had broken out, and the Thessalonians needed consolation and encouragement under their sore trial (<520214>1 Thessalonians 2:14; 3:2-4).

(3.) An unhealthy state of feeling with regard to spiritual gifts was manifesting itself. Like the Corinthians at a later day, they needed to be reminded of the superior value of "prophesying," compared with other gifts of the Spirit, which they exalted at its expense (<520519>1 Thessalonians 5:19, 20).

(4.) There was the danger, which they shared in common with most Gentile churches, of relapsing into their old heathen profligacy. Against this the apostle offers a word in season (<520404>1 Thessalonians 4:4-8). We need not suppose, however, that Thessalonica was worse in this respect than other Greek cities. *SEE THESSALONICA*.

Yet, notwithstanding all these drawbacks, the condition of the Thessalonian Church was highly satisfactory, and the most cordial relations existed between Paul and his converts there. This honorable distinction it shares with the other great Church of Macedonia, that of Philippi. At all times, and amid every change of circumstance, it is to his Macedonian churches that the apostle turns for sympathy and support. A period of nearly ten years is interposed between the First Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Philippians, and yet no two of his letters more closely resemble each other in this respect. In both he drop's his official title of apostle in the opening salutation, thus appealing rather to their affection than to his own authority; in both he commences the body of his letter with hearty and unqualified commendation of his converts; and in both the game spirit of confidence and warm affection breathes throughout.

VI. *Contents.* —The design of this epistle thus being to comfort the-Thessalonians under trial, and to encourage them to the patient and consistent profession of Christianity, the letter itself is rather practical than doctrinal. It was suggested more by personal feeling than by any urgent need, which might have formed a center of thought, and impressed a distinct character on the whole. Under these circumstances, we need not expect to trace unity of purpose, or a continuous argument, and any analysis must be more or less artificial. The body of the epistle, however,

may conveniently be divided into two parts, the former of which, extending over the first three chapters, is chiefly taken up with a retrospect of the apostle's relation to his Thessalonian converts, and an explanation of his present circumstances and feelings; while the latter, comprising the 4th and 5th chapters, contains some seasonable exhortations. At the close of each of these divisions is a prayer commencing with the same words, "May God himself," etc., and expressed in somewhat similar language. The epistle may therefore be tabulated as follows:

Salutation (1 Thessalonians 1:1).

I. Narrative portion (1 Thessalonians 1:2-3, 13).

1. The apostle gratefully records their conversion to the Gospel and their progress in the faith (1 Thessalonians 1:2-10).

2. He reminds them how pure and blameless his life and ministry among them had been (1 Thessalonians 2:1-12).

3. He repeats his thanksgiving for their conversion, dwelling especially on the persecutions which they had endured (1 Thessalonians 2:13-16).

4. He describes his own suspense and anxiety, the consequent mission of Timothy to Thessalonica, and the encouraging report which he brought back (1 Thessalonians 2:17-3:10).

5. The apostle's *prayer* for the Thessalonians (1 Thessalonians 3:11-13).

II. Hortatory portion (1 Thessalonians 4:l-5, 24).

1. Warning against impurity (1 Thessalonians 4:1-8).

2. Exhortation to brotherly love and sobriety of conduct (1 Thessalonians 4:9-12). —

3. Touching the advent of the Lord (1 Thessalonians 4:13-5, 11).

a. The dead shall have their place in the resurrection (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18).

b. The time, however, is uncertain (1 Thessalonians 5:1-3).

c. Therefore all must be watchful (1 Thessalonians 5:4-11).

4. Exhortation to orderly living and the due performance of social duties (1 Thessalonians 5:12-15).

5. Injunctions relating to prayer and spiritual matters generally (1 Thessalonians 5:16-22).

6. The apostle's *prayer* for the Thessalonians (1 Thessalonians 5:23, 24).

The epistle closes with personal injunctions and a benediction (1 Thessalonians 5:25-28).

VII. *Commentaries.* —The following are the special exegetical helps on *both* the epistles to the Thessalonians exclusively; to the most important of them we prefix an asterisk: Willich, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1545; Basil. 1546, 8vo); Weller, *Commentarius* [includ. Philippians] (Norib. 1561, 8vo); Major, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1563, 8vo-); Musculus, *Commentarius* [includ. other ep.] (Basil. 1564, 1578, 1595, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarius* [includ. Philippians and Colossians] (Morg. 1580, 8vo); *Jewell, *Exposition* (Lond. 1583, 12mo; 1811, 8vo; also in Latin, and in *Works*); Zanchius, *Comnmentarius* [includ. Philippians and Colossians] (Neost. 1595, fol.; also in *Opp.*); *Rollock, *Commentarius* (Edinb. 1598; Herb. 1601, 8vo); also *Lectures* (Edinb. 1606, 4to); Hunnius, *Expositio* (Francof. 1603, 8vo); Steuart [Romans Cath.], *Commentarius* (Ingolst. 1609, 4to); Crell [Socin.], *Commentarius* [from Peter Mocov's notes] (Racov. 1636, 8vo; also in *Opp.*); *Ferguson, Exposition* (Lond. 1674, 8vo); Schmid, *Paraphrasis* [includ. other ep.] (Hamb. 1691,1696,1704,4to); Landresen,: *Erklarung* (Frankf. 1707, 4t.); Streso, *Meditatien* (Amst. 1710, 8vo); Turretin, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1739, 8vo; also in Opp.); Chandler, *Notes* [includ. Galatians] (Lond. 1777, 4to); Krause, *Erklurung* [includ. Philippians] (Frankf. 1790); Schleiermacher, *Notae* (Berol. 1823,8vo); *Pelt, *Commentarius* (Gryph. 1830, 8vo); Schott, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1834, 8vo); Tafel, *Historia Thessalonicensium* (Tub. 1835, 8vo); Sumner, *Lectures* (Lond. 1850, 2 vols. 12mo); Lillie, *Version* (N. Y. 1856, 4to); also *Lectures* (ibid. 1870, 8vo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* (Lond. 1858, 1862, 1866, 8vo); Edmunds, *Commentary* (ibid. 1858,-8vo); Headland, *Notes* (ibid. 1866, 8vo); *Eadie, *Commentary* (ibid. 1877, 8vo). *SEE EPISTLE*.

On the first epistle alone there are the following: Sclater, *Exposition* (Lond. 1629, 4to); Martin, *Analysis* (Greening. 1669, 12mo); Van Alphen, *Verklaering* (Utrecht, 1741, 4to); Phillips, *Explanation* (Lond. 1751, 4to);

Burgerhoudt, *De Argumento*, etc. (L. B. 1825, Svo); Koch, *Commentar* (Berl. 1848,1855, 8vo); Paterson, *Commentary* [includ. James and 1 John] (Edinb. 1857, 8vo). *SEE COMMENTARY*.

Thessalonians, Second Epistle To The,

follows immediately after the first in all the texts and versions of the New Test.

I. *Author.* —

1. The external evidence in favor of the second epistle is somewhat more definite than that which can be brought in favor of the first. It seems to be referred to in one or two passages of Polycarp (3, 15, in Polyc. c. 11, and possibly 1, 4 in the same chapter; comp. Polyc. c. 3, and see Lardner, 2, 6); and the language in which Justin Martyr (*Dial.* p. 336 D) speaks of the Man of Sin is so similar that it can scarcely be independent of this epistle. With Irenseus the direct testimony commences (*Adv. Hcer.* 3, 7, 2): "And again in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, speaking concerning Antichrist, 'And then shall the ungodly one be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus Christ shall slay with the breath of his mouth,'" etc. (comp. 2 Thessalonians 2:8). Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* 5, 554): "The apostle says, 'Pray that we may be delivered from perverse and wicked men, for all have not faith" (comp. 2 Thessalonians 3:2). Tertullian (*De Res. Carnis, 24*:339): "And in the second epistle to the same," viz. the Thessalonians, "with greater earnestness he says, 'I beseech you, brethren, by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, etc., that ye be not soon moved in your mind, nor shaken, neither by spirit nor by word,'" etc. (comp. 2 Thessalonians 2:2,3).

The second epistle, like the first, is found in the canons of the Syriac and Old Latin versions, and in those of the-Muratorian fragment and of the heretic Marcion, and was universally received by the Church.

2. The internal character of the epistle, as in the former case, bears the strongest testimony to its Pauline origin (see Jowett, 1, 143). "The genuineness of this epistle, remarks Eichhorn, "follows from its contents. Its design is to correct the erroneous use which had been made of some things in the first epistle; and who but the writer of that first epistle would have set himself thus to such a task? It, however, appears that the author of the first must also be the author of the second; and, as the former is the

production of Paul, we must ascribe the latter also to him. It was essential to the apostle's reputation that the erroneous consequences which had been deduced from his words should be refuted. Had he refrained from noticing the expectation built upon his words of the speedy return of Christ, his silence would have confirmed the conclusion that this was one of his peculiar doctrines; as such it would have passed to the succeeding generation; and when they perceived that in this Paul had been mistaken, what confidence could they have had in other parts of his teaching? The weight of this as an evidence of the genuineness of this Second Epistle to the Thessalonians acquires new strength from the fact that of all the other expressions in the epistle not one is opposed to any point either in the history or the doctrine of the apostle" (*Einleit. ins N.T.* 3, 69).

3. Notwithstanding these evidences in its favor, the genuineness of this epistle has been called into doubt by the restless scepticism of some of the German critics. The way here was led by John Ernest Chr. Schmidt, who, in 1801, published in his *Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese* a tract entitled *Vermuthungen über die beiden Briefe an die Thessalonier,* in which he impugned the genuineness of the first twelve verses of the second chapter. He afterwards, in his *Einleitung,* p. 256, enlarged his objections and applied them to the whole epistle. He has been followed by Schrader (*Apostel Paulus*), Kern (*Tiibing. Zeitschrif. Theol.* 1839, 2, 145), and Baur (*Paulus der Apostel*). De Wette at first condemned this epistle, but afterwards withdrew his condemnation and frankly accepted it as genuine. His cavils are more than usually frivolous,-and have been most fully replied to by Guericke (*Beitrdge zur hist. —krit. Einleit. ins N.T.* [Halle, 1828], p. 92-99), by Reiche (*Authentiae Post. ad Thessalon. Epist. Vindiciae* [Gött. 1829], and by Pelt, in the *Prolegomena* to his *Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians* (p. 27). See also Grimm, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1850, p. 753 sq.; Lipsius, *ibid.* 1854, p. 905 sq.; Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitschr.f. wiss. Theol.* 1862, p. 225 sq. It will thus be seen that this epistle has been rejected by some modern critics who acknowledge the first to be genuine. Such critics, of course, attribute no weight to arguments brought against the first, such as we have considered already. The Apocalyptic passage (2 Thessalonians 2:1-12) is the great stumbling-block to them. It has been objected to either as alluding to events subsequent to Paul's death — the Neronian persecution, for instance-or *'as* betraying religious views derived from the Montanism of the 2nd century, or, lastly, as contradicting Paul's anticipations expressed elsewhere, especially in the

first epistle, of the near approach of the Lord's advent. That there is no reference to Nero we shall endeavor to show presently. That the doctrine of an Antichrist did not start into being with Montanism is shown from the allusions of Jewish writers even before the Christian era (see Bertholdt, *Christ.* p. 69; Gfrorer, *Jahrh. des Heils,* 2, 257); and appears still more clearly from the passage of Justin Martyr referred to in the paragraph above. That the language used of the Lord's coming in the second epistle does not contradict, but rather supplement, the teaching of the first-postponing the day, indeed, but still anticipating its approach as possibly within the apostle's lifetime-may be gathered both from expressions in the passage itself (e.g. <5207>2 Thessalonians 2:7," is already working") and from other parts of the epistle (<5207>1 Thessalonians 1:7, 8), especially those which speak of the "signs" of the coming. Other special objections to the epistle will scarcely command a hearing, and must necessarily be passed over here.

II. *Date.* —There is the strongest reason for believing that this second epistle was written very soon after the first, and at the same place, viz. Corinth, A.D. cir. 50. The circumstances of the apostle while writing the one seem very much the same as they were while writing the other; nor do those of the Thessalonians present any greater difference than such as the influences referred to in the second epistle may be supposed in a very short time to have produced. What seems almost to decide the question is that, while writing the second epistle, the apostle had Timothy and Silas still with him. Now, after he left Corinth, it was not for a long time that either of these individuals was found again in his company (<4418>Acts 18:18; comp. 19:22); and with regard to one of them, Silas, there is no evidence that he and Paul were ever together at any subsequent period.

It will be seen presently that the teaching of the second epistle is corrective of, or rather supplemental to, that of the first, and therefore presupposes it. Moreover, the first epistle bears on its face evidence that it is the first gush of his affectionate yearnings towards his converts after his departure from Thessalonica; while, on the other hand, the second epistle contains a direct allusion to a previous letter, which may suitably be referred to the first-" Hold fast the tradition which ye were taught either by word or by letter from us" (<5215>2 Thessalonians 2:15). We can scarcely be wrong, therefore, in maintaining the received order of the two epistles. It is due, however, to the great names of Grotius and of Ewald (*Jahrb.* 3, 250; *Sendschr.* p. 16), who are followed in this by Baur, Hilgenfeld. Laurent, and Davidson, to

mention that they reverse the order, placing the second epistle before the first in point of time--on different grounds, indeed, but both equally insufficient to disturb the traditional order, supported as it is by the considerations already alleged.

III. *Occasion and Design.* —In the former letter we saw chiefly the outpouring of strong personal affection occasioned by the renewal of the apostle's intercourse with the Thessalonians, and the doctrinal and hortatory portions are there subordinate. In the second epistle, on the other hand, his leading motive seems to have been the desire of correcting errors in the Church of Thessalonica. We notice two points especially which call forth his rebuke.

1. It seems that the anxious expectation of the Lord's advent, instead of subsiding, had gained ground since the writing of the first epistle. They now looked upon this great crisis as imminent, and their daily vocations were neglected in consequence. There were expressions in the first epistle which, taken by themselves, might seem to favor this view; and, at all events, such was falsely represented to be the apostle's doctrine. This notion some inculcated as a truth specially confirmed to them by the Spirit; others advocated it as part of the apostolic doctrine; and some claimed for it the specific support of Paul in a letter (2 Thessalonians 2:2). Whether the letter here referred to is the apostle's former epistle to the Thessalonians or one forged in his name by some keen and unscrupulous advocates of the notion above referred to is uncertain. The latter opinion has been very generally adopted from the time of Chrysostom downwards, and is certainly somewhat countenanced by the apostle's statement in the close of the epistle as to his autograph salutation being the mark of a genuine letter from him (2 Thessalonians 3:17). At the same time, it must be admitted that the probability of such a thing being done by any one at Thessalonica is, under all the circumstances of the case, not very strong. He now writes to soothe this restless spirit and quell their apprehensions by showing that many things must happen first, and that the end was not yet, referring to his oral teaching at Thessalonica in confirmation of this statement (2 Thessalonians 2:1-12; 3:6-12).

2. The apostle had also a personal ground of complaint. His authority was not denied by any, but it was tampered with, and an unauthorized use was made of his name. It is difficult to ascertain the exact circumstances of the case from casual and indirect allusions, and indeed we may perhaps infer

from the vagueness of the apostle’s own language that he himself was not in possession of definite information; but, at all events, his suspicions were aroused. Designing men might misrepresent his teaching in two ways, either by suppressing what he actually had written or said, or by forging letters and in other ways representing him as teaching what he had not taught. Paul’s language hints in different places at both these modes of false dealing. He seems to have entertained suspicions of this dishonesty even when he wrote the first epistle. At the close of that epistle he binds the Thessalonians by a solemn oath, “in the name of the Lord,” to see that the epistle is read “to all the holy brethren” (<520527>1 Thessalonians 5:27) a charge unintelligible in itself, and only to be explained by supposing some misgivings in the apostle’s mind. Before the second epistle was written his suspicions seem to have been confirmed, for there are two passages which allude to these misrepresentations of his teaching... In the first of these he tells them in vague language, which may refer equally well to a false interpretation put upon his own words in the first epistle, or to a supplemental letter forged in his name, “not to be troubled either by spirit or by word or by letter, as coming from us as if the day of the Lord were at hand. They are not to be deceived,” he adds, “by any one, whatever means he employs” (κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον, 2, 2, 3). In the second passage, at the close of the epistle, he says, “The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is a token in every epistle: so I write” (<530317>2 Thessalonians 3:17) evidently a precaution against forgery. With these two passages should be combined the expression in <530314>2 Thessalonians 3:14, from which we infer that he now entertained a fear of direct opposition “If any man obey not our word conveyed by our epistle, note that man.”

IV. *Eschatology.* —The most striking feature in the epistle is the apocalyptic passage, announcing the revelation of the Man of Sin (<530201>2 Thessalonians 2:1-12); and it will not be irrelevant to investigate its meaning, bearing, as it does, on the circumstances under which the epistle was written, and illustrating this aspect of the apostle’s teaching. He had dwelt much on the subject; for he appeals to the Thessalonians as knowing this truth, and reminds them that he told them these things when he was yet with them. The following considerations may help to clear up this obscure subject.

1. The passage speaks of a great apostasy which is to usher in the advent of Christ, the great judgment. There are three prominent figures in the picture — Christ, Antichrist, and the Restrainer. Antichrist is described as

the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, as the Adversary who exalteth himself above all that is called God, as making himself out to be God. Later on (for apparently the reference is the same) he is styled the "mystery of lawlessness," "the lawless one." The Restrainer is in one place spoken of in the masculine as a person (ὁ κατέχων), in another in the neuter as a power, an influence (τὸ κατέχον). The "mystery of lawlessness" is already at work. At present it is checked by the Restrainer; but the check will be removed, and then it will break out in all its violence. Then Christ will appear, and the enemy shall be consumed by the breath of his mouth, shall be brought to naught by the splendor of his presence.

2. Many different explanations have been offered of this passage. Each generation and each section in the Church has regarded it as a prophecy of that particular power which seemed to them and in their own time to be most fraught with evil to the true faith. A good account of these manifold interpretations will be found in Linemann's commentary on the epistle, p. 204, *Schlussbem. zu* 2, 1-12 (see also Alford, *Proleg.*). By one class of interpreters it has been referred to circumstances which passed within the circle of the apostle's own experience, the events of his own lifetime, or the period immediately following. Others, again, have seen in it the prediction of a crisis yet to be realized, the end of all things. The former of these, the Praeterists, have identified the Man of Sin with divers historical characters, and have sought for a historical counterpart to the Restrainer in like manner. Among them may be mentioned Grotius, Wettstein, Whitby, Schöttgen, Nosselt, Krause, and Kern. Agreeing, however, in the main point of a past accomplishment, these writers differ widely from each other in the details of interpretation. The Man of Sin was, according to Grotius, Caligula; according to Wettstein, Titus; according to Hammond, Simon Magus; by many (Whitby, Le Clerc, etc.) the Jewish people are thought to have been thus indicated in their opposition to Christianity and to the Roman power (τὸ κατέχον). Commentators of this class are, of course, compelled to consider the coming of Christ as already past, i.e. to interpret it of the destruction of Jerusalem; and this alone seems to render the view untenable. For Paul's description of the *parousia*, or appearance, of Christ (⁵²1 Thessalonians 2:19) is far too exalted to correspond to any temporal event. The latter class of interpreters, the Futurists, have also given various accounts of the Antichrist, the mysterious power of evil which is already working. We hold, in general terms, that this view is substantially right, i.e. that the prophecy, however it may have been partially fulfilled in the past,

yet awaits its complete fulfillment. But among the advocates of the Futurist opinion also differences of opinion prevail. To the Greek Church the Man of Sin was Mohammed, and the "mystery of iniquity" is Mohammedanism, which, it is held, will yet culminate in some fearfully Antichristian form. From the middle of the 11th century the pope began to be considered the predicted Antichrist, and this view, as might have been expected, became the prevalent one in all the Protestant churches. By way of retaliation, Romanists maintained that Luther and Protestantism are pointed at in the passage. This seems to show the danger of limiting the prophecy to any one form of Antichristian error. John writes that even in his time there were many antichrists" (61218 1 John 2:18); the one he specifies as denying that "Jesus Christ had come in the flesh" is descriptive neither of Mohammed nor of the pope nor of Luther, but of the Gnostics. Many of the features of Antichrist as portrayed by Paul no doubt present themselves in the papacy, but others hardly so. At any rate, the papacy, so far as it contains elements of impiety, seems to have reached its culminating point; perhaps did so three hundred years ago, and yet Christ has not come. We are disposed, therefore, to adopt the view that there have been, since the prophecy was written, many partial manifestations of Antichristian error the Gnostics, the Judaizing tendencies of the 1st century, Mohammed, the papacy, the French Revolution, etc.; but that there still is in prospect some mystery of iniquity which will combine in itself the several evil tendencies which the Church has already witnessed, but in a greatly intensified form; and probably that this final outburst of impiety will be embodied in a personal head or representative, the Man of Sin of our epistle. His appearance will be the signal for the second advent of Christ. As regards the Restrainer (ὁ κα τέχων, τὸ κατέχον), the view of the fathers does not seem far wrong— viz. that Paul obscurely alludes to the temporal power (in his and their day the Roman empire), by which the excesses of lawless licentiousness are, to some extent, held in check. Hence, in Paul's view, the mission of the State as such was a divine one (Romans 13). *SEE ANTICHRIST*.

3. More particularly, therefore, in arbitrating between the Praeterists and the Futurists, we are led by the analogy of other prophetic announcements, as well as by the language of the passage itself, to take a middle course. Neither is wholly right, and yet both are, to a certain extent, right. It is the special characteristic of prophecy to speak of the distant future through the present and immediate. The persons and events falling within the horizon

of the prophet's own view are the types and 'representatives of greater figures and crises far off, and as yet but dimly discerned. Thus the older prophets, while speaking of a delivery from the temporary oppression of Egypt or Babylon, spoke also of Messiah's kingdom. Thus our Lord himself, foretelling the doom, which was even then hanging over the holy city, glances at the future judgment of the world as typified and portrayed in this; and the two are so interwoven that it is impossible to disentangle them. *SEE DOUBLE SENSE*. Following this analogy, we may agree with the Praeterists that Paul is referring to events which fell under his own cognizance; for indeed the Restrainer is said to be restraining now, and the mystery of iniquity to be already working; while, at the same time, we may accept the Futurist view, that the apostle is describing the end of all things, and that therefore the prophecy has not yet received its most striking and complete fulfillment. This commingling of the immediate and partial with the final and universal manifestation of God's judgments, characteristic of all prophecy, is rendered more easy in Paul's case, because he seems to have contemplated the end of all things as possibly, or even probably, near at hand; and therefore the: particular manifestation of Antichrist, which he witnessed with his own eyes, would naturally be merged in and identified with the final Antichrist, in which the opposition to the Gospel will culminate. *SEE ESCHATOLOGY*.

4. If this view be correct, it remains to inquire what particular adversary of the Gospel, and what particular restraining influence, Paul may have had primarily in view. But, before attempting to approximate to an explanation; we may clear the way by laying down two rules.

(1.) The imagery of the passage must be interpreted mainly by itself, and by the circumstances of the time. The symbols may be borrowed in some cases from the Old Test.; they may reappear in other parts of the New. But we cannot be sure that the same image denotes exactly the same thing in both cases. The language describing the Man of Sin is borrowed, to some extent, from the representation of Antiochus Epiphanes in the Book of Daniel, but Antiochlus cannot be meant here. The great adversary in the Revelation seems to be the Roman power, but it may be widely different here. There were even in the apostolic age "many antichrists;" and we cannot be sure that the Antichrist present to the mind of Paul was the same with the Antichrist contemplated by John.

(2.) In all figurative passages it is arbitrary to assume that a person is denoted where we find a personification. Thus the Man of Sin here need not be an individual man; it may be a body of men, or a power, a spiritual influence. In the case of the Restrainer we seem to have positive ground for: so interpreting it, since in one passage the neuter gender is used, "the thing which restraineth" (τὸ κατέχον), as if synonymous. (See Jowett, *Essay on the Man of Sin*, 1, 178, rather for suggestions as to the mode of interpretation than for the conclusion he arrives at; also Cowles, in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, *29*:623.) *SEE MAN OF SIN*.

5. When we inquire definitely, then, what Paul had immediately in view when he spoke of the Man of Sin and the Restrainer, we can only hope to get even an approximate answer by investigating the circumstances of the apostle's life at this epoch. Now we find that the chief opposition to the Gospel, and especially to Paul's preaching at this time, arose from the Jews. The Jews had conspired against the apostle and his companions at Thessalonica, and he only saved himself by secret flight. Thence they followed him to Beroea, which he hurriedly left in the same way. At Corinth, whence the letters to the Thessalonians were written, they persecuted him still further, raising a cry of treason against him, and bringing him before the Roman proconsul. These incidents explain the strong expressions he uses of them in these epistles: "They slew the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and persecuted the apostles; they are hateful to God; they are the common enemies of mankind, whom the Divine wrath (ἡ ὀργή) at length overtakes" (<52215>1 Thessalonians 2:15, 16). With these facts in view, it seems, on the whole, probable that the Antichrist, in its primary aspect, is represented especially by Judaism. With a prophetic insight the apostle foresaw, as he contemplated the moral and political condition of the race, the approach of a great and overwhelming catastrophe. And it is not improbable that our Lord's predictions of the vengeance which threatened Jerusalem blended with the apostle's vision, and gave *as* color to this passage. If it seem strange that "lawlessness" should be mentioned as the distinguishing feature of those whose very zeal for "the law" stimulated their opposition to the Gospel, we may appeal to our Lord's own words (<402328>Matthew 23:28) describing the Jewish teachers, "within they are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness (ἀνομίας)." Corresponding to this view of the Antichrist, we shall probably be correct, as already suggested, in regarding the Roman empire as the restraining power, for so it was taken by many of the fathers, though without altogether

understanding its bearing. It was to Roman justice and Roman magistrates that the apostle had recourse at this time to shield him from the enmity of the Jews, and to check their violence. At Philippi, his Roman citizenship extorted an ample apology for ill-treatment. At Thessalonica, Roman law secured him fair play. At Corinth, a Roman proconsul acquitted him of frivolous charges brought by the Jews. It was only at a later date under Nero that Rome became the antagonist of Christendom, and then she also, in turn, was fitly portrayed by John as the type of Antichrist. Whether the Jewish opposition to the Gospel entirely exhausted Paul's own conception of the "mystery of lawlessness" as he saw it "already working" in his own day, or whether other elements did not also combine with this to complete the idea, it is impossible to say; but we may presume that he had at least a dim and general anticipation of the more distant future, and at least of the final earthly catastrophe which the Divine Spirit intimates in this striking prediction. Moreover, at this distance of time and with our imperfect information, we cannot hope to explain the exact bearing of all the details in the picture. But, following the guidance of history, we seem justified in adopting this as a probable, though only a partial, explanation of a very difficult passage. *SEE REVELATION, BOOK OF*.

V. *Contents.* —This epistle, in the range of subject as well as in style and general character, closely resembles the first; and the remarks made on that epistle apply, for the most part, equally well to this. The structure, also, is somewhat similar, the main body of the epistle being divided into two parts in the same way, and each part closing with a prayer (2 Thessalonians 2:16, 17; 3:16; both commencing with αὐτὸς δὲ κύριος). The following is a tabular summary:

The opening salutation (2 Thessalonians 1:1, 2).

I. A general expression of thankfulness and interest, leading up to the difficulty about the Lord's advent (2 Thessalonians 1:3-2, 17).

1. The apostle pours forth his thanksgiving for their progress in the faith; he encourages them to be patient under persecution, reminding them of the judgment to come, and prays that they may be prepared to meet it (2 Thessalonians 1:3-12).

2. He is thus led to correct the erroneous idea that the judgment is imminent, pointing out that much must happen first (2 Thessalonians 2:1-12).

3. He repeats his thanksgiving and exhortation, and concludes this portion with a *prayer* (2 Thessalonians 2:13-17).

II. Direct exhortation (2 Thessalonians 3:1-16).

1. He urges them to pray for him, and confidently anticipates their progress in the faith (2 Thessalonians 3:1-5).

2. He reproves the idle, disorderly, and disobedient, and charges the faithful to withdraw from such (2 Thessalonians 3:6-15).

This portion again closes with *a prayer* (2 Thessalonians 3:16). The epistle ends with a special direction and benediction (2 Thessalonians 3:17, 18).

VI. *Commentaries.* —The following exegetical helps are on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians exclusively: Hoffmann, *Commentarius* [includ. Titus] (Francof. 1545, 8vo); Bradshaw,: *Exposition* (Lond. 1620, 4to); Jackson, *Exposition* (ibid. 1621, 4to); Reiche, *Authentiae,* etc. (Gött. 1829, 4to); Sclater, *Exposition* (Lond. 1629, 4to). *SEE EPISTLE*.

Thessaloni'ca

Picture for Thessalonica 1

(θεσσαλονίκη, in classical writers also θεσσαλονικεία and θετταλονίκη), a large and important town of Macedonia, visited by Paul on several occasions, and the seat of a Church to which two of his letters were addressed. (For fuller details we refer to Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography,* s.v.)

I. *Name.* —Two legendary names which Thessalonica is said to have borne in early times are *Emathia* (Zonar. -*Hist. 12*:26) and *Halia* (Steph. B. s.v.), the latter probably having reference to the maritime position of the town. During the first period of its authentic history, it was known under the name of *Therma* (θέρ μα, Esch.; θέρμη, Herod.,Thucyd.; θέρ μαι, Malelas, *Chronog.* p. 190, ed. Bonn), 1 derived, in common with the designation of the gulf (Thermaicus Sinus), from the hot salt-springs which are found on various parts of this coast, and one of which especially is described by Pococke as being at a distance of four English miles from the modern city (see Scylax, p. 278, ed. Gail). Three stories are told of the origin of the name Thessalonica. The first (and by far the most probable) is

given by Strabo (7, *Epit.* 10), who says that Therma was rebuilt by Cassander, and called after his wife Thessalonica, the daughter of Philip; the second is found in Steph. B. (s.v.), who says that its new name was a memorial of a victory obtained by Philip over the Thessalians (see Const. Porphyrog. *De Them.* 2, 51. ed. Bonn); the third is in the *Etym. Magn.* (s.v.), where it is stated that Philip himself gave the name in honor of his daughter. Whichever of these stories is true, the new name of Thessalonica, and the new eminence connected with the name, are distinctly associated with the Macedonian period, and not at all with the earlier passages of true Greek history. The name thus given became permanent. Through the Roman and Byzantine periods it remained unaltered. In the Middle Ages the Italians gave it the form of *Salonichi* or *Saloniki,* which is still frequent. In Latin chronicles we find *Salonicia.* In German poems of the 13th century the name appears, With a Teutonic termination, as *Salnek.* The uneducated Greeks of the present day call the place, Σαλο νίκη, the Turks *Selanik.*

II. *Situation.* —This is well described by Pliny (4, 10) as "medio flexu litoris [sinus Thermaici]." The gulf extends about thirty leagues in a north-westerly direction from the group of the Thessalian islands, and then turns to the north-east, forming a noble basin between Capes Vardar and Karaburnu. On the edge of this basin is the city, partly on the level shore and partly on the slope of a hill, in 40° 38'47" N. lat., and 22° 57'22" E. long. The present appearance of the city, as seen from the sea, is described by Leake, Holland, and other travelers as very imposing. It rises in the form of a crescent up the declivity, and is surrounded by lofty whitened walls with towers at intervals. On the east and west sides of the city ravines ascend from the shore and converge towards the highest point, on which is the citadel called ῾Επταπύργιον, like that of Constantinople. The port is still convenient for large ships, and the anchorage in front of the town is good. These circumstances in the situation of Thessalonica were evidently favorable for commanding the trade of the Macedonian sea. Its relations to the inland districts were equally advantageous, With one of the two great levels of Macedonia, viz. the plain of the "wide-flowing Axius" (Homer, *Il.* 2, 849), to the north of the range of Olympus, it was immediately connected. With the other, the plain of the Strymon and Lake Cercinitis, it communicated by a pass across the neck of the Chalcidic peninsula. Its distance from Pella, as given by the Itineraries, is twenty-seven miles,: and from Amphipolis (with intermediate stations; see Acts 17:1) sixty-seven

miles. It is still the chief center of the trade of the district. It contains a population of 60,000 or 70,000, and (though Adrianople may possibly be larger) it is the most important town of European Turkey next after Constantinople.

III. *Political and Military History.* —Thessalonica was a place of some importance even while it bore its earlier name of Therma. Three passages of chief interest may be mentioned in this period of its history. Xerxes rested here on his march, his land-forces being encamped on the plain between Therma and the Axius, and his ships cruising about the Thermaic gulf; and it was the view from hence of Olympus and Ossa which tempted him to explore the course of the Peneus (Herod. 7:128 sq.). A short time (B.C. 421) before the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war, Therma was occupied by the Athenians (Thucyd. 1, 61); but two years later it was given up to Perdiccas (ibid. 2, 29). The third mention of Therma is in Eschines (*De Fals. Leg.* p. 31, ed. Bekk.), where it is spoken of as one of the places taken by Pausanias.

The true history of Thessalonica begins, as we have implied above, with the decay of Greek nationality. The earliest author who mentions it under its new name is Polybius. It seems probable that it was rebuilt in the same year (B.C. 315) with Cassandrea, immediately after the fall of Pydna and the death of Olympias. We are told by Strabo. (*loc.cit.*) that Cassander incorporated in his new city the population not only of Therma, but likewise of three smaller towns, viz. Anea and Cissus (which are supposed to have been on the eastern side of the gulf) and Chalastra (which is said by Strabo [7, *Epit. 9*] to have been on the farther side of the Axius, whence Tafel [p. 22], by some mistake, infers that it lay between the Axius and Therma). It does not appear that these earlier cities were absolutely destroyed; nor, indeed, is it certain that Therma lost its separate existence. Pliny (*loc. cit.*) seems to imply that a place bearing this name was near Thessalonica; but the text is probably corrupt.

As we approach the Roman period, Thessalonica begins to be more and more mentioned. From Livy (44, 10) this city would appear to have been the great Macedonian naval station. It surrendered to the Romans after the battle of Pydna (ibid. 44, 45), and was made the capital of the second of the four divisions of Macedonia (ibid. 45, 29). Afterwards, when the whole of Macedonia was reduced to one province (Flor. 2, 14), Thessalonica was its most important city, and virtually its metropolis, though not so called till

a later period. *SEE MACEDONIA*. Cicero, during his exile, found a refuge here in the quaestor's house (*Pro Planc.* 41); and on his journeys to and from his province of Cilicia he passed this way, and wrote here several of his extant letters. During the first civil war Thessalonica was the headquarters of the Pompeian party and the Senate (Dion Cass. 41, 20). During the second it took the side of Octavius and Antonius (Plutarch, *Brut.* 46; Appian, *B. C. 4*:118), and reaped the advantage of this course by being made a free city (see Pliny, *loc. cit.*). It is possible that the word ἐλευθερίας, with the head of Octavia, on some of the coins of Thessalonica, has reference to this circumstance (see Eckhel, 2, 79); and some writers see in the Vardar gate, mentioned below, a monument of the victory over Brutus and Cassius.

Even before the close of the Republic, Thessalonica was a city of great importance, in consequence of its position on the line of communication between Rome and the Earst. Cicero speaks of it as "posita in gremio imperil nostri." It increased in size and rose in importance with the consolidation of the Empire. Strabo, in the 1st century, and Lucian.'in the 2nd, speak in strong language of the amount of its population. The supreme magistrates (apparently six in number) who ruled in Thessalonica as a free city of the Empire were entitled πολιτάρχαι, as we learn from the remarkable coincidence of Luke's language (<44706>Acts 17:6) with an inscription on the Vardar gate (Bockh, 1967.'Belley mentions another inscription containing the same term). In <44705>Acts 17:5 the δῆμος is mentioned, which formed part of the constitution of the city. Tafel thinks that it had a βουλή also.

Picture for Thessalonica 2

During the first three centuries of the Christian sera Thessalonica was the capital of the whole country between the Adriatic and the Black Sea; and even after the founding of Constantinople it remained practically the metropolis of Greece, Macedonia, and Illyricum. In the middle of the 3rd century, as we learn from coins, it was made a Roman *colonia*; perhaps with the view of strengthening this position against the barbarian invasions, which now became threatening. Thessalonica was-the great safeguard of the Empire during the first shock of the Gothic inroads. Constantine passed some time here after his victory over the Samarians; and perhaps the second arch, which is mentioned below, was a commemoration of this victory. He is said also, by Zosimus (2, 86, ed. Bonn), to have constructed

the port, by which we are, no doubt, to understand that he repaired and improved it after a time of comparative neglect. Passing by the dreadful massacre by Theodosius (Gibbon, *Rome,* ch. 27), we come to the Slavonic wars, of which the Gothic wars were only the prelude, and the brunt of which was successfully borne by Thessalonica from the middle of the 6th century to the latter part of the 8th. The history of these six Slavonic wars, and their relation to Thessalonica, has been elaborated with great care by Tafel.

In the course of the Middle Ages, Thessalonica was three times taken; and its history during this period is thus conveniently divided into three stages. On Sunday, July 29, 904, the Saracen fleet appeared before the city, which was stormed after a few days fighting. The slaughter of the citizens was dreadful, and vast numbers were sold in the various slave-markets of the Levant. The story of these events is told by Jo. Cameniata, who was crosier-bearer to the archbishop of Thessalonica. From his narrative it has been inferred that the population of the city at that time must have been 220,000 (*De Excidio Thessalonicensi,* in the volume entitled *Theophanes Continuatus* of the Bonn ed. of the Byzantine writers [1838]). The next great catastrophe of Thessalonica was caused by a different enemy-the Normans of Sicily, The fleet of Tancred sailed round the Morea to the Thermaic gulf, while an army marched by the Via Egnatia from Dyrrhachium. Thessalonica was taken on Aug. 15, 1185, and the Greeks were barbarously treated by the Latins, whose cruelties are de scribed by Nicetas Choniates (*De Andron. Commeno,* p. 4388, ed. Bonn, 1835). The celebrated Eustathius was archbishop of Thessalonica at this time; and he wrote an account of this capture of the city, which was first published by Tafel (Tub. 1832), and is now printed in the Bonn ed. of the Byzantine writers (*De Thessalonica a Latinis Capta,* in the same vol. with Leo Grammaticus [1842]). Soon after this period follows the curious history of Western feudalism in Thessalonica under Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, and his successors, during the first half of the 13th century. The city was again under Latin dominion (having been sold by the Greek emperor to the Venetians), when it was finally Ataken by the Turks under Amurath II, in 1430. This event also is described by a writer in the Bonn Byzantine series (Joannes Anagnostes, *De Thessalonicensi Exidio NVarratio,* in the same vol. with Phranzes and Cananus [1838]).

For the mediaeval history of Thessalonica see Mr. Finlay’s works, *Mediaeval Greece* (1851), p. 70, 71,135147; *Byzantine and Greek*

Empires (1853), 1, 315-332; (1854), 2, 182, 264-266, 607. For its modern condition we must refer to the travelers, especially Beaujour, Cousindry, Holland, and Leake.

IV. *Ecclesiastical History.* —The annals of Thessalonica are so closely connected with religion that it is desirable to review them in this aspect. After Alexander's death the Jews spread rapidly in all the large cities of the provinces which had formed his empire. Hence there is no doubt that, in the 1st century of the Christian era, they were settled in considerable numbers at Thessalonica; indeed, this circumstance contributed to the first establishment of Christianity there by Paul (<44170>Acts 17:1). It seems probable that a large community of Jews has been found in this city ever since. They are mentioned in the 7th century, during the Slavonic wars; and again in the 12th, by Eustathis and Benjamin of Tudela. The events of the 15th century had the effect of bringing a large number of Spanish Jews to Thessalonica. Paul Lucas says that in his day there were 30,000 of this nation here, with 22 synagogues. More recent authorities vary between 10,000 and 20,000. The present Jewish quarter is in the south-east part of the town.

Christianity, once established in Thessalonica, spread from it in various directions, in consequence of the mercantile relations of the city (1 Thessalonians 1, 8). During the succeeding centuries this city was the bulwark, not simply of the Byzantine empire, but of Oriental Christendom; and was largely instrumental in the conversion of the Slavonians and Bulgarians. Thus it received the designation of "The Orthodox City." It is true that the legends of Demetrius, its patron saint (a martyr of the early part of the 4th century), disfigure the Christian history of Thessalonica; in every siege success or failure seems to have been attributed to the granting or withholding of his favor: but still this see has a distinguished place in the annals of the Church. Theodosius was baptized by its bishop; even his massacre, in consequence of the stern severity of Ambrose, is chiefly connected in our minds with ecclesiastical associations. The see of Thessalonica became almost a patriarchate after this time; and the withdrawal of the provinces subject to its jurisdiction from connection with the see of Rome, in the reign of Leo Isauricus, became one of the principal causes of the separation of East and West. Cameniata, the native historian of the calamity of 904, was, as we have seen, an ecclesiastic. Eustathius, who was archbishop in 1185, was, beyond dispute, the most learned man of his age, and the author of an invaluable commentary on the *Iliad* and

Odyssey, and of theological works, which have been recently published by Tafel. A list of the Latin archbishops of Thessalonica from 1205 to 1418, when a Roman hierarchy was established along with Western feudalism, is given by Le Quien (*Oriens Christianus,* 3, 1089). Even to the last we find this city connected with questions of religious interest. Simeon of Thessalonica, who is a chief authority in the modern Greek Church on ritual subjects, died a few months before the fatal siege of 1430; and Theodore Gaza, who went to Italy soon after this siege, and, as a Latin ecclesiastic, became the translator of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Hippocrates, was a native of the city of Demetrius and Eustathius.

V. *Connection with the Apostle Paul.* —Paul's visit to Thessalonica (with Silas and Timothy) occurred during his second missionary journey, and to this is due the introduction of Christianity into Thessalonica. Timothy is not mentioned in any part of the direct narrative of what happened at Thessalonica, though he appears as Paul's companion before at Philippi (<44160>Acts 16:1-13), and afterwards at Beroea (<44174>Acts 17:14, 15); but from his subsequent mission to Thessalonica (1 Thessalonians 3. 1-7; see <44185>Acts 18:5), and the mention of his name in the opening salutation of both epistles to the Thessalonians, we can hardly doubt that he had been with the apostle throughout.

Three circumstances must here be mentioned, which illustrate in an important manner this visit and this journey, as well as the two epistles to the Thessalonians, which the apostle wrote from Corinth very soon after his departure from his new Macedonian converts.

Picture for Thessalonica 3

(1.) This was the chief station on the great Roman road called the Via Egnatia, which connected Rome with the whole region to the north of the Eggean Sea. Paul was on this road at Neapolis (<44161>Acts 16:11) and Philippi (ver. 12-40), and his route from the latter place (<44170>Acts 17:1) had brought him through two of the well-known minor stations mentioned in the Itineraries. *SEE AMPHIPOLIS*; *SEE APOLLONIA*

(2.) Placed as it was on this great road, and in connection with other important Roman ways, Thessalonica was an invaluable centre for the spread of the Gospel. It must be remembered that, be sides its inland communication with the rich plains of Macedonia and with far more remote regions, its maritime position made it a great emporium of trade by sea. In

fact, it was nearly, if not quite, on a level with Corinth and Ephesus in its share of the commerce of the Levant. Thus we see the force of what Paul says in his first epistle, shortly-after leaving Thessalonica— ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονιᾷ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ (1, 8).

(3.) The circumstance noted in <44170>Acts 17:1, that here was the synagogue of the Jews in this part of Macedonia, had-evidently much to do with the apostle's plans, and also doubtless with his success. Trade would inevitably bring Jews to Thessalonica; and it is remarkable that, ever since, they have had a prominent place in the annals of the city.

The first scene of the apostle's work at Thessalonica was the synagogue. According to his custom, he began there, arguing from the ancient Scriptures (<44170>Acts 17:2, 3); and the same general results followed as in other places. Some believed, both Jews and proselytes, and it is particularly added that among these were many influential women (ver. 4); on which the general body of the Jews, stirred up with jealousy, excited the Gentile population to persecute Paul and Silas (ver. 5-10). It is stated that the ministrations among the Jews continued for three weeks (ver. 2); but we are not obliged to limit to this time the whole stay of the apostles at Thessalonica. A flourishing church was certainly formed there; and the epistles show that its elements were much more Gentile than Jewish. Paul speaks of the Thessalonians as having turned "from idols;" and he does not here, as in other epistles, quote the Jewish Scriptures. In all respects it is important to compare these two letters with the narrative in the Acts; and such references have the greater freshness from the short interval which elapsed between visiting the Thessalonians and writing to them. Such expressions as ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ (<52106>1 Thessalonians 1:6), and ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι (2, 2), sum up the suffering and conflict which Paul and Silas and their converts went through at Thessalonica (see also ver..14, 15; 3, 3, 4; <53104>2 Thessalonians 1:4-7). The persecution took place through the instrumentality of worthless idlers (τῶν ἀγοραίων ἄνδρας τινὰς πονηρούς, <44175>Acts 17:5), who, instigated by the Jews, raised a tumult. The house of Jason, with whom the apostles seem to have been residing, was attacked; they themselves were not found, but Jason was brought before the authorities on the accusation that the Christians were trying to set up a new king in opposition to the emperor; a guarantee (τὸ ἱκανόν) was taken from Jason and others for the maintenance of the peace, and Paul and Silas were sent away by night southward to Beroea (<44175>Acts 17:5-10). The

particular charge brought against the apostles receives an illustration from the epistles, where the *kingdom* of Christ is prominently mentioned (<51212>1 Thessalonians 2:12; <53105>2 Thessalonians 1:5). So, again, the doctrine of the resurrection is conspicuous both in Luke's narrative (Acts 17, 3) and in the first letter (<51110>1 Thessalonians 1:10; 4:14, 16). If we pass from these points to such as are personal, we are enabled from the epistles to complete the picture of Paul's conduct and attitude at Thessalonica, as regards his love, tenderness, and zeal, his care of individual souls, and his disinterestedness (see <51205>1 Thessalonians 1:5; 2:1-10). As to this last point, Paul was partly supported here by contributions from Philippi (<50415>Philippians 4:15, 16), partly by the labor of his own hands, which he diligently practiced for the sake of the better success of the Gospel, and that he might set an example to the idle and selfish. (He refers very expressly to what he had said and done at Thessalonica in regard to this point; see <52009>1 Thessalonians 2:9; 4:11; comp. <53308>2 Thessalonians 3:8-12.) *SEE THESSALONIANS*. To complete the account of Paul's connection with Thessalonica, it must be noticed that he was certainly there again, though the name of the city is not specified, on his third missionary journey, both in going and returning (<44201>Acts 20:1-3). Possibly he was also there again after his liberation from his first imprisonment. See <50125>Philippians 1:25; 26; 2:24, for the hope of revisiting Macedonia, entertained by the apostle at Rome, and <54103>1 Timothy 1:3; <55403>2 Timothy 4:13; <56332>Titus 3:12, for subsequent journeys in the neighborhood of Thessalonica.

Of the first Christians of Thessalonica, we are able to specify by name the above-mentioned Jason (who maybe the same as the apostle's own kinsman mentioned in <45621>Romans 16:21), Demas (at least conjecturally; see 2 Timothy. 4:10), Gaius, who shared some of Paul's perils at Ephesus (<44929>Acts 19:29), Secundus (who accompanied him, from Macedonia to Asia on the eastward route of his third missionary journey, and was probably concerned in the business of the collection; see 20:4), and especially Aristarchus (who, besides being mentioned here with Secundus, accompanied Paul on his voyage to Rome, and had therefore probably been with him during the whole interval, and is also specially referred to in two of the epistles written during the first Roman im-prisonment; see 27:2; <51040>Colossians 4:10; <57024>Philemon 1:24; also, <44929>Acts 19:29, for his association with the apostle at Ephesus in the earlier part of the third journey).

VI. *Ancient Remains.* —The two monuments of greatest interest at Thessalonica are two arches connected with the line of the Via Egnatia. The course of this. Roman road is undoubtedly preserved in the long street which intersects the city from east to west. At its western extremity is the Vardar gate, which is nearly in the line of the modern wall, and which has received its present name from the circumstance of its leading to the river Vardar, or Axius. This is the Roman arch believed by Beaujour, Holland, and others to have been erected by the people of Thessalonica in honor of Octavius and Antonius, and in memory of the battle of Philippi. The arch is constructed of large blocks of marble, and is about twelve feet wide and eighteen feet high; but a considerable portion of it is buried deep be-low the surface of the ground. On the outside face are two bas-reliefs of a Roman wearing the toga and standing before a horse. On this arch is the above-mentioned inscription containing the names of the *politarchs*of the city. Leake thinks from the style of the sculpture, and Tafel from the occurrence of the name Flaviusin the inscription, that a later date ought to be assigned to the arch (a drawing of it is given by Cousinerry). The other arch is near the eastern (said in Clarke's *Travels, 4*:359, by mistake, to be near the western) extremity of the main street. It is built of brick and. faced with marble, and formerly consisted of three archways. The sculptured camels give an Oriental aspect to the monument; and it is generally supposed to commemorate the victory of Constantine over Licinius or over the Sarmatians.

Picture for Thessalonica 4

Near the line of the main street, between the two above-mentioned arches, are four Corinthian columns supporting an architrave, above which are caryatides; his monument is now part of the house of a Jew; and, from a inoion that the figures were petrified by magic, it is called by the Spanish Jews *Las Incantadas.* The Turks call it *Sureth-Maleh.* (A view will be found, with architectural details, in Stuart and Revett, *Athen. Antiq.* 3, 53). This colonnade is supposed by some to have been part of the Propylea of the Hippodrome, the position of which is believed by Beaujour and Clarke to have been in the south-eastern part of the town, between the sea and a building called the *Rotunda,* now a mosque, previously the church *Eski-Metropoli,* but formerly a temple, and in construction similar to the Pantheon at Rome. Another mosque in Thessalonica, called *Eski-Juma,* is said by Beaujour to have been a temple consecrated to Venus Thermeea.

The city walls are of brick, and of Greek construction, resting on a much older foundation, which consists of hewn stones of immense thickness. Everywhere are broken columns and fragments of sculpture. Many remains were taken in 1430 to Constantinople. One of the towers in the city wall is called the Tower of the Statue, because it contains a colossal figure of Thessalonica, with the representation of a ship at its feet. The castle is partly Greek and partly Venetian. Some columns of verd antique, supposed to be relics of a temple of Hercules, are to be noticed there, and also a shattered triumphal arch, erected (as an inscription proves) in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, in honor of Antoninus Pius and his daughter Faustina.

In harmony with what has been noticed of its history, Thessalonica has many remains ‘of ecclesiastical antiquity. Leake says that in this respect it surpasses any other city in Greece. The church of greatest interest (now a mosque) is that of St. Sophia, built, according to tradition, like the church of the same name at Constantinople, in the reign of Justinian, and after the designs of the architect Anthemius. This church is often mentioned in the records of the Middle Ages, as in the letters of pope Innocent III, and in the account of the Norman siege. It remains very entire, and is fully described by Beaujour and Leake. The Church of St. Demetrius (apparently the third on the same site, and now also a mosque) is a structure of still greater size and beauty. Tafel believes that it was erected about the end of the 7th century; but Leake conjectures, from its architectural features; that it was built by the, Latins in the 13th. Tafel has collected with much diligence the notices of a great number of churches which have existed in Thessalonica. Dapper says that in his day the Greeks had the use of thirty churches. Walpole (in Clarke’s *Travels, 4*:349) gives the number as sixteen. All travelers have noticed two ancient pulpits, consisting of “single blocks of variegated marble, with small steps cut in them,” which are among the most interesting ecclesiastical remains of Thessalonica.

VII. *Authorities.* —The travelers who have described Thessalonica are numerous. The most important are Lucas, *Second Voyage* (1705); Pococke, *Description of the East* (1743-45); Beaujour, *Tableau du Commerce de la Graec,* translated into English (1800); Clarke, *Travels in Europe,* etc. (1810-23); Holland, *Travels in the Ionian Isles,* etc. (1815); Cousindry, *Voyage dans la Macedoine* (1831); Leake, *Northern Greece* (1835); Zacharia, *Reise in dem Orient* (1840); Griesbach, *Reise durch*

Rumelien (1841); Bowen, *Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus* (1852); Dodd, in the *Biblioth. —Sacra*, *11*:830; 18:845.

In the *Memoires de Academie des Inscriptions*, tom. 38 *Sect. Hist.* p. 121-146, is an essay on the subject of Thessalonica by the abbé Belley. But the most elaborate work on the subject is that by Tafel, *Hist. Thessalonicae usque ad A.D.* 904, the first part of which was published at Tübingen in 1835; this was afterwards reprinted as Prolegomena to the *Dissertatio de Thessalonica ejusque Agro Geographica* (Berl. 1839). With this should be compared his work on the *Via Egnatia.* To these authorities we ought to add the introduction to some of the commentaries on Paul's *Epistles to the Thessalonians-especially* those of Koch (ibid. 1849) and Linemann (Gött. 1850). The early history of the Thessalonian Church is discussed by Burgerhoudt, *De Coetu Chr. Thessal., Ort, Fatisque* :(Leid. 1825). A good description of the modern place is given in *Murray's Handbook for Greece*, p. 455.

Theu'das

a person incidentally mentioned but once in the New Test. (Acts 5:36), and concerning whom much controversy has arisen.

I. *The Name.* —This, in the original, is θευδᾶς (a form which likewise occurs in Josephus, *Ant. 20*:5, 1), and, if Greek, may be for θεοδᾶς, as a contraction of θεόδο τος or θεόδωρος, i.e. *God-given=Johanan* (comp. Vulg. *Theodas*). A similar form, θειώδας', occurs in Diogenes Laert. 9:116. If Hebrew (Simonis, *Onomast. N.T.* p. 72), it may = hdwt, *praise.* The Mishna has a similar form, µydwt (*Bechor.* 4:4).

II. *Scriptural Statement.* —According to Luke's report of Gamaliel's speech before the Jewish Sanhedrim, on the occasion of the first arraignment of the apostles (A.D. 29), Theudas was the leader of a popular tumult some time previously (πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν) (Acts 5:34-36). He is spoken of as a religious impostor of high pretensions (λέγων ειναί τινα ἑαυτόν), to whom a considerable body of adherents (ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμὸς ὡς τετρακοσίων) closely attached themselves (προσεκολ λήθη, προσεκλίθη, A. B.), but who was ultimately slain (ἀνῃρέθη), and his party annihilated (ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐ δέν). Gamaliel, it appears, was counseling prudent and temperate measures towards the apostles. Previous well-known examples, he said, had made it plain that the leaders of a bad

cause would soon bring all to ruin, while those of a different kind would be sure to succeed. The first case he appeals to is that of Theudas, as above recited. He then goes on to notice the case of Judas of Galilee, who rose after Theudas in the days of the taxing, and after collecting a considerable band was defeated and slain. Now there can be no doubt that the Judas here spoken of was the Judas Gaulonites of Josephus, or Judas the Galilean, who, in the time of Cyrenius, raised a disturbance by opposing the census then ordered to be taken by the 'Roman government, and was cut off (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:1, 2; *War*, 2, 12). Thus far there is no difficulty; it is only by a comparison of contemporaneous history that a discrepancy is alleged as arising.

III. *Adjustment of the Account with Josephus.* —No insurgent of this name is mentioned by the Jewish historian at the period to which Gamaliel must refer, but he gives statements of several somewhat similar occurrences about that time.

1. A religious impostor (γόης τις ἀνήρ) named Theudas is described by him as having raised a strikingly analogous commotion in the reign of Claudius, when Cuspius Fadus was procurator of Judaea. Josephus's account of the matter (*Ant.* 20:5, 1) is that this fanatic, laying claim to prophetical powers, persuaded a very large body (τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον) to follow him to the Jordan, taking their effects along with them, with the assurance that the waters would divide before him as they had done before Elijah and Elisha in the days of old; but being unexpectedly attacked by a squadron of cavalry sent out after him by Fadus, his followers werb killed: or taken prisoners, and the leader himself, being taken, was beheaded. The reign of Claudius and the procuratorship of Fadus fix this incident at about A.D. 44, i.e. some fifteen years later than the delivery of Gamaliel's speech; and some forty after the scriptural event, since Luke places his Theudas, in the order of time, before Judas the Galilaean, who made his appearance soon after the dethronement of Arcbelaus, i.e. A.D. 6 or 7 (Josephus, War, *2*, 8, 1; *Ant. 18*:1,6; 20:5, 2).

Now, if we are to regard it as certain that there was only one Jewish insurgent named Theudas, it follows that either Luke or Josephus must be guilty of a chronological blunder. The hypothesis that Josephus has misplaced Theudas, though not impossible, and maintained by Michaelis (*Einleit. in N.T.* 1, 63) and Jahn (*Archceöl.* 2, 2), is a way of cutting the knot which no unbiased critic would desire to resort to. That the error is

Luke's, though taken for granted by most modern German critics (Eichhorn, De Wette, Credner, Meyer, Baur, etc.), is even more improbable when we take into account the great historical accuracy of his narrative, which closer researches are continually placing in a stronger light, and the date of the publication of the Acts. (It may not be amiss to remind the reader of some fine remarks, in illustration of Luke's historical accuracy, in Tholuck's *Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte,* p. 161-177, 375-389. See also Ebrard, *Evangelische Kritik,* p. 678 sq.; and Lechler, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter,* p. 6 sq.) Few things are, therefore, less credible than that a careful author like Luke, writing within a few years of the event, should have been betrayed into such a glaring historical mistake as antedating the insurrection of Theudas by nearly half a century. That he should have done this by an intentional *prolepsis,* as is supposed by some (Vales. *Ad Euseb. H. E.* 2, 11), is as completely at variance with the simplicity and unartistic character of his narrative. It is the height of injustice to charge that the writer of the Acts either fabricated the speech put into the mouth of Gamaliel, or that he carelessly or surreptitiously wrought into it a transaction which took place forty years or more after the time when it is said to have occurred (see Zeller, *Die Apostelgeschichte,* p. 132 sq.).

But without resorting to either of these violent methods, the difficulty may be solved with perfect satisfaction by the simple hypothesis that there were two insurgents of the same name. Since Luke represents Theudas as having preceded Judas the Galilean (q.v.), it is certain that he could not have appeared later, at all events, than the latter part of the reign of Herod the Great. The very year, now, of that monarch's death was remarkably turbulent; the land was overrun with belligerent parties, under the direction of insurrectionary chiefs or fanatics (ἕτερα μυρία θορύβων ἐχόμενα τὴν Ἰουδαίαν κατελάμβανε, Josephus, *Ant. 17*:12,4). The whole of these, with three exceptions, are passed over by Josephus without particularizing their leaders, so that it need create little surprise that one in which comparatively so small a number were concerned (Gamaliel's 400 can hardly be made to tally with Josephus's πλεῖστος ὄχλος) should have been omitted by him, or spoken of in equally general terms. The name Theudas was one of no infrequent occurrence (see above), while the fact that there were as many as three impostors of the name of Simon (Josephus, *Ant. 17*:12, 6; 20:4, 2), besides Simon Magus, and as many Judases (*ibid. 17*:12, 5; *War,* 1, 33, 2-4), mentioned by Josephus in the

space of about ten years increases the probability that there may have been two named Theudas in the space of forty years. This mode of reconciling Luke with Josephus, which has commended itself to such critics as Beza, Scaliger, Casaubon, and Bengel, in earlier times, and Kuinol, Olshausen, Winer, and Ebrard, in later days, is ably supported by Anger (*De Temp. in Act. Apost. Ratione,* p. 185), and also by Lardner (*Credibility*, 1, 404-414), who remarks that "it is not at all strange that-there should be two impostors in Judaea of the same name in the compass of forty years, and that they should come to the same end; on the contrary, it is strange that any learned man should find this hard to believe." So impartial a witness as Jost, the historian of the Jews (*Geschichte der Israeliten,* 2, Anh. p.76), admits the reasonableness of such combinations, and holds in this case to the credibility of Luke, as well as that of Josephus. Moreover Jsephus was by no means infallible, as Strauss and critics of his school may almost be said to take for granted; and it is possible certainly (this is the position of some) that Josephus himself may have misplaced the time of Theudas, instead of Luke: who is charged with that oversight. Calvin's view that Judas the Galilean appeared not *after,* but *before,* Theudas (μετὰ τοῦτον =*insuper* vel *praeterea*), and that the examination of the apostles before the Sanhedrim occurred in the time of Claudius (contrary to the manifest chronological order of the Acts), deserves mention only as a way mark of the progress which has been made in Biblical exegesis since his time.

2. Another explanation (essentially different only as proposing to identify the person) is that Luke's Theudas may have been one of the three insurgents whose names are mentioned by Josephus in connection with the disturbances that took place about the time of Herod's death. Sonntak (*Theol. Stud. u. Kritik.* 1837, p. 622, etc.; translated in the *Biblioth. Sacra,* 1848, p. 409 sq.) has advanced this view, and supported it with much learning and ability. He argues that the Theudas referred to by Gamaliel, is the individual who occurs in Josephus under the name of *Simon* (*War,* 2, 4, 2; *Ant. 17*:10, 6), a slave of Herod, who attempted to make himself king amid the confusion which attended the vacancy pf the throne when that monarch died. He urges the following reasons for that opinion: first, this Simon, as he was the most noted among those who disturbed the public peace at that time, would be apt to occur to Gamaliel as an illustration of his point; secondly, he is described as a man of the same lofty pretensions (ειναι ἄξιος ἐλπίσας παῤ ὁντιονῦν = λέγων ειναί τινα ἑαυτόν); thirdly, he died a violent death, which Josephus does not mention as true of

the other two insurgents; fourthly, he appears to have had comparatively few adherents, in conformity with Luke's ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων; and, lastly, his having been originally a slave accounts for the twofold appellation, since it was very common among the Jews to assume a different name on changing their occupation or mode of life. It is very possible, therefore, that Gamaliel speaks of him as Theudas because, having borne that name so long at Jerusalem, he was best known by it to the members of the Sanhedrim; and that Josephus, on the contrary, who wrote for Romans and Greeks, speaks of him as Simon because it was under that name that he set himself up as king, and thus acquired his foreign notoriety (see Tacit. -*Hist.* 5, 9).

3. Wieseler (*Chronicles Synops. of Gospels*, transl. p. 9092) considers Luke's Theudas to have been the same with *Matthias* or Matthew, the son of Margaloth (Matthias = hY;Tam being the Hebrew form of θεόδοτος = θευδᾶς), of whom Josephus (*Ant. 17*:6, 2-4) gives a detailed account as a distinguished teacher among the Jews, who, in the latter days of Herod the Great, raised a band of his scholars to effect a social reform in the spirit of the old Hebrew constitution, by "destroying the heathen works which the king had erected contrary to the law of their fathers." A large golden eagle, which the king had caused to be erected over the great gate of the Temple, in defiance of the law that forbids images or representations of any living creatures, was an object of their special dislike, which, on hearing a false report that Herod was dead, Matthias and his companions proceeded to demolish; when the king's captain, supposing the undertaking to have a higher aim than was the fact, came upon the riotous reformers with a band of soldiers, and arrested the proceedings of the multitude. Dispersing the mob, he apprehended forty of the bolder spirits, together with Matthias and his fellow-leader Judas. Matthias was burned. Now, had we used the term Theudas for the term Matthias, the reader would at once have seen that what we have just given from the more minute narrative of Josephus is only a somewhat detailed statement of the facts of which Gamaliel gave a brief summary before the Sanhedrim. The chronological difficulty then disappears. Matthias, or Theudas, appeared "before these days," before Judas of Galilee, and before the census; he appeared, that is, some four years anterior to the birth of our Lord.

4. Other identifications are those of Usher (*Ann.* p. 797) and Zuschlag, who regard Theudas as the same person with *Judas* the robber (Josephus, *Ant. 17*:10, 5), or with *Theudion* (*ibid.* 4, 2). Such attempts arise from an

unwillingness to acquiesce in the fragmentary character of the annals of the period, and are simply curious as efforts of ingenuity. —

IV. *Literature.* Among the works, in addition to those already mentioned, which discuss this question or touch upon it are the following: Casaubon, *Exercit. Antibaron.* 2, 18; Neander, *Geschichte der Pacmung,* 1, 75, 76; Heinrichs, *Exerc. ad Act.* 2, 375; Guericke, *Beitrdge zür Einleit. ins N. Test.* p. 90; Baumgarten, *Apostelgeschichte,* 1, 114; Lightfoot, *Hot. Heb.* 2, 704; Biscoe, *History of the Acts,* p. 428; Wordsworth, *Commentary,* 2, 26; and the monographs *De Theuda* by Gros (Viteb. 1697), Kling (Hafn. 1714), and Scheuffelhut (Lips. 1774).

Theurgists, those mystics who claim to hold converse with the world of spirits, and to have the high power and prerogative of working miracles, not by magic, but by supernatural endowment. Among these may be mentioned Apollonius of Tyana, Peter of Alcantara, and the large company of Romish saints.

Theurgy

(θεουργία, *divine work*) is the *science* concerning the gods and the various classes of superior spirits, their appearing to men and their operations; and the *art,* by means of certain acts, habits, words, and symbols, of moving the gods to impart to men secrets which surpass the powers of reason, to lay open to them the future, and to become visible to them. These communications were claimed as being held with the inferior orders of supernatural beings, with whom men rose to converse by the power of purificatory rites and by the possession of science. Magic of this kind was considered to be a divine work, as its name clearly shows, and its action entirely beneficent. The theurgical system attained perfection among the Neo-Platonists of the Alexandrian school, particularly those of the last epoch, and the propensity to daemonological rites which was already marked in the time of Porphyry triumphed completely under Proclus. The magic of ancient Egypt was quite theurgic in origin and doctrine, and we cannot deny that the reveries of the later Neo-Platonists are in a great measure due to its influence; although it did not take the place of all other worship, being considered inferior to the official religion, and not formally recognised as a rite. See Lenormant, *Chaldean Magic,* p. 74 sq.

Thevet, Andre

a writer of some note in the 16th century, was born at Angouleme, France, and entered the Franciscan Order, and afterwards visited Italy, the Holy Land, Egypt, Greece, and Brazil. On his return to France, in 1556, he quitted the Cordelier's habit, took that of an ecclesiastic, and was appointed almoner to queen Catherine de Medicis. He had the titles of historiographer of France and cosmographer to the king, and received the profits of these offices. He died Nov. 23, 1590, leaving *Cosmographie du Levant* (Lyons, 1554, 4to). —*A History of Illustrious Men* (1671,8 vols. 12mo; or 1684, 2 vols. *fol.*): —*Singularites de la France Antarctique* (Paris, 1558, 4to); and other works.

Thiard, Cyrus de

a French prelate, became bishop of Chalon-sur-Sabne, Feb. 20, 1594, and assisted at the States-General held in Paris in 1614, having received by letters-patent, Aug. 13, 1602, the right to represent Dijon. He died Jan. 3, 1624, leaving only a *Pastoral* addressed to his clergy (Chalon, 1605).

Thiard, Henri de

cardinal of Bissy, was born May 25, 1657, and at the age of twelve received the abbey of Noaille, in reward for his father's services to Louis XIV. He was educated at the Jesuit College of Dijon and at the Sorbonne, and was made doctor of theology in the latter. In 1687 he was named as bishop of Toul, but was not consecrated until 1692. In 1697 he was offered the archbishopric of Bordeaux, but declined; and soon afterwards was given the abbeys of Trois-Fontaines and Saint-Germain, and the bishopric of Meaux. He was raised to the cardinalate May 29, 1715. Other papal honors were subsequently conferred upon him. He died in Paris, July 26, 1737, having published numerous ecclesiastical works, for which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, s.v.*

Thibaud

archbishop of Canterbury, of whose family nothing is known, was first made abbot of Bec after the year 1136, and soon after was called to England, where we find him raised to the see of Canterbury in 1139. Under the influence of Thomas a Becket, Thibaud espoused the cause of the pope in the quarrels with the king of England, and was therefore treated by the

latter as a public enemy. He escaped to St. Omer, but was afterwards imprisoned by Eustachius for refusing to crown the son of the latter. Some time after 1153 he was restored to his diocese by the duke of Normandy, and died April 18, 1161, leaving a number of *Letters.* See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, s.v.*

Thibet, Religion of

The religion of Buddha was introduced into Thibet under king Srongstan Gampo, in A.D. 617-698, by priests from Sinde. These priests brought with them the art of writing, and translated the sacred books of the Indian Buddhists into Thibetan, and their monasteries became the centers of learned education and professional skill. In the 11th century, the Bompa religion (the old worship of evil daemons) was once more established, but after eighty years the Buddhist priests again came into power. These priests, in the 14th century, had become mere jugglers; and then arose a reformer, the monk Tsonkhapa, born in 1355, in the district of Amdo, where is now the famous monastery of Kunbum. He opposed the tricks and pretended miracles of charlatanism, and undertook the task of uniting and reconciling the dialectical and mystical schools of Thibetan Buddhism. His innovations were never universally acknowledged. In the 15th century, GednuDub, provost of a large monastery, claimed to be an incarnation of Buddha, and assumed the title of the “very costliest teacher ocean.” The Mongols called him Gyasto, or Dalai Lama, the “priest ocean,” and thus was inaugurated Lamaism (q.v.), which became the established religion of the country. The election of the grand lama, although by lot, has been so managed as to prevent any child from being elected which might be disagreeable to the Chinese government. The last election took place in 1875, and a child from the western boundary, towards Ladak, was elected, which seems to indicate a decrease of the Chinese influence. Thibet is greatly oppressed by its ecclesiastical system. The number of monasteries and monks is almost incredible. Eighteen thousand live in and around Lassa; on an average every thirteenth, and in some places every seventh, man is a monk, and must be provided for by others. The poverty of the people is very great, their moral depravity still greater. Between 1854 and 1864 some French missionaries attempted to establish a Roman Catholic station at Bonga, in South-eastern Thibet, but were violently assailed by the lamas, and, unprotected by the Chinese authorities, they were obliged to leave. All other efforts to introduce Christianity have also failed; indeed,

so jealous of Europeans are the authorities that they are rarely even admitted into the country. *SEE LAMAISM*.

Thibetan Version

The vast and mountainous tract of country in which the Thibetan language is spoken lies directly north of Hindustan, from which it is separated by the Himalaya Mountains. Its eastern frontiers border on China; to the west it extends as tar as Cashmere, Afghanistan, and Turkestan; while on the north it is bounded by the countries of the Turks and the Mongols. It is, for the most part, comprised within the Chinese empire; the western parts, however, appear to be independent of China. On account of the extreme jealousy of the Chinese government, Thibet has hitherto been almost inaccessible to foreigners, and our knowledge of the country is in consequence extremely limited.

In 1816 an attempt was made by the Church Missionary Society to furnish the Thibetans with a version of the Scriptures in their own language, but, unhappily, this important undertaking ultimately proved abortive. The matter rested until the year 1843, when Dr. Haberlin, an agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, after journeying through Thibet, again forced the necessity of a Thibetan version upon the attention of Christian societies. Dr. Haberlin states, as the result of his observations and inquiries in Thibet, that as far as the Thibetan language is spoken and the Lamas have any sway, so far literature exercises an important influence on the people. If there were a version of the Scriptures in the Thibetan language, thousands of volumes might annually be sent into the interior of Asia from five different points along the immense frontier of British India; and the millions of people speaking that language, and inquisitive as the Chinese are, might thus have a profitable opportunity of being made acquainted with the things that belong to their salvation." In spite of this encouraging fact, the object advocated by Dr. Haberlin moved very slowly, for not until 1856 do we read of an effort made towards translating the Gospel of St. Matthew, which in 1863 was published by the Moravian Mission at Kyelang. About the same time, a Bible society for the Punjab, with its headquarters at Lahore, was formed, and one of the projects entertained by that society was the translation of the Scriptures into the Thibetan, which had already been commenced by Moravian missionaries. The difficulties, however, were very great, and the work of translation was naturally very slow. Hence we need not be surprised that about five years after the

publication of the Gospel of St. Matthew those of John and Mark were published, while up to date the New Test. has not yet been completed. See *Bible of Every Land, p.* 20 sq. (B. P.)

Thief

(bNgi κλέτης). Among the Hebrews, the restitution that was required in case of theft was *double* the amount taken (<02203>Exodus 20:3-8). If a sheep, however, was stolen, and had been slain or sold, fourfold was required; or if an *ox,* a fivefold restitution was to be made. The reason of this distinction was that sheep, being kept in the desert, were more exposed than other animals to be stolen; and oxen, being so indispensably necessary in an agricultural community, could not be taken from their owners without great injury and peculiar aggravation (<02201>Exodus 22:1). In case the thief was unable to make the restitution demanded by the law, he was sold, with his wife and children, into servitude (ver. 3; <10206>2 Samuel 12:6; <12401>2 Kings 4:1; comp. <01447>Genesis 44:17). In later times, the fine is thought by some to have been increased (<20630>Proverbs 6:30,31). 'Whoever slew a thief who was attempting to break a house at night, i.e. any hour before sunrise, was left unpunished, since he did not know but that the thief might have a design upon his life, and he was unable also, owing to the darkness, to identify and thereby bring him to justice (<02202>Exodus 22:2). — *SEE THEFT*.

"Men do not despise a thief," says Solomon, "if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry. But if he be found, he shall-restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house" (<20630>Proverbs 6:30, 31). Bishop Hall is of opinion that Solomon, in this passage, does not so much extenuate the crime of theft as point out the greater criminality of adultery; but we have abundant evidence that theft, unaccompanied by violence, was viewed more leniently by ancient than by modern legislators. Wilkinson says, "The Egyptians held a singular custom respecting theft and burglary. Those who followed the profession of thief gave in their name to the chief of the robbers and agreed that he should be informed of everything they might thenceforward steal the moment it was in their possession. In consequence of this, the owner of the lost goods always applied by letter to the chief for their recovery; and having stated their quality and quantity, the day and hour when they were stolen, and other requisite particulars, the goods were identified, and on payment of one quarter of their value they were restored to the applicant in the same state as when taken from his house; for, being

fully persuaded of the impracticability of putting an entire check to robbery, either by the dread of punishment or by any other method that could be adopted by the most vigilant police, they considered it more for the advantage of the community that a certain sacrifice should be made, in order to secure the restitution of the remainder, than that the law, by taking on itself to protect the citizen and discover the offender, should be the indirect cause of greater loss; and that the Egyptians, like the Indians, and, I may say, the modern inhabitants of the Nile, were very expert in the art of thieving we have abundant testimony from ancient authors" (*Anc. Egyptians*, 2, 216). *SEE STEAL*.

The criminals who were crucified with our Lord appear to have been, not "thieves" in the ordinary sense of the word, but rather public robbers or highwaymen (λῃστής is carefully distinguished from κλέπτης, John 10:8), 1. . *fellow-insurgents* with Barabbas; for it is said that he "lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him in the city, who had committed murder in the insurrection" (Mark 15:7). These malefactors, as bishop Maltby has well observed, "were not thieves who robbed all for *profit*, but men who had taken up arms on a principle of resistance to the Roman oppression, and to what they thought an unlawful burden, the tribute-money; who made no scruple to rob all the Romans, and when engaged in these unlawful causes made less difference between Jews and Romans than they at first meant to do" (*Sermons* [1819-22], vol. 1). *SEE ROBBER*.

Thiemon, otherwise Diethmar

a Bavarian prelate and artist, was born of noble parentage about 1045. Agreeably to the custom of his time, he was as well versed in mechanics as in the fine arts. He executed many works in painting and sculpture for the churches, particularly for the Church of St. Blaise, near Ems. In 1079 he was appointed abbé of the diocese of Salzburg, and in 1090 was chosen archbishop of that city. He started for the Holy Land about 1099, and is said to have been taken prisoner by the infidels, who, learning of his skill in sculpture, commanded him to restore the arms of a brazen idol. Refusing to do so on account of religious scruples, he was put to death, in 1101. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.*

Thiermes (or Tiermes)

in the mythology of the Laplanders, was the son of the devil by a Lapland girl. The latter was sitting upon the ground under a tree, when Perkel (the devil), disguised as a stranger, came to her, and asked her to hang her fur coat upon a bundle of wood. This she complied with, but suddenly the bundle of wood began to burn, and she, vainly endeavoring to escape his embraces, became his victim. The child was removed to the highest heaven, and was there questioned as to whose child it desired to be, the father's or the mother's. It decided in favor of the mother, after which the high ruler made of it a god of thunder. As such, pursued by its father, it flies about in the heavens, thundering and lightening, now uprooting trees, again splitting rocks, doing good and evil. The Laplanders have a poorly developed worship of the deities. Thus, it seems, there can be accredited to Thiermes only a general worship.

Thiers, Jean Baptiste

a French divine, was born at Chartres, Nov. 11, 1636. He was professor at the College du Plessis in Paris, and was, in 1666, appointed to the incumbency of Champrond in Gastine (Chartres). Here he came in conflict with the archdeacon of Chartres, and went to Ribraye (Meuse), where he died, Feb. 28, 1703. He wrote, *De Festorum Diesrum Imminutione* (Lyons, 1668), which was placed on the Index "donec corrigatur" *Traite de l'Exposition du S. Sacrament de I'Autel* (Paris, *1673*): —*Traite des Superstitions selon Ecriture Sainte* (ibid. *1679*): —*Dissert. sur la Sainte Larme de Vend6me* (ibid. 1696), against which Mabillon wrote a rejoinder, *Lettre d'un Benedictin a Mgr. de Jelois* (ibid. 1700). Against the priesthood he wrote, *Avocat des Pauvres* (ibid. *1676*): —*Histoire des Perruques* (ibid. 1690). He also wrote some historical work's, for which see Niceron, *Memoires pour Servir*, etc., vol. 11; Dupin, *Nouvelle Biblioth.* vol. 19; *Theolog. Universal-Lex.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé,* s.v. (B. P.)

Thiess, Johann O.

a German doctor of theology, was born Aug. 15, 1762, at Hamburg. For a number o)f years he lectured at the University of Kiel, retiring in 1805. He died Jan. 7,1810. He wrote, *Handbuch d. neueren bes. deutschen u. protest. Literat. d. Theol.* (Leips. 1795-97, 2 *vols.*): —*Neuer krit. Commentar fiber das N.T.* (pt. 1, 2, *Die Evangel. der Apostel und Jesus*

Halle, *1804-6]*): —*Vorlesungen über die Moral* (Gera, *1810*): —*Fundamenta Theol. Christ. Critico-dogmaticae* (Lips. 1792): —*A Commentary on 2 Thessalonians 2, 1-12 and* <48102>*John 10:12-16* (Kiel, *1809*): —*Ueber die bibl. und kirchl. Meinung von der Ewigkeit der Hillenstrafen* (Hamb. 1791): — *Ueber die Magier und ihren Stern* (ibid. 1794): *Einleitung in die neuere Gesch. der Religion, der Kirche u. der theol. Wissenschaften* (ibid. 1740, 1796; Sleswick, 1797), etc. See Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, 1, 6, 172, 237, 290, 294, 358, 478, 555, 580, 857, 868; 2, 31, 59, 92, 125, 126, 331, 360, 366; Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 3, 422. (B. P.)

Thietmar

a noble Saxon belonging to the family of Waldeck, and related to the imperial house, was born July 25, 976. In 989 he became canon of St. Maurice, and in 1002 provost of Waldeck, which his grandfather had founded. In 1009 he was made bishop of Merseburg, and in 1018 he died. He wrote a chronicle, with the purpose of transmitting to his successors in the bishopric a history of Merseburg; but the work grew into a history of the German State and of the neighboring Germanic and Slavonic countries. It is the most important of accessible sources for the time of the later emperors, since its statements cover almost the whole of the 10th century, and are largely the reports of what the author himself saw and knew. The book is deficient in point of literary excellences, but is characterized by abundance of matter and truthfulness of spirit. It is as important for the illustration of manners and customs in the days of the Saxon emperors as for the statement of historical events.

Literature. —Lappenberg's preface to *Mon. Germ. Hist. vol.* 3 of *Script.*; Giesebrecht, in Ranke's *Jahrbb.* II, 1, 156-163, and *Gesch. der Kais.* 1, 746, 780; 2, 517, 547 sq.; Wattenbach, *Geschichtsquellen Deutschlands inm ittelalter*, p. 181 sq.; Maurenbrecher, *De Hist. Decimi SCeculi Scriptt.* (Bonn, 1861); Lappenberg, ed. of Thietmar's *Chronik* in *Mon. Germ. Hist.* 3, 733-871. See also Hall, *Allqenz. Lit. —Zeitung*, 1849, Nos. 204-206. —Herzog, *Real Encyclop.* s.v.

Thieves, the Two on the Cross

(<40738>Matthew 27:38-44; <41527>Mark 15:27; <42339>Luke 23:39-43; comp. <43840>John 18:40). The men who under this name appear in the history of the crucifixion were robbers (λῃσταί) rather than thieves (κλεπταί)

belonging to the lawless bands by which Palestine was at that time and afterwards infested (Josephus, *Ant. 17*:10, 8; 20:8, 10). Against these brigands every Roman procurator had to wage continual war (Josephus, *War*, 2, 13, 2). The parable of the Good Samaritan shows how common it was for them to attack and plunder travelers even on the high-road from Jerusalem to Jericho (<42108>Luke 10:30). It was necessary to use an armed police to encounter them (<42252>Luke 22:52). Often, as in the case of Barabbas, the wild robber life was connected with a fanatic zeal for freedom which turned the marauding attack into a popular insurrection (<41507>Mark 15:7). For crimes such as these the Romans had but one sentence. Crucifixion was the penalty at once of the robber and the rebel (Josephus, *War*, 2, 13, 2).

Of the previous history of the two who suffered on Golgotha we know nothing. They had been tried and condemned, and were waiting their execution before our Lord was accused. It is probable enough, as the death of Barabbas was clearly expected at the same time, that they were among the συστασιασταί who had been imprisoned with him, and had taken part in the insurrection in which zeal, and hate, and patriotism, and lust of plunder were mingled in wild confusion.

They had expected to die with Jesus Barabbas (q.v.). They find themselves with one who bore the same name, but who was described in the superscription on his cross as Jesus of Nazareth. They could hardly fail to have heard something of his fame as a prophet, of his triumphal entry as a king. They now find him sharing the same fate as themselves, condemned on much the same charge (<42305>Luke 23:5). They too would bear their crosses to the appointed place, while He fainted by the way. Their garments would be parted among the soldiers. For them also there would be the drugged wine, which He refused, to dull the sharp pain of the first hours on the cross. They catch at first the prevailing tone of scorn. A king of the Jews who could neither save himself nor help them, whose followers had not even fought for him (<43836>John 18:36), was strangely unlike the many chieftains whom they had probably known claiming the same title (Josephus, *Ant. 17*:10, 8), strangely unlike the “notable prisoner” for whom they had not hesitated, it would seem, to incur the risk of bloodshed. But over one of them there came a change. The darkness which, at noon, was beginning to steal over the sky awed him, and the divine patience and silence and meekness of the sufferer touched him. He looked back upon his past life, and saw an infinite evil. He looked to the man dying on the cross

beside him, and saw an infinite compassion. There, indeed, was one unlike all other "kings of the Jews" whom the robber had ever known. Such a one must be all that he had claimed to be. To be forgotten by that King seems to him now the most terrible of all punishments to take part in the triumph of his return, the most blessed of all hopes. The yearning prayer was answered, not in the letter, but in the spirit. To him alone, of all the myriads who had listened to him, did the Lord speak of Paradise (q.v.), waking with that word the thoughts of a purer past and the hopes of an immediate rest. But its joy was to be more than that of fair groves and pleasant streams. "Thou shalt be *with me!*" He should be *remembered* there.

We cannot marvel that a history of such wonderful interest should at all times have fixed itself on men's minds, and led them to speculate and ask questions which we have no data to answer. The simplest and truest way of looking at it has been that of those who, from the great Alexandrian thinker (Origen, *in Romans 3*) to the writer of the most popular hymn of our own times, have seen in the "dying thief" the first great typical instance that "a mail is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Even those whose thoughts were less deep and wide acknowledged that in this and other like cases the baptism of blood supplied the place of the outward sign of regeneration (Hilar. *De Trinit.* c. 10; Jerome, *Ep.* 13). The logical speculations of the Pelagian controversy overclouded, in this as in other instances, the clear judgment of Augustine. Maintaining the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, he had to discuss the question whether the penitent thief had been baptized or not, and he oscillates, with melancholy indecision, between the two answers. At times he is disposed to rest content with the solution which had satisfied others. Then again he ventures on the conjecture that the water which sprang forth from the pierced side had sprinkled him, and so had been a sufficient baptism. Finally, yielding to the inexorable logic of a sacramental theory, he rests in the assumption that he probably had been baptized before, either in his prison or before he entered on his robber-life (August. *De Anima*, 1, 11; 3, 12; *Serm. de Temp.* 130; *Retract.* 1, 26; 3, 18, 55).

Other conjectures turn more on the circumstances of the history. Bengel, usually acute, here overshoots the mark, and finds in the Lord's words to him, dropping all mention of the Messianic kingdom, an indication that the penitent thief was a Gentile, the impenitent a Jew, and that this the scene on Calvary was typical of the position of the two churches (*Gnomon N.T.*

in Luke 23). Stier (*Words of the Lord Jesus*, ad loc.) reads in the words of reproof (οὐδὲ φοβῇ σὺ τὸν θεόν) the language of one who had all along listened with grief and horror to the revilings of the multitude, the burst of an indignation previously suppressed. The Apocryphal gospels, as usual, do their best to lower the divine history to the level of a legend. They follow the repentant robber into the unseen world. He is the first to enter Paradise of all mankind. Adam and Seth and the patriarchs find him already there bearing his cross. Michael the archangel had led him to the gate, and the fiery sword had turned aside to let him pass (*Evang. Nicod.* 2, 10). Names were given to the two robbers. Demas or Dismas was the penitent thief, hanging on the right, Gestas the impenitent on the left (*ibid.* 1, 10; *Narrat. Joseph.* c. 3). The cry of entreaty is expanded into a long, wordy prayer (*Narrat. Joseph.* loc. cit.), and the promise suffers the same treatment. The history of the Infancy is made prophetic of that of the crucifixion. The holy family, on their flight to Egypt, come upon a band of robbers. One of them, Titus (the names are different here), has compassion, purchases the silence of his companion Dumachus, and the infant Christ prophesies that after thirty years Titus shall be crucified with him, and shall go before him into Paradise (*Evang. Infant.* c. 23). As in other instances [see MAGI], so in this, the fancy of inventors seems to have been fertile in names. Bede (*Collectan.*) gives Matha and Joca as those which prevailed in his time. The name given in the Gospel of Nicodemus has, however, kept its ground, and St. Dismas takes his place in the hagiology of the Syrian, the Greek, and the Latin Church. —Smith. It has been assumed that the penitent thief had been very wicked; that he continued so till he was nailed to the cross; that he joined the other malefactor in insulting the Savior; and that then, by a miracle of grace, he was transformed into a penitent Christian; so Origen (*Hom.* 35 *in Matthew*), Chrysostom (*Hom.* 88 *in Matthew*), and others (comp. Suicer, s.v. Λῃστής). But this view of the case seems to involve some misconception of the facts, which it may not be inexpedient to indicate. Whitby says, "Almost all interpreters that I have read here say that this thief began his repentance on the cross." With regard to his moral character, he is indeed styled by the evangelist one of the "malefactors (κακοῦργοι) who were led with Jesus to be put to death" (<42>23:32 Luke 23:32); but the word is evidently used δοξαστικῶς, i.e. malefactors as they were considered. Matthew (<40>27:44 Matthew 27:44) and Mark (<41>15:27 Mark 15:27) call them λῃσταί; but this word denotes not only robbers, etc., but also brigands, rebels, or any who carry on unauthorized hostilities, *insurgents* (Thucyd. 4:53). Insurrection was a crime, but it was a crime a

person might have committed who had good qualities, and had maintained a respectable character. Again, this man's punishment was crucifixion, which was not in use among the Jews, but was inflicted by the Romans, as we have seen, not on mere thieves, but rebels. Barabbas had been one of these, and though he'" lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder in the insurrection," Mark (<411527>Mark 15:27) has the same word, λῃστής, "robber," which is applied to him by John (<431840>John 18:40). It is most probable that these "malefactors" were two of his companions. Our Lord-was condemned under the same charge of insurrection (<422302>Luke 23:2), and the man whose case we are considering says to his fellow-sufferer, "Thou art under the same *sentence,* ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι, and admits that they both were guilty of the charge, while our Lord was innocent of it (ver. 40, 41). It is impossible, then, to determine the degree of his criminality without knowing what provocations he had received under the despotic and arbitrary rule of a Roman governor such as Pilate, how far he had been active, or only mixed up with the sedition, etc. The notion that he was suddenly and instantaneously converted on the cross is grounded entirely upon the *general* statement of Matthew, "the thieves also which were crucified with him cast the same in his teeth" (<402744>Matthew 27:44); whereas Luke, in his relation of the incident, is more exact. Instances of Matthew's style of speaking, which is called *amplification,* abound in the gospels, and in all writers. Thus, "the soldiers brought him vinegar" (<422336>Luke 23:36; <431929>John 19:29), "one of them did so" (<402748>Matthew 27:48; <411536>Mark 15:36). "The disciples had indignation" (<402608>Matthew 26:8), "some of them" (<411404>Mark 14:4)," one of them" (<431204>John 12:4). So on <411605>Mark 16:5; <402802>Matthew 28:2, there is mention of one angel only: but in <422404>Luke 24:4; <432012>John 20:12, there is mention of two. This is substantially the explanation given by Cyprian (*De Passione Domini*), Augustine (*DeCons. Evang.* 3, 16), and others, which assumes a synecdoche or syllepsis or enallage. The captious objections to the narrative of Luke as inconsistent with that. of Matthew and Mark, and the inference drawn from; them that both are more or less legendary, are therefore puerile (Strauss, *Leben Jesu,* 2, 519; Ewald, *Christus,* in *Gesch.* 5, 438). It is far from certain that either faith or repentance of this "thief" was the fruit of this particular season. He must have known something o the Savior, otherwise he could not have said οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξε, "he hath done nothing amiss." He may have been acquainted with the miracles and preaching of Jesus before he was cast into prison; he may have even conversed with him there. He was convinced of our Lord's Messiahship,

"Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." His crime possibly consisted of only one act of insubordination, and he might have been both a sincere believer, and, with this one exception, a practical follower of Christ. Kocher (ap. Bloomfield, *Recen. Synop.*) tells; us that it is a very ancient tradition that the thief was not converted at the cross, but was previously imbued; with a knowledge of the Gospel. See Kuinol, Macknight, etc.; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum,* p. 63; Hase, *Leben Jesu.*, p. 212.

Thigh

(Ëræ;*yarek*; Sept. μηρός ; Vulg. *femur*), properly the part of the body from the legs to the trunk, of men, quadrupeds, etc. (<01325>Genesis 32:25, 31, 32; <07086>Judges 3:16, 21; <19045>Psalm 45:3; <22308>Song of Solomon 3:8), occurs in several phrases of special significance in the Bible.

1. *Putting the hand under the 'thigh* appears to have been a very ancient custom, upon occasion of taking an oath to any one. Abraham required this of the oldest servant of his house, when he made him swear that he would not take a wife for Isaac of the daughters of the Canaanites (<01242>Genesis 24:2-9). Jacob required it of his son Joseph, when he bound him by oath not to bury him in Egypt, but with his fathers in the land of Canaan (<01472>Genesis 47:29-31). The origin, form, and import of this ceremony in taking an oath are very doubtful Aben-Ezra says, "It appears to me that it was the custom in that age for a servant to place his hand on his master's thigh, at the command of the latter, to show that he considered himself subject to, and undertook, his master's bidding; and such is at present the custom in India." Grotius thinks that, as the sword was worn upon the thigh (comp. <07086>Judges 3:16, 21; <19045>Psalm 45:3; <22308>Song of Solomon 3:8), this custom was as much as to say, If I falsify, kill me. Not a few commentators, ancient and modern, explain it of laying the hand on or near the *sectio circumcisionis,* to protest by that solemn covenant of God, whereof circumcision was the badge and type, in the Abrahamic family. So R. Eleazar says, "Before the giving of the law, the ancient fathers swore by the covenant of circumcision" (*Pirke,* c. 49). The Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel explains it ytlwhm tryzgk, "in sectione circumcisionis meae;" the Jerusalem Targum, ymyq !ry twjt, "sub femore foederis mei." Dr. Adam Clarke adopts the former of these two explanations (*Commentary on* <01249>*Genesis 24*:9). This interpretation supposes *meiosis,* or metonymy such as is supposed by some to attend the use of the word with regard to the

effect of the *water of Jealousy* (Numbers 5, 21, 22, 27). Bochart adduces many similar instances (*Hieroz.* II, 5, 15). We may also refer to the margin or Heb. of <0146>Genesis 46:26; <0201>Exodus 1:5; <0708>Judges 8:30. No further allusion to this ceremony in taking an oath occurs in Scripture, unless the phrase "giving the hand under" ? refer to it. (See Heb. or margin of <1324>1 Chronicles 29:24, and "giving the hand," <1430>2 Chronicles 30:8; <2415>Jeremiah 1:15; <2618>Ezekiel 17:18.) *SEE OATH*.

2. Our translation states that "*the hollow of Jacob's thigh* was out of joint by the touch of the angel who wrestled with him" (<0125>Genesis 32:25). Some, however, (prefer to render [qit;, *was sprained* or *wrenched,* and adduce <2608>Jeremiah 6:8; <2623>Ezekiel 23:17, 18. The Sept. renders it καὶ ἐνάρκησε τὸ πλάτος τοῦ μηροῦ; the Vulg. *tetigit nervum femoris ejus, et statim emarcuit.* Some such sense better suits ver. 31, where we find Jacob *limping* on his thigh; see Gesenius on [lx. The custom of Jacob's descendants, founded upon this incident, is recorded in ver. 32, which has been thus translated: "Therefore the children of Israel eat not of the nerve Nashe, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day; because he struck the hollow of Jacob's thigh, on the nerve Nashe (Sept. τὸ νεῦρον,Vulg. *nervus*). The true derivation of the word hçn is considered by Dr. Fürst, in his *Concordance,* to be still a secret; but, along with Gesenius, he understands the nerve itself to be the *sciatic nerve,* which proceeds from the hip to the ankle. This nerve is still extracted from the hinder limbs *by* the Jews in England, and in other countries where properly qualified persons are appointed to remove it (*New Translation,* etc., by the Rev. D. A. De Sola, p. 333).

3. (qwo, *shok.*) The phrase "*hip and thigh*" occurs in <7508>Judges 15:8, in the account of Samson's slaughter of the Philistines. Gesenius translates l[i in this passage *with,* and understands it as a proverbial expression for "he smote them all." The Chaldee paraphrase interprets it, "He smote both footmen and horsemen, the one resting on their legs (as the word qwo should be rendered), the other on their thighs, as they sat on their horses." Others understand that he smote them both on the legs and thighs. Some give another interpretation: *smiting on the thigh* denotes penitence (<2419>Jeremiah 31:19), grief, and mourning (<2612>Ezekiel 21:12).

A few mistranslations occur. The word "thigh" should have been translated "leg" in <2302>Isaiah 47:2, qwo, κνήμας, *crura.* In <2201>Song of Solomon 7:1,

"The joints of thy thighs," etc., the true meaning is "the *cincture of thy loins* (i.e. the drawers, trousers) is like jewelry." Lady Wortley Montagu describes this article of female attire as: composed of thin rose-colored damask, brocaded with *silver flowers"* (*Letters,* 2, 12; see Harmer, *On Solomon's Song,* p. 110). Cocceius, Buxtorf, Mercerus and Junius all adopt this explanation. In Rev. 19:16 it is said "the Word of God (ver. 13) hath on his vesture and *on his thigh a name written,* King of kings and Lord of lords." Schleusner thinks the name was not written upon the thigh, but upon the sword. Montfaucon gives an account of several images of warriors having inscriptions *on the thighs* (*Antiquite Expliquae,* III, 2, 268, 269; Grupter, 3, 1489; and Zornii *Opuscula S. S.* 2, 759).

Thilo, Johann Karl

a theologian of Halle, was born at Langensalza, in Thuringia, Nov. 28,1794. While a student he began to distinguish himself by superior philological attainments. He completed his studies at Leipsic and Halle, and in 1817 obtained the post of collaborator in the Latin school of the Orphanage at Halle, and subsequently that of teacher in the Royal Pe4agogium. He remained in the latter station five years, but joined to its duties those of theological tutor in the university, where he began to deliver lectures on exegetical and patristical subjects in 1819. In 1820 he visited Paris and Oxford in the company of Gesenius, and on his return assisted Knapp, who afterwards became his father-in-law, in the conduct of the Theological Seminary. In 1822 he was made extraordinary, and in 1825 ordinary, professor of theology. In 1833 he received the title of consistorial councilor, and in 1840 the badge of the Order of the Red Eagle. He was a member of the Order of Freemasons, and temporarily of the direction of Francke's institutes. The lectures of Thilo extended into the fields of the history of doctrines and of the Church, and into symbolics and patristics. They were characterized by thoroughness of treatment and fullness of detail as well as simplicity of style; and they came in time to be recognized and valued by the entire university. The progress of his researches led him from the study of classical antiquity and the Greek philosophers to the antiquity of the Church, the Neo-Platonists, and the Greek fathers. He was also led to give attention to the almost uncultivated field of the New Test. Apocrypha. In 1823 he published *Acta St. Thomae Apostoli,* etc. The fruit of subsequent labors was accidentally lost in 1828, so that the appearance of the first volume of his *Codex Apocryphus* N.T., etc., was delayed until 1832. This volume, containing the Apocryphal gospels, proved the greatest

literary production of his life. His plans for the completion of the series were only partially executed. In 1838 appeared *Acta Apostol. Petri* et *Pauli*, etc.: —in 1846, *Acta Apostol. Andrece et Matthice*, etc. and in 1847, *Fragm. Actuum S. Joannis*, etc. Thilo also furnished a contribution to the literature of the Old-Test. Apocrypha in the memorial written for Knapp's jubilee in 1825, *Specimen Exercit. Criticarum in Sap. Salomonis* (Hallse, 1825). Various dissertations display his acquaintance with the Neo-Platonists and the Church writers who followed in their steps; e.g. *De Celo Empyreo Commentationes III* (1839 sq.) *Euseb. Alexandr. Oratio* περὶ ἀστρονόμων *prcemissa de Magis et Stella Quaestione* (1834): —Comment. *in Synesii Hymnum II* (1842 sq.). He was long employed on a complete edition of the hymns of Synesius but did not finish the undertaking. This was also the case with his last important work, the *Bibliotheca Patrum Graec. Dogmatica*, a single volume, containing *S. A thanasii Opera Dogmatica Selecta*, after the text of Montfaucon, being the extent to which it was published. Thilo was simply a student and an inquirer. He connected himself with none of the theological parties in the Church, because he saw much to approve and something to condemn in them all. Nor did he found any school, because he was unable to regard his own mind as fully formed. He gave himself simply to the work of inquiry, and became, in consequence, one of the most widely and accurately. learned men of the modern Church within the field of his own chosen labors. He was, withal, a devout lover of the Bible, a most genial associate in the friendly circle, and a profoundly interested observer of all important events. He died May 17, 1853. Dryander's discourse delivered at the funeral of Thilo was published at Halle in 1853; and a brief characterization of Thilo was given by Meier in the *Hallischer Sektionskatatog* (185354); and another in *Convers. —Lexikon d. Gegenwart* (1841),4, 2, by Henke. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Thilo, Wilhelm

a German teacher, was born in the year 1802, and died Feb. 17,1870, at Berlin. For a; number of years he stood at the head of the Berlin seminary for the education of teachers, and published, *Spener als Katechet* (Berlin, *1840*): *—Das geistliche Lied in der evangel. Volksschule Deutschlands* (ibid. 1842; 2nd ed. *1855*): *—Ludwig Helmbold nach Leben und Dichten* (2nd ed. *1856*): *—Ludamilia Elisabeth Grafin von Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt. Ein Beitrag zür Geschichte der geistl. Dichtung im* 17. *Jahrhundert* (ibid. *1855*): *—Melanchthon im Dienste an heiliger Schrift*

(ibid. 1860): —*Preussisches Volksschulwesen nach Geschichte und Statistik* (ibid. 1867). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1332; *Literarischer Handweiser fur das kathol. Deutschland*, 1868, p. 66; 1870, p. 486. (B.P.)

Thim'natha

(Joshua 19:43). *SEE TIMNAH*.

Thionville, Councils of

(*Concilia apud Theodonis-villam*). Thionville, now known as *Diedenhofen*, is a town of Germany; in Lorraine, situated on the Moselle; and has belonged in succession to the counts of Luxemburg, to Burgundy, Austria, Spain, and France. It was ceded by the peace of May 10, 1871, to Germany. This town has been the seat of three councils.

I. Held in 822; thirty-two bishops being present, among whom were Aistuphus of Mayence and Ebbo of Rheims. Four or five articles were drawn up in defense of ecclesiastical persons and property. See Mansi, *Concil.* 7:1519.

II. Held in February, 835; more than forty bishops being present. All the proceedings against Louis le Debonnaire were declared to be null and void, and he was conducted to the cathedral church of Metz, and solemnly restored to his rights and privileges. This done, the prelates returned to Thionville, where Agobard of Lyons and Bernard of Vienne, who were absent, were solemnly deposed, together with Ebbo of Rheims, who, being present, himself consented to the sentence, and renounced the episcopate. See Mansi, 7:1695.

III. Held in October, 844, in a place called at present "Just" (Judicium); Drogon, bishop of Metz, presided. In this council Lothaire, Louis, and Charles promised to observe brotherly concord among themselves. Six articles were drawn up, which the princes promised to observe. They are exhorted, among other things, to live in unity and brotherly love; to fill without delay the sees which, owing to their quarrels, had remained vacant; to hinder the laity from appropriating to themselves the property of the Church, etc.

Third Orders is the name given by Roman Catholics to persons who desire to lead a religious life in their homes, and yet have connection with some regular order. The first mention of such persons is in 1199, in connection

with the Augustines, though this order claims that it was established much earlier. There are third orders of nearly all the principal orders, as of Dominicans, Minims, Carmelites, Trinitarians, etc. Their members take the vow of allegiance to the rules of the order, with the exception of that of perpetual chastity; have directors and superiors, yet live in the world, marry, and carry on business. Their only distinguishing mark is a scapulary and leather girdle, but these are often worn under their ordinary dress.

Thirds, a peculiar arrangement, under Mary queen of Scots, for the support of the Protestant clergy. "The barons," says Knox, "perceiving that the *Book of Discipline* was refused, presented to the nobility certain articles, requiring idolatry to be suppressed, the Kirk to be planted with true ministers, and some certain provision to be made for them, according to equity and conscience… And so devised they that the kirkmen" (the former clergy) "should have no intromission with the two parts of their benefices" (that is, with two thirds), "and that the third part should be lifted up by such men as thereto should be appointed, for such apsesas in the acts are more fully expressed." The result was that two thirds of the benefices were retained by the popish clergy, and the remaining third handed to a collector for the queen. The ministers and superintendents were to have a sum modified for their support, anti the surplus was to become a part of the revenue of the crown. Thus very little was left for the ministers of the Kirk.

Thirlwall, Connop, D.D.

an English clergyman and historian, was born at Stepney, Middlesex. Feb. 11, 179. His precocity was so great that his father published for him, at the age of eleven, a volume of his compositions, *Primitiae, or Essays and Poems on Various Subjects* (1809). He took the Craven and Bell scholarships at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1815; graduated as senior chancellor's medallist, 1818; became tutor and fellow; and was called to the bar in 1825. In 1828 he entered, the Church, and became rector of Kirby-under-Dale, Yorkshire. For several years he was examiner for the classical tripos at Cambridge, classical examiner in the University of London, and visitor of St. David's College, Lampeter. He was created bishop of St. David's in 1840, which office he resigned in June, 1874. He died July 27, 1875. He published a number of sermons, charges, letters, addresses, and essays, which, with other writings, were issued under the title of *Literary and Theological Remains*, edited by canon Perowne (Lond. 1875-6,3 vols.).

Thirst

(aµ[ι.oχ) is a painful natural sensation occasioned by the absence of moistening liquors from the stomach. As this sensation is accompanied by vehement desire, the term is sometimes used in Scripture, in. a moral sense, for a mental desire, as in Jeremiah 2, 25," With-hold thy throat from thirst; but thou saidst, I loved strangers, and after them will I go;" in other words, "I desire the commission of sin — I thirst for criminal indulgence,." Matthew 5, 6, "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness." <19402>Psalm 43:2, "My soul thirsteth for God." The same figure is employed in the discourse of our Lord with the woman of Samaria,. "Whosoever drinketh of the water which I shall give him shall never thirst," an allusion which the woman mistook as if intended of natural water, drawn from some spring possessing peculiar properties (<43814>John 3:14) *SEE HUNGER*.

Thirty nine Articles

SEE ARTICIES, THE THIRTY-NINE.

Thirty Years War, the

a German political and, religious conflict, was not properly one war, but rather an uninterrupted succession of wars (1618-48), in Germany. Austria, most of the Catholic princes of Germany, and Spain were engaged on one side throughout, but against different antagonists.

1. *Causes of the War*. —For the influences which led to this struggle we must look back to the 16th century, when Germany was divided into two parties by the Reformation. Under Maurice of Saxony, Protestantisms became triumphant, and by the Peace of Augsburg(1555) each State was allowed to prescribe the form of worship within its bounds, and subjects were allowed to move from those states where their worship was prohibited to those in which it was not. There still remained many unsettled questions which provoked strife.. To guard against the future appropriation of prelacies. by Protestants, the Catholic party, against the protest of the Lutheran members of the diet, inserted an article by which all prelates who should thereafter abjure Catholicism were to forfeit their benefices. Another matter of dispute was the desire to secure for Protestants the right of worship in Catholic states. The Catholics refused to admit such an article, and all that could be gained was a personal declaration to 'this

effect from the emperor's brother, Ferdinand, who presided over the diet at Augsburg. Under the reign of Maximilian (1564-76) Protestantism spread in Bohemia, Hungary, and Austria proper; but under his successor, Rudolf II (1576-1612), there was a reaction. Swayed by the Jesuits and the court of Spain, he proceeded to restrict, and even to abolish, Protestant worship.

2. *First Stage of the War.* —Thoroughly aroused, the Protestant princes formed the Evangelical Union at Anhausen, in Franconia, May 4, 1608, under the lead of the elector-palatine, Frederick-IV. The rival union of the Catholic powers, under the leadership of the duke of Bavaria, followed, July 11, 1609. The Bohemians had forced from Rudolf an edict of toleration (*Majesttsbrief*), July 11, 1609, which guaranteed them religious liberty; but his successor, Matthias, having signed it upon his accession, appointed his cousin Ferdinand of Styria his heir. Ferdinand, educated by the Jesuits, had taken an oath to exterminate Protestantism from his kingdom; and immediately upon: his accession, in 1617, persecutions began. Two Protestant churches, in Klostergraben and Braunau, having been pulled down, a lawsuit was instituted, and decided in favor of the Roman Catholic authorities. An appeal to the emperor only elicited a harsh reply, which aroused the Protestants, who, under the leadership of count Thurn, penetrated into the Castle of Prague (May 23,1618), threw the imperial councilors out of the window, and organized a general rising. They routed the imperial troops, and actually besieged the emperor in Vienna. Frederick, whose sole allies were Bohemians, Moravians, Hungarians, and a Piedmontese contingent of 3000, was opposed by a well-appointed army of 30,000 under duke Maximilian, and totally routed at Weissenberg, Nov. 8, 1620. The military operations of count Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick, and the forced cession of large portions of Hungary and Transylvania to Bethlem Gabor, did much to equalize the success of the antagonistic parties.

3. *Second Stage of the War.* —The fearful tyranny of Ferdinand over all the Protestants in his dominions, Hungary excepted, drove them to despair, and prolonged the war. Christian IV of Denmark, smarting under some. injuries inflicted upon him by the emperor, and aided by a British subsidy, came to the relief of his German coreligionists in 1624. Holland aided with troops, and Christian of Brunswick and Mansfeld reappeared in the field. In April, 1626, Mansfeld's army was nearly annihilated by Wallenstein at Dessau, while in August Tilly overwhelmed the king of Denmark at Lutter. This victory was followed up by Wallenstein, who drove the Danes into

Jutland and extended his operations to the Baltic. Christian IV was compelled by the Peace of Lubeck, May 22, 1629, to withdraw altogether from the contest. Here, again, the war might have ended; but Ferdinand, on March 6, 1629, issued the Edict of Restitution, ordering that all ecclesiastical estates secularized since 1552 should be returned to the Church, and all immediate sees held by Protestants transferred to Roman Catholic prelates. Brandenburg, Saxony, Hesse, Magdeburg, and other states protested, but the edict was carried out by force in all the imperial cities; and Tilly was ordered to move northward and crush every attempt at resistance. At this juncture Gustavus Adolphus came to the rescue of German Protestantism, and thus began the

4. *Third Stage of the War.* —Gustavus landed on the island of Usedom, in June, 1630, and drove away the imperial garrisons from Pomerania and Mecklenburg, where he reinstated the expelled princes. He then formed alliances with Hesse, Saxe -Weimar, Magdeburg, and France; and was afterwards joined by the electors of Brandenburg and Saxony. With these last allies he joined battle with Tilly at Breitenfeld, Sept. 17, 1631, and nearly annihilated his army. Defeating Tilly the second time, April 15, 1632, on the Lech, Gustavus and Frederick V entered Munich. Wallenstein was recalled; and, after a few months waiting, the battle of Ltitzen was fought, Nov. 16, 1632, in which Gustavus fell, but Wallenstein was defeated. The death of Gustavus Adolphus was a severe blow to the Protestants, though the genius and indefatigable zeal of his chancellor, Oxenstierna, and the superior ability of the Swedish generals, preserved the advantages they had gained, till the crushing defeat of Bernard of Weimar at Nordlingen, Sept. 6,1634, restored to the emperor a preponderating influence in Germany. Saxony now made peace at Prague, May 30, 1635, obtaining such satisfactory terms for the Lutherans that the treaty was, within three months, adhered to by all the princes of that sect. The Calvinists were left to their fate. Sweden, however, resolved to continue the struggle, and Oxenstierna propitiated Richelieu by giving him the direction of the war. Baner led the Swedes into Germany, and won the great battle of Wittstock. Sept. 24,1636. Upon his death, in 1641, he was succeeded by Torstensson, who made the Swedish arms a terror throughout Germany. Cond and Turenne led the French to victory over the leaguers on the Rhine, until at last the emperor was deserted by all his allies except the duke of Bavaria, whose territories were already mostly in the hands of Turenne and Wrarigel. Preliminaries had been arranged for

negotiations as early as 1641, but it was not until Oct. 24, 1648, that the Peace of Westphalia was concluded at Minster.

5. *Results of the War.* — These, ecclesiastically considered, were that the possession of the ecclesiastical benefices was placed on the basis of Jan. 1, 1624; and in the case of the Palatinate, Baden, Durlach, and Würtemberg, the Catholics were obliged to accept 1618 as the normal year. An age of greater toleration was introduced into Germany. In all religious questions the Protestants secured an equality with the Catholics, and gained equal weight in the diet and high courts of the empire. The Peace of Westphalia terminated the religious wars of Europe, and thus became an important landmark in its history. *SEE WESTPHALIA. PEACE OF*.

For literature of the Thirty Years War, see Cust. *Lives of the Warriors of the Thirty Years War* (Lond. 1865); Ranke, *Geschichte Wallezsteins* (Leips. 1869) ; Stieve, *Ursprung des dreissigjaihrigen Kieges* (Munich, 1875),: vol. 1; and similar sketches by Menzel (Breslau, 183539, 3 vols.), Flathe (1840), Mebold (1840), Barthold (1842), Heilman (1851), Klopp (1861), Hausser (1862), Gindely (Prague, 1869), Gardner (Lond. 1874).

This'be

(θίσβη v.r. θίβη), a name found only in Tob. 1, 2, as that of a city of Naphtali from which Tobit's ancestor had been carried captive by the Assyrians. The real interest of the name resides in the fact that it is maintained by some interpreters (Hiller, Ononu. p. 236, 947; Reland, *Palaest.* p. 1035) to be the place which had the glory of giving birth to Elijah (q.v.) the *Tishbite.* This, however, is, at the best, very questionable, and derives its main support from the fact that the word employed in 1 Kings 17:1 to denote the relation of Elijah to Gilead, if pointed as it now stands in the received Hebrew text, signifies that he was not a native of Gilead, but merely a resident there, and came originally from a different and foreign district. But it is also possible to point the word so that the sentence shall mean "from Tishbi of Gilead," in which case all relation between the great prophet and Thisbe of Naphtali at once falls to the ground. There is, however, a truly singular variation in the texts of the passage in Tobit, a glance at which (on the following page) will show how hazardous it is to base any definite topographical conclusions upon it.

Assuming that *Thisbe,* and not *Thibe,* is the correct reading of the name, it has been conjectured (apparently for the first time by Keil, *Comm. über die*

Konige, p. 247) that it originated in an erroneous rendering of the Hebrew word yBvTa, which word, in fact, occurs in the Hebrew version of the passage, and may be pointed in two ways, so as to mean either "from the inhabitants of" or "from Tishbi," i.e. Thisbe. The reverse suggestion, in respect of the same word in <1117001>1 Kings 17:1, has also been made. *SEE TISHBITE*. But this, though very ingenious, and quite within the bounds of possibility, is at present a mere conjecture, since none of the texts support it, and there is no other evidence in its favor.

No name resembling Thisbe or Thibe has been yet encountered in the neighborhood of Kedes or Safed, but it seems impossible to suppose that the minute definition of the Latin and Revised Greek texts-equaled in the sacred books only by the well-known description of the position of Shiloh in <072119>Judges 21:19-can be mere invention.

Thistle

Picture for Thistle

is the rendering, in the A.V., of two Heb. and one Gr. word: 1. rDirDj, *darddr,* any thorny plant, especially of the weed-like sort; always collectively in parallelism with /wq, *kots,* "thorn" (Genesis 3, 18; <281008>Hosea 10:8); 2. jwqo, *choäch,* a stronger or *hook-like* thorny bush (<121409>2 Kings 14:9; <142518>2 Chronicles 25:18; <183140>Job 31:40; elsewhere "thorn," etc.); 3. τρίβολος, a *three-pronged* thorn, the *caltrop* (<400716>Matthew 7:16; "brier," Heb. 6:8). The tendency of all vegetation in Palestine to run into spines, noticeable in the merest weeds as well as in trees, is a subject of remark to all travelers (see Hackett, *Illust. of Script.* p. 126). The thistle (a common name for various genera, especially *Carduus cirsium,* etc.) grows abundantly in. most countries, and is a small plant; but in the warm air of Palestine, and in rich soils like the plain of Esdraelon, the large and luxuriant thistle will overtop the mounted horseman. On the road from Jerusalem to Ramaj Hasselquist (*Travels,-p.* 280) found six different sorts; and in the south of Judaea, in the course of one afternoon, Messrs. M'Cheyne and Bonar counted ten or eleven species. Miss Beaufort speaks of giant thistles of the height of a man on horseback, which she saw near the ruins of Felham (*Egyptian Sep. and Syrian Shrines,* 2, 45, 50). "The most common species of this weed in Palestine are, *Notobasis Syriaca,* a tall flowering pink thistle with powerful spines; *Scolymus maculatus,* a very noxious plant, with a bright-orange flower and *Carthemus oxycantha,*

another yellow-flowering thistle. Whose formidable spines inflict irritating wounds, like the sting of a poisonous insect" (Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible,* p. 424 sq.). *SEE THORN*.

Thiven, Synod of

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

Tholuck, Friedrich August Gottgetreu

one of the greatest Protestant divines of Germany, was born at Breslau, March 30, 1799, of humble parentage. He continued at school till twelve years of age, when he was set to learn his father's trade, which was that of a goldsmith. It is said that he had till late years a ring, which he himself had made. Still he bated the trade so much that he determined to get back to study. He soon found his way to the gymnasium, from which he graduated at the age of eighteen. His diligence was so great that he almost destroyed his sight, so that at times he has been on the verge of blindness. For a while he remained at the University of Breslau, but afterwards went to Berlin. In some way or other a taste for Oriental literature was awakened in him and he sought from Prof. Kosegarten (then of Greifswalde, but from 1817 till 1824 professor at Jena), who was a great Oriental scholar, the means to carry on such studies. Prelate von Dietz, another distinguished Orientalist, took such an interest in him as to adopt him as his son; and when the prelate died, Von Altenstein secured for him all needful support. He went soon after to Jena, where he studied under his benefactor, Kosegarten, and graduated as doctor of philosophy. He always looked back upon these Oriental studies with delight, and said on Dec. 1, 1870 (the evening before the fiftieth anniversary of his appointment as professor), in answer to a congratulatory address from Jena, "You may be assured, my friends, that when I look back upon these studies, it is not with feelings like those with which one recollects a forsaken love, but rather with those felt towards one that still inflames and fills my spirit with youthful enthusiasm, and, at the same time, calls up a grateful remembrance of Prof. Kosegarten of Jena, who so lovingly encouraged and helped me on in the path of these studies."

Tholuck's progress in Oriental lore is proved by three works which he published, two of which are learned productions. The first was written in 1821, from Turkish, Persian, and Arabic MSS., and entitled *Sufismus sire Theosophia Persarunm Pantheistica, quam e MSS. Bibliothecae Regiae Berolinensis Persicis, Arabicis, Turcicis eruit et illustravit* (Berolini, 1821). The second was more popular, and appeared in 1825 with the title An *Anthology of the Oriental Mystic Poems, with an Introduction on the Mystics Generally, and the Eastern in Particular.* The third of these works appeared in 1826, and was one of *learning-Speculations of the Later Orientalists respecting the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

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

"Those whom I see around me are not merely my pupils, nor my admirers, but my friends-my friends in Christ, many of them also my children in Christ, whom I have also borne with much pain. My course has been designated a *successful life among youth.* I have had not merely to water like Apollos, but to plant with Paul, and introduce new life into dead, corrupt, and wayward youthful hearts. But this-can only be where the spirit of fire is the beam of a divine influence from God. 'Nothing fills me more with adoring wonder than to think how this spirit of fire has ever been given to me since the hour when I received the baptism of fire from above. From the age of seventeen I have always asked myself, '*What is the chief end of man's life?'* I could never persuade myself that the acquisition of knowledge was this end. Just then God brought me into contact with a venerable saint who lived in fellowship with Christ, and from that time *I have had but one passion, and that is Christ, and Christ alone.* Every one out of Christ I look upon as a fortress which I must storm and win. I was in my eighteenth year when the Lord gave me my first convert. He was an

artillery officer, a Jew, a wild creature, without rest; but soon he became such a true follower of Christ that he put me to shame. And when I look back upon the thousands of youths whose hearts have opened up under my influence, I can only say *the Lord hath done it.* In working thus to save souls, my life has been one of joy rather than toil. Among the students were many frivolous, careless ones. I just now remember one whom a mother laid on my heart, but who soon fell among companions who led him astray, so that he could be found at home only at six in the morning. More than once I have visited him at that hour, and also in prison, but all seemed in vain, till one day in the sermon I said, 'Ah, yes, we preachers should have hard work were it not that we have one in league with us in every heart, even the most careless, that says, while we are preachers, "Well, the preacher is right." 'The next evening I received a letter from him, in which he promised to give up evil and enter upon a new life. Alas! four or five days later a card came from him with only these words— "*Tholuck is sighing, Tholuck is praying, but I am drinking like a brute.*" Yet my labor was not in vain, for he is now a noted preacher of the Gospel of Christ. And what a number of those who were once my students have risen up and can now say, each one, like myself, *'I have but one passion, and that is Christ, and Christ alone!'*

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

On Dec, 2, 1820, Tholuck passed his examination as licentiate of theology at the Berlin University. This was a daring step, for he then suffered from a complaint which, according to three physicians whom. he consulted at the request of baron von Kottwitz, was to end in speedy death. But a young physician, without curing him, removed the imminent danger, and he could

go on in his work. Through the considerateness and liberality of the Prussian government, he went to England in 1825, and spent nearly a year there in travels undertaken for the purpose of prosecuting scientific researches. On his return to Berlin in 1826, he was called to fill the chair of ordinary theology at Halle, made vacant by the death of Dr. Knapp. Notwithstanding -his promotion to the position of extraordinary professor of theology at Berlin, so deeply was he imbued with the spirit and interested in the prosecution of the work of Francke at Halle that the daily longing of his heart was that he might be transferred to the university founded by him. “Every day,” says he, “I prayed to God that he might be pleased to call me to that place where, a hundred years before, August H. Francke had built his Orphan Asylum, and had, by his addresses both from the pulpit and from the chair, gathered a faithful community, teaching that the first stage on the way to the tree of knowledge was by the tree of life.” His prayer was answered, the mantle of Francke fell upon him, and, by a remarkable coincidence of Providence, after laboring as his successor for more than fifty years, his burial took place within one day of the 150th anniversary of the burial of Francke, and the passage selected as the text of the preacher at the obsequies of Francke served the same purpose at the funeral of Tholuck— “Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded,” from the Gospel for the Sunday (June 10) on which Tholuck died.

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

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

> against my appointment to a professorship at Halle. That was the most trying period of my life, in which I learned seeking and pursuing love."

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

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

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

Tholuck verified the prophetic words of Prof. Hegel, drew the sword of the Spirit, and gave bald rationalism its death-blow in the University of Halle. It was only with the change of government and ministry in Prussia in 1840 that Tholuck's influence assumed great dimensions. Frederick William IV and the minister of worship, Eichhorn. looked upon his theology as one which avoided all extremes and yet held the faith firmly. They considered it the only justifiable form. When vacancies were to be filled in the Prussian universities, his advice was always valued, whether it had been formally asked or voluntarily proposed. Under the minister Von Raumer, his influence rather declined; but under the succeeding minister, Von Müller, it acquired its old power and dimensions, and many of the

appointments of that time were suggested by him. His earnest labor for personal and experimental religion caused him to view with mildness smaller departures from ecclesiastical orthodoxy. Divine truth was in his eyes too sublime to be sharply and exactly defined in formulae. In his *True Consecration of the Sceptic,* he does not even stiffly demand an express belief in the personality of God if the self-consciousness and existence of the Divine Being are admitted. Sternly to insist upon creeds seemed to him a departure from the faith. In his sermons he despised all rhetoric and display of learning. There were, however, flashes of appeal that cut into the heart like lightning. And then his life, so warm and tender and loving, made him a universal favorite with his students. It is no wonder that he exerted an almost fascinating influence over them. Indeed, he looked upon personal effort among students as his peculiar calling. Every day he spent two hours in walking, and generally had one or two with him, with whom he engaged in pleasant but earnest conversation. This gave him, after a time, such an extensive psychological knowledge that he could easily find an entrance to the hearts of those whom he would save. Tholuck said himself, in the address which he delivered at his jubilee,

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

"But, at the same time, the life of a professor is not all pleasure and enjoyment. If upon every word an echo would resound in the awakened heart; if upon every warning [spiritual breath green shoots would spring up; if on every bestowal of a gift there would follow its reception then it would be nothing but enjoyment. But thus it does not always happen, for there are also the silent, the dull, and the slow ones, whom one can call

again and again, but no echo resounds; where one can thrust in the spade day after day before anything is heard resounding under the earth. And to be surrounded by such, that was my lot in the beginning.

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

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

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

Besides the English, he was a master of a great many languages, and was only surpassed by cardinal Mezzofanti, who is said to have known fifty, including dialects. He was also gifted with poetic genius, and had acquired an immense store of varied learning. He was not only a master in theology, but profoundly versed in philology, philosophy, history, and poetry; in ancient and modern, Oriental and Occidental, heathen, Jewish, Mohammedan, and Christian literature. He was a voluminous writer. He commenced his literary labors as an author in 1821, and, besides the works already named, he wrote *Commentaries* on the Epistle to the Romans, the Hebrews, the Psalms, the Gospel of John: —a philosophico-theological exposition on *The Sermon on the Mount*: —*The Credibility of the Gospel History* (an antidote to *Strauss’s Life of Christ*): —*The Spirit of the Lutheran Theologians of Wittenberg in the 17th Century*: —*and The Academic Life of the 17th Century*. In the last two productions he gives,

mostly from MS. sources, a very interesting and graphic, but by -no means favorable, picture of the palmy days of orthodox Lutheranism, for the instruction and warning of those contemporaries who would so zealously revive it as the best state of the Church, without considering that it was followed by the terrible apostasy of Rationalism. These works were forerunners of an extensive history of Rationalism. We mention the *Hours of Devotion,* together with several volumes of *Sermons,* as well as numerous articles published in. the theological journals of Germany. He also issued his miscellaneous writings in two volumes, and republished *The True Consecration of the Sceptic* (1823), under the changed title of *The Doctrine of Sin and the Propitiator,* in 1851. Most of his writings have been translated into the more widely spoken modern languages. of Europe.

Dr. Tholuck was also an able and popular preacher. He breathed and exhibited the spirit of evangelical piety in all the circles in which he. moved-domestic, social, literary, and theological. He was simple and bland in his manners, social in his disposition, and kindly affectioned towards all men. He did not eschew pleasantry, but gave it its due place in conversation, and thus furnished the matter for many relishable anecdotes. He accepted the Prussian Union as consistent with ,the catholicity of Christianity, as well as with the doctrines of the Lutheran Church as set forth in her catholic symbol, the *Augustana,* and hence never allied himself with the separatistic Lutherans in their attempt to revive and perpetuate the symbolic dogmatism of the Lutheran theologians of the 17th-'century. In spite of his frail physical constitution, he was permitted to celebrate his semi-centennial jubilee as a professor Dec. 2, 1870, an occasion which was graced by the presence of a great number of his former pupils from all parts of the world. In responding to one of the addresses presented to him at his semi-centennial jubilee, he referred to the bodily infirmities he had been called upon to bear, and the comparatively small number of his days in which he was in the enjoyment of health. The performance of so much unintermitted labor, and the great age which he-attained, are attributable to his abstemious habits and systematic exercise, as well as to the cheerfulness of disposition inspired by his personal piety, and his extraordinary success in doing good and glorifying Christ. On June 10,1877, Dr. Tholuck's wife sent the following telegram to Dr. Schaff, who was then at Stuttgart, announcing his death, together with his last words: "HALLE, June 10,1877.

"This day, at 4 o'clock P. M., my dear husband, Dr. August Tholuck, after long suffering, gently entered into that blessed rest for which he had been longing from the days of his youth. Through the grace of God, his life, which was often threatened with an early termination, has been prolonged in indefatigable and fruitful labors to the age of seventy-eight years, two months, and ten days. Under the heavy pressure and painful anxiety of the last year, his friends around him were permitted to observe, in various ways, the growing assurance of his faith and the victory of love in his heart. His last intelligent words were a cheerful profession of the cross of Christ in view of approaching death: 'I am not afraid; Christ died for me'(*Ich fiurchte mich nicht*; *denn Christus starb für mich*)."

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

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

We have not as yet a complete biography of Dr. Tholuck, who will fill some chapters in the Church history of the 19th century. A sketch was

published by Dr. Schaff, in his *Germany*: *its Universities, Theology, and Religion* (Phila. 1857), p. 278 sq. Another sketch is given in the *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.* Our present article is made up from different necrologies. As to Tholuck's works, it would be useless to try to enumerate them. Zuchold alone (*Bibl. Theol. 2,* 1332 sq.) gives four pages. His *Commentaries* have been translated into English, and so also have some others of his works. The last of these, so far as we are aware, is *Hours of Christian Devotion* (Edinb. 1870), a work which has repeatedly been edited in Germany. (B.P.)

Thom'as

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

1. *His Name.* —This is evidently a Graecized form of the Aramaic ממת, *Tomd,* which means *the twin*; and so it is translated in <431116>John 11:16; 20:24; 21:2, ὁ Δίδυμος, which has passed into a name, *Didymus* (q.v.). This name occurs also on Phoenician inscriptions in a form which reminds us of the colloquial English abbreviation, viz. מוא and מא (Gesenius, *Monumenta,* "p. 356). In Heb. also (<220704>Song of Solomon 7:4) it is simply מאם *feom,* almost exactly our "Tom." The frequency of the name in England is derived not from the apostle, but from St. Thomas of Canterbury. Out of the signification of this name has grown the tradition that he had a twin-sister, Lysia (*Patres Apost.* p. 272), or that he was a twin-brother of our Lord (Thilo, *Acta Thomae,* p. 94); which last, again, would confirm his identification with *Jude* (comp. <401355>Matthew 13:55), with whom Eusebius expressly identifies him (*Hist. Eccles.* 1, 13; so also the *Acta Thomae*). This may have been a mere confusion with Thaddaeus (q.v.), who is mentioned in the extract. But it may also be that Judas was his real name, and that Thomas was a surname.

2. *History and Character from the New Test.* —(We here chiefly adopt Stanley's art. in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*). In the catalogue of the apostles he is coupled with Matthew in <401003>Matthew 10:3; Mark 3, 18; <420615>Luke 6:15; and with Philip in Acts 1, 13.

All that we know of him is derived from the Gospel of John; and this amounts to three traits, which, however, so exactly agree together that, slight as they are, they place his character before us with a, precision which belongs to no other of the twelve apostles, except Peter, John, and Judas

Iscariot. This character is that of a man slow to believe, seeing all the difficulties of a case, subject to despondency, viewing things on the darker side, and yet full of ardent love for his Master (see Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 1, 108).

(a.) The first trait is found in his speech when our Lord determined to face the dangers that awaited him in Judaea on his journey to Bethany. Thomas said to his fellow-disciples, "Let us also go (καὶ ἡμεῖς), that wee may die with him" (<43116>John 11:16). He entertained no hope of his escape-he looked on the journey as leading to total ruin; but he determined to share the peril. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him."

(b.) The second occurs in his speech during the last supper: "Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?" (<43145>John 14:5). It was the prosaic, incredulous doubt as to moving a step in the unseen future, and yet an eager inquiry to know how this step was to be taken.

(c.) The third was after the resurrection. He was absent-possibly by accident, perhaps characteristically from the first assembly when Jesus had appeared. The others told him what they had seen. He broke forth into an exclamation, the terms of which convey to us at once the vehemence of his doubt, and, at the same time, the vivid picture that his mind retained of his Master's form as he had last seen him lifeless on the cross: "Except I see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not, I cannot, believe" (οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω, <43025>John 20:25). On the eighth day he was with them at their gathering, perhaps in expectation of a recurrence of the visit of the previous week; and Jesus stood among them. He pronounced the same salutation, "Peace be unto you;" and then, turning to Thomas, as if this had been the special object of his appearance, uttered the words which convey as strongly the sense of condemnation and tender reproof as those of Thomas had shown the sense of hesitation and doubt: "Bring: thy finger hither [ωδε as if himself pointing to his wounds] and see my hands; and bring thy hand and thrust it in my side; and do not become (μὴ γίνου) unbelieving (ἄπιστος), but believing (πιστός)." "He answers to the words that Thomas had spoken to the ears of his fellow-disciples only; but it is to the thought of his heart rather than to the words of his lips that the Searcher of hearts answers. Eye, ear, and touch at once appealed to and at once satisfied-the form, the look, the voice, the solid and actual body: and

not the senses only, but the mind satisfied too; the knowledge that searches the very reins and the hearts; the love that loveth to the end, infinite and eternal" (Arnold, *Serm. 6*:238). The effect on Thomas is immediate. It is useless to speculate whether he obeyed our Lord's invitation to examine the wounds. The impression is that he did not. Be that as it may, the conviction produced by the removal of his doubt became deeper and stronger than that of any of the other apostles. The words in which he expressed his belief contain a far higher assertion of his Master's divine nature than is contained in any other expression used by apostolic lips, "My Lord, and my God f Some have supposed that κύριος refers to the human θεός to the divine nature. 'This is too artificial. 'It is more to the point to observe the exact terms of the sentence, uttered, as it were, in astonished awe. "It is, then, my Lord and my God!" (It is obviously of no dogmatic importance whether the words are an address or a description. That they are the latter appears from the use of the nominative ὁ κύριος. The form ὁ θεός proves nothing, as this is used for the vocative. At the same time, it should be observed that the passage is *said to Christ,* ειπεν αὐτῶ.) The word "my" gives it a personal application to himself. Additional emphasis is given to this declaration from its being the last incident related in the direct narrative of the gospel (before the supplement of ch. 21), thus corresponding to the opening words of the prologue. '"Thus Christ was acknowledged on earth to be what John had in the beginning of his gospel declared him to be from all eternity; and the words of Thomas at the end of the twentieth chapter do but repeat the truth which John had stated before in his own words at the beginning of the first" (Arnold, *Serm. 6*:401). The answer of our Lord sums up the moral of the whole narrative: "Because ["Thomas" (θῶμα) is omitted in the best MSS.] thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen me, and yet have believed" (20, 29). By this incident, therefore, Thomas, "the doubting apostle," is raised at once to the theologian in the original sense of the word. "Ab eo dubitatum est," says Augustine, "ne a nobis dubitaretur." Winer and others find in the character of Thomas what they consider contradictory traits, viz. inconsiderate faith and a turn for exacting the most rigorous evidence. We find that a resolute and lively faith is always necessarily combined with a sense of its importance, and with a desire to keep its objects unalloyed and free from error and superstition. Christ himself did not blame Thomas for availing himself of all possible evidence, but only pronounced those blessed who would be open to conviction even if some external form of evidence should not be within their reach (comp.

Niemeyer, *Akademische Predigten und Reden,* p. 321 sq.). Monographs have been written in Latin on this scene in Thomas's life by Carpzov (Helmst. 1757), id. (Vim. 1765), Rost (Budiss. 1785), and Gram (Nurimb. 1618).

In the New Test. we hear of Thomas only twice again-once on the Sea of Galilee with the seven disciples, where he is ranked next after Peter (<4210>John 21:2), and again in the assemblage of the apostles after the Ascension (Acts 1, 13).

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

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

Thomas (St.), Christians Of,

a body of Syrian Christians dwelling in the interior of Malabar and Travancore, in the south-western part of Hindustan. When the Portuguese landed in India in the 16th century, they discovered what they supposed to be a Nestorian Church there, the members of which called themselves. Christians of St. Thomas. They retained the Syrian language, held the validity of only two sacraments, and were governed by bishops under a metropolitan. They rejected the authority of Peter, and did not enforce sacerdotal celibacy. They neither invoked saints nor worshipped images. These churches were soon subjected to severe persecution, and many were forced into Romanism. The inquisition, also, was established at. Goa. Dr. Claudius Buchanan found, however, a remnant of them, in 1807, near Travancore. They still retain some ecclesiastical independence. According to a. statement of some authority, the St. Thomas Christians number 70,000 individuals, and the Syro-Roman Catholics 90,000, that is, the party who have submitted to the papal jurisdiction. But the Church service in Syriac: is not understood by the people, who are ignorant and prejudiced. That their creed is not directly Nestorian may be seen from the declaration of the metropolitan of Malabar made in 1806: “We believe in the Father,. Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons in one God, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance; One in Three, and Three in One: the Father generator, the Son generated, and the Holy Ghost proceeding.. None is before or after the other; in majesty, honor, might, and power coequal; Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. The metropolitan disclaims the heresies of Arius, Sabellius, Macedonius, Manes, Manianus, Julianus, Nestorius, and the Chalcedonians, adding that in the appointed time, through the disposition of the Father and the Holy Ghost, the Son appeared on earth. for the salvation of mankind; that he was born of the Virgin Mary through the means of the Holy Ghost, and was incarnate God and man.” “They believe that the souls of departed men do not see God till the judgment day; they allow three sacraments-baptism, orders, and the

Eucharist; and they abhor auricular confession. In the consecration of the Eucharist they use small cakes made with oil and salt; instead of wine is water in which raisins have been steeped; they observe no age for orders, but admit priests at seven, eighteen, twenty, etc., who may marry as often as their wives die. Their children, unless in cases of sickness, are not baptized till the fiftieth day. At the death of any friend the relations keep an eight days fast in memory of the de-ceased. They observe the times of Advent and Lent, and many other feasts and festivals, but especially those which relate to Thomas — the *Dominica in albis*, or Sun-day after Easter, in memory of the notable confession of Thomas; one on June 1, which is also celebrated by Moors and Pagans. The Church of England Missionary Society has established among these people an extensive mission, occupying two or three stations; and a college has been established at Kottaytm for the instruction of candidates for the ministry, which has been liberally endowed. See Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s.v.; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v. *SEE NESTORIANS*.

Thomas (St.), Day Of,

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

Thomas (St.), Writings Of.

These are as follows:

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

2. THOMAE CONSUMMATIO (*Consummation of Thomas*), which, like the former, was the source for *the Hist. Apost. Abdice.* It was edited first

by Tischendorf from a cod. Paris. of the 11th century, and published in his *Acta Apostolorum,* p. 235-242. More important than these is the-

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

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

Thomas à Becket, or of Canterbury

SEE BECKET, THOMAS 1.

Thomas à Kempis

SEE KEMPIS, THOMAS A.

Thomas Aquinas

SEE AQUINAS, ST. THOMAS.

Thomas of Celano

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

Thomas of Villanova

SEE VILLENEUVE.

Thomas, Barnabas

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

Thomas, Benjamin Calley

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

Thomas, Benjamin Franklin

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

Thomas, Christian

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

Thomas, Christopher

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

Thomas, David (1)

a minister of the Baptist denomination, was born at Loudon Tract, Pa., Aug. 16, 1732. In early life he enjoyed more than ordinary advantages for

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

Thomas, David (2)

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

Thomas, David (3)

a Welsh Congregational minister, was born in 1793. He graduated at the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen, and was ordained in 1820 at Pembrokeshire, and shortly afterwards settled at Wotton-under-Edge, and retained this charge until the close of his life. He died March 28, 1861. His

preaching was earnest, faithful, and evangelical. See (Lond.) *Cong. Year-book,* 1862, p. 263.

Thomas, David (4) A.B.

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

Thomas, Ebenezer, D.D., LL.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Chelmsford, England, Dec. 23, 1812. His father was an Independent minister, educated at Hoxton College in London, and was ordained at Chelmsford in 1805, where he remained as pastor for a number of years. He removed to Cincinnati, O., when his son was but a child. He was engaged in preaching in Cincinnati and destitute neighborhoods for several years. With a view of supplying the destitute, he organized a Home Evangelization Society, and was its agent. He accepted a call to take charge of the Welsh Independent Church at Paddy’s Run, O. Here he established a boarding school, and some of the first men of the country were his patrons and pupils. Under his father’s instruction, young Thomas was prepared for college. He entered the Miami University and graduated in 1834. He possessed powers of mind of the highest order, and his scholarly attainments were rarely equaled, never surpassed. Immediately after his graduation, he commenced teaching at Rising Sun, Ind., and afterwards at Franklin, O. When not engaged in teaching, he pursued the study of theology. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Oxford in 1836. Although he had not had the advantage of training in a theological seminary, there were few more thoroughly educated in every branch of theology. He was called to take charge of the Church at Harrison, and he was ordained and installed over the same in July, 1837. After remaining in Harrison over two years, he was called to the Hamilton

Church, where he remained until 1849, when he was elected president of Hanover. College. This position he occupied until 1854, when he resigned to accept the chair of Biblical literature and exegesis in the Theological Seminary at New -Albany, Ind. Here he remained till the seminary was-removed so Chicago, when he resigned, but was re-elected by the new board at its first meeting. He accepted the appointment, but on account of controversy in the Church in regard to his views and those of his colleague, Professor McMasters, in regard to slavery, the seminary was not opened for two years. In the meantime he supplied the pulpit of the first Presbyterian Church in New Albany. In 1858 the synods in whose bounds the seminary was located voted to offer it to the General Assembly, and in 1859 it was accepted by the same. In the meantime the first Church of Dayton, O., gave Dr. Thomas a call, which he accepted. Here he was duly installed, and entered on his work, which he prosecuted with energy and success for twelve years, when he resigned to accept the chair of New Test. Greek and exegesis in Lane Seminary, Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, O. He died there Feb. 2, 1875. Dr. Thomas was a general scholar. He carried his studies outside of the curriculum, and was at home in history, geology, botany, entomology, mineralogy, astronomy, and microscopy. He was a model teacher, his thorough knowledge of every department and his unrivalled colloquial powers combined to make him a great favorite in the classroom. As a theologian he was a sincere and sound Calvinist, and he was as rich in Christian experience as he was sound in the faith. As a preacher he was popular and successful in all the fields of his labor. In all that goes to make tp excellences in writing and speaking, he was a prince. He was esteemed and honored by all. (W. P. S.)

Thomas, Edward

an Episcopal clergyman, was born in St. Stephen’s Parish, S. C., Sept. 28, 1800, and received his early education at the grammar-school in Pineville. In 1817 he entered the sophomore class in the South Carolina College, Columbia, and graduated in 1819. He lived in Cambridge, Mass., in order to study at Harvard College; and, after a few months, transferred his residence to New Haven, prosecuting his studies at Yale. He entered the Theological Seminary, city of New York, in 1822; returned to his native state in the fall of 1824; and, in February, 1825, was ordained deacon by bishop Bowen, and became a missionary first to Fairfield District, and afterwards to Greenville. In April, 1826, he was admitted to priest’s orders by bishop Bowen, and, after filling out his unexpired term at Greenville,

became rector, February, 1827, of Trinity Church on Edisto Island. In 1834 he resigned his charge on account of ill-health, and went to reside at St. Augustine, Fla., where his health so improved that the rectorship of the Church there was offered to him. He declined, and after a further residence there returned to South Carolina, and in 1836 accepted a call to the parish of St. John's, Berkeley County. In the winter of 1837-38 the disease of which he did (an affection of the bowels) began to show itself, but he continued to labor on until May 24,1840, when he gave up work entirely, dying July 11 of the same year. A volume of *Sermons* was published after his death, under the supervision of his widow. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5,664.

Thomas, Eleazer, D.D.

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

Thomas, Enoch

a Presbyterian minister, was born Dec. 31, 1805, at St. George's, Newcastle Co., Del. He was prepared for college at the Phillips Academy at Andover, Mass., under John Adams, principal, and was graduated from Amherst College in 1833. About this time he united with the Second Presbyterian Church of Wilmington, Del. He then engaged for six months as assistant teacher in a seminary at Newark, Del., after which he entered Princeton Seminary, N. J., and remained there until near the close of 1835, when he left because of feeble health. He was licensed by the Wilmington Presbytery Oct. 14, 1835, after which he began to labor as a missionary in

Rockingham Counnty, Va. He was ordained *sine tutela* by the Lexington, Presbytery at High Bridge Church, Va., June 17,1837.. For about a year he preached at Union, Port Republic, and Shilohi where his labors were blessed and large Congregations attended his ministry. Having accepted a call to Shemariah Church, Augusta Co., Va., he was installed as pastor Dec. 1, 1838. His health having improved, and the community having provided an academy, Mr. Thomas also commenced a classical school, which became in a short time quite flourishing. But the united duties of pastor and teacher were too onerous, and he was, at his own request, released from his former charge, Oct. 12,1843. This was his only pastoral charge. Thenceforth he resided about eighteen years at Beverly, Randolph Co., and labored as a missionary in that and several adjacent counties, ranging over a wide extent of wild and mountainous country, preaching in court-houses, jails, school-houses, barns, and private houses, wherever any would gather to hear the Word of God. There was no minister nearer on the west than Clarksburg, and on the south-west than Parkersburg. Much of the wide region he traversed was a mountain wilderness; often his only road was an obscure path; dangerous rivers were to be forded; and many of the best people were living in log-cabins, often in a single room. But he enjoyed the work, gladly breaking the bread of life to the hungry and the starving. The breaking-out of the Civil War, in 1861, stopped his work, and his mission field became a scene of strife. Having removed his family from Beverly to Craigsville, Augusta Co., he occasionally supplied, during the war, the churches of Windy Cove, Warm Springs, and Lebanon. After 1865 he preached as opportunity; offered. He generally taught school in the winter season. For several of his last years he suffered severely from chronic throat-disease. He died at Craigsville, Jan. 25, 1879. (W. P. S.)

Thomas, John (1), LL.D.

an English prelate, was born at Carlisle, Oct. 14, 1712; was educated at the grammar-school at Carlisle, and Queen’s College, Oxford. . After his graduation he became an assistant at a classical academy, Soho Square, London; then private tutor to the younger son of Sir William Clayton. He was ordained deacon March 27, 1737, and priest Sept. 25. In the same year he was presented by George II to the rectory of Blechingly, and was instituted Jan. 27, 1738. On Jan. 18,1748, he was appointed chaplain in ordinary to the king; April 23, 1754, he was made prebendary of Westminster; and Dec. 12, 1760, was appointed chaplain to George Il. In 1762 he was appointed sub almoner to the archbishop of York; and in

1766 was instituted to the vicarage of St. Bride's, London. He succeeded Dr. Pearce as dean of Westminster, 1768; and in November, 1774, became bishop of Rochester. He died Aug. 22, 1793. A valuable collection of his *Sermons and Charges* was published by Rev. G. A. Thomas (1796, 2 vols. 8vo).

Thomas, John (2)

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

Thomas, Joshua

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

Thomas, Richard H., M.D.

a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Anne-Arundel County, Md., June, 1805. "Having received a liberal education and completed a course of medical studies, he settled in Baltimbre, where he became eminent as a practitioner and teacher of medicine." In the work of the ministry he labored with great diligence. He held many meetings among other denominations, and preached with great acceptability. He was a man of pleasing address; and, possessing great vivacity and extraordinary

talents, he gained ready access to the most cultivated society. He died at his residence, near Baltimore, Jan. 15,1860. See *Annual Monitor*, 1860, p. 128.

Thomas, Robert Jermain, A.B.

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

Thomas, Samuel (1)

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

Thomas, Samuel (2)

an Independent minister, was born in Jorat, Switzerland, in 1801. By his own industry he obtained an education at Lausanne Academy, and was ordained at Grancy in 1825. After four years of usefulness at the latter place, Mr. Thomas was elected president of the Training Institute at Lausanne, a post for which he was eminently fitted, both by his earnest

piety and varied gifts and attainments. In 1836 he was called to the Church of the Oratory at Yverdun, where he spent nineteen years of useful labor, and in 1855 settled at Neufchatel. He died Jan. 12,1867. Mr. Thomas was a man of inflexible principles, yet of most gentle and tender disposition. He took a conspicuous part in the revival movement in Switzerland, and showed himself a wise and experienced counsellor. See (Lond.) *Cong. Year-book,* 1868, p. 297.

Thomas, Samuel (3)

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

Thomas, Thomas

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

Thomas, William (1)

an English prelate, was born at Bristol, Feb. 2, 1613, and received his primary education in the school of Carmarthen, where his grandfather lived. He entered St. John’s College, Oxford, in 1629, and removed, later, to Jesus College, of which he was afterwards chosen a fellow and appointed tutor. His ordination as deacon took place at Christ Church, June 4, 1637, and as priest in the year following. His first preferment was the vicarage of Penbryn, Cardiganshire. He became chaplain to the earl of Northumberland, who presented him to the vicarage of Laugharne, with

the rectory of Llansadwrhen) annexed. In 1644 a party of Parliament horse came into town threatening to kill Mr. Thomas if they found him praying for the queen. They did interfere with, the service, but were so struck with his composure and. patience that they left him without further disturbance. Soon after, the Parliament committee deprived him of his living of Laugharne, from which time till the Restoration he endured great hardships, being obliged to teach a private school for his support. At the Restoration, Mr. Thomas was reinstated in his living, and by the king's letters-patent made chanter of St. David's. In 1661 he was presented to the rectory of Llanbedr in the Valley, Pembroke County, and made chaplain to the duke of York, through whose influence he was promoted to the deanery of Worcester, Nov. 25,1665; and was presented to the rectory of Hampton Lovett in 1670.. Here he removed his family, quitting the living of Laugharne. In 1677 he was promoted to the see of St. David's and held the deanery of Worcester *in commendam.* Having been bishop of St. David's six years, he was translated to the see of Worcester, where he effected several reforms. He died June 25,1688. Bishop Thomas published, *An Apology for the Church of England* (1678-79, *8vo*): —*Assize Sermon* (*1657*): —*The Mammon of Unrighteousness,* a sermon. His *Letter to the Clergy,* and an imperfect work, *Roman Oracles Silenced,* were published after his death. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Thomas, William (2)

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

Thomasin Of Zirklaria (Zerkldre)

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

Thomasius, Gottfried

a German Protestant divine, was born in the year 1802 at Egenhausen, in Franconia. In 1821 he graduated at the gymnasium in Anspach, and prosecuted his theological studies at the universities of Erlangen, Halle, and Berlin. In 1829 he was preacher at the Church of the Holy Ghost in Nuremberg, and in 1830 religious instructor, also, at the gymnasium there. In 1842 he was called to Erlangen as professor of dogmatics and university preacher. For more than thirty years he filled that chair and died as senior of the faculty, Jan. 24, 1875. He published, *Origenes*: *ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des 3ten Jahrh.* (Nuremb. 1837): *De Controverisia*

Hofnannianc Commentatio (Erlangae, *1844*): *—Beitrage zür kirchlichen Christologie* (ibid. *1845*): *—Dogmatis de Obedientia Christi Activa Historia et Progressionis inde a Con.fessione A ugustana ad Formulam usque Concordice* (ibid. *1846*): *—Das Bekenntniss der evalng. —luth. Kirche in der Consequen seines Prinzipes* (Nuremb. 1848): *—Christi Person und Werk*: *Darstellunq der luther. Dogmatik vom Mittelpunkt der Christologie aus* (Erlang. 1853-61, 3 vols.; 2nd ed. 1857): *Das Bekenntniss der luther*; *Kirche von der Versohnung und die Versohnungslehre Dr. Chr. K. v. Hofmanns* (ibid. 1857). He also published several volumes of *Sermons*: a practical *Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Colossians* (Erlang. 1869), etc. See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1337 sq.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon,* s.v.; *Literarischer Handweiserfür das kathol. Deutschland,* 1868, p. 119; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. (B. P.)

Thomassin, Louis de

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

Thomists

a name often given to the followers of Thomas Aquinas, who, besides adopting the Aristotelian philosophy, in opposition to Duns Scotus, who held the Platonic, also taught the doctrines of Augustine on the subject of

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

Thomlinson, Joseph Smith, D.D.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Georgetown, Ky., March 15,1802;'and, after serving a time at the saddler's trade, entered Transylvania University, where he held a high rank as a scholar. When Lafayette visited the institution, Thomlinson was the person chosen to tender him the greetings of his fellow-students. He graduated, in 1825. and became professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in Augusta College. In the same year he was admitted to the traveling connection, and in due time was ordained to the offices of deacon and elder. Having served as professor for some time, he was chosen president of the Augusta College, and held that office till 1849, when the institution was broken

down by a withdrawal of the patronage of the Kentucky Conference, and the repeal of its charter by the legislature of the State. He was subsequently elected to a professorship of the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, 0., but declined to accept it, though he acted as agent for the institution for two years. He accepted an election as professor in the university at Athens, 0., and, having served in this capacity for a year, was chosen president, which latter position he declined on account of ill-health. His mind was so affected by the sudden death of a favorite son that he never fully recovered; and although elected to the presidency of the Springfield High-school and of the State University of Indiana, he declined both. He died at Neville, O., June 4, 1853. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:706.

Thom'oï

(θομοΐ. Vulg. *Coesi*), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 5, 32) of the Heb. name (Ezra 2, 53; <1075>Nehemiah 7:55) TAMAH *SEE TAMAH* or THAMAH *SEE THAMAH* (q.v.).

Thompson, Alexander Scroggs

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

Thompson, Amherst L.

a young Congregational missionary, was born at Peru, Mass., in 1834. Converted at the age of fourteen, he resolved to prepare himself for the

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

Thompson, Anthony, A.B.

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

Thompson, Anthony P.

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

Thompson, Charles

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Salem, N.Y., Nov.26, 1831. He was converted in 1853; educated at Monmouth College and Theological Seminary, Monmouth, Ill.; licensed by Chicago Presbytery April 3, 1863; ordained by Monmouth Presbytery pastor of Olena and Oquaka churches,

Ill., June 17, 1863; and died Dec. 31, 1865. He was a good, man, "walked with God," and preached in demonstration of the spirit, and with power. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 363.

Thompson, Frederick Bordine

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

Thompson, George C.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Nanticoke, Luzerne Co., Pa., Jan. 15,1817. He was converted in December, 1832, educated at

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

Thompson, George Washington, D.D.

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

Thompson, John

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

Thompson, Jonathan

a Wesleyan Methodist preacher, was born at Torhouse, Haltwhistle, Northumberland, England. In his early life he resided for a time in Ayr, Scotland. He was converted under Cownley at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. In 1786 he returned to Ayr, where he officiated as a local preacher. In 1789

he came out to labor in connection with the British Conference, and was sent to the Inverness Circuit. He was soon cut down by a fever in Elgin, Morayshire. He was interred in the same tomb that had received the remains of the holy Joshua Keighley only a year before. Young Thompson was a man of holiness and much prayer. “His great zeal for God, united with the fervor and imprudence of youth, led him to excessive labor in the work of his great Master, which proved the cause of his death.” See *Minutes of Wesleyan Conferences,* 1790; Atmore, *Meth. Memorial, s.v.*

Thompson, Joseph Parrish, D.D., LL.D.

an eminent Congregational divine, was born in Philadelphia, Aug. 7,1819. He graduated at Yale College in 1838. Afterwards he pursued the study of theology at the Andover and New Haven Theological schools. In November, 1840, he was ordained pastor of the Chapel Street Congregational Church in New Haven. While occupying this position, Dr. Thompson assisted in establishing *The New-Englander.* He published also, while at New Haven, a *Memoir of Timothy Dwight.* In 1845 he was called to the pastoral charge of the Broadway Tabernacle Church in New York city, and was installed on the 15th of April of that year. For some years the Tabernacle continued to be a great center of religious interest. The vast edifice was often thronged by a congregation composed of strangers, young men, and those who had no regular place of worship. The Tabernacle Church was the mother of several Congregational churches in New York and Brooklyn. The society determined to sell the Tabernacle in 1855, and the new church was built at the intersection of Broadway, Sixth Ave., and Thirty-fourth Street. This building was completed in 1859, and dedicated April 24 of that year. Under the ministry of Dr. Thompson the society flourished exceedingly. When the church was dedicated there was a debt upon it of 165,000. No pews were sold, as it was resolved that there should be no private ownership in the building. In 1863 the society paid off $25,000 of this indebtedness; the remaining sum of $40,000 was paid in March, 1864. Notwithstanding Dr. Thompson’s immediate pastoral labors, he was always busy with his pen. In 1845 he printed a *Memoir of David Hale* (late editor of the *Journal of Commerce*), *with Selections from his Miscellaneous Writings-a* work which passed through various editions. In 1846 appeared his *Young Men Admonished,* afterwards, in subsequent editions, which were numerous, entitled *Lectures to Young Men… Hints to Employers* appeared in 1847, and another edition in 1851. *Stray Meditations,* was published in 1852; and in 1857 there was a revised

edition, entitled *The Believer's Refuge.* He was one of the first editors of the *Independent,* being associated ill that service with the Rev. Dr. Storrs and the Bev. Dr. Bacon. In 1852 he originated the plan of the Albany Congregational Convention. He also served as a manager of the American Congregational Union and of the American Home Missionary Society. In 1852 he went abroad, visiting Palestine, Egypt, and other Eastern lands. This gave an Oriental cast to his subsequent, studies and writings, and he became well known as art authority in Egyptology. Many of his writings upon this subject appeared in the *North American Review,* the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* the *Journal* of the American Geographical and Statistical Society, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible,* and the revised edition of Kitto's *Cyclop. of Biblical Literature.* He published *Egypt, Past and Present,* in 1856. During the Civil War, Dr. Thompson occupied a warmly patriotic position. He did a great deal for the Christian Commission. Twice he went to the South; he visited the army; and he was a member of the Union League Club. His son was killed in the service of the country. Dr. Thompson published (1863) a souvenir of him entitled *The Sergeant's Memorial, by his Father.* When president Lincoln was assassinated, Dr. Thompson delivered a notable eulogy upon him before the Union League Club. In 1872 Dr. Thompson was compelled by ill health to sever the relation, which he had so long maintained with the society. One night, while working in his study, he imagined that he heard a terrible crash, as if the whole house were falling, and he remembered-nothing more 4til he regained consciousness at three o'clock in the morning. When he resigned his pastoral charge of the Tabernacle Church, it made him a gift of $30,000; and individuals gave him $20,000 more. Having resolved upon going abroad, he took up his residence in Berlin, where he devoted himself to study, especially in Egyptology. During the controversy between Bismarck and the pope, at the request of the Prussian minister, he prepared and published a work on the relations of Church and State in America; and in the Centennial Year he delivered in different cities of Europe several addresses concerning the United States. . His oration occasioned by the death of Mr. Bayard Taylor, the American minister, delivered in Berlin, was a beautiful and much-admired production. He had prepared an address to be delivered before the Evangelical Alliance at Basle, Switzerland, on the subject of the persecutions in. Austria. When Mr. Taylor died, Dr. Thompson was spoken of as his successor. It is known that when the rumor reached his ears, he wrote that he could not accept the position, and considered himself unfitted for it. He spoke excellently both French and German, and he

frequently had occasion to employ his accomplishments as a linguist. in the public addresses which he delivered in Europe. Though always an invalid, Dr. Thompson's last illness was caused by an accident which had happened to him during his visit to London, when, while standing upon the doorstep of a friend's house, he was prostrated by vertigo, severely injuring his head. He died at Berlin, Sept. 20,1879. Among his other productions may be noted *The College as a Religious Institution* (1859) *Love and Penalty* (1860): — *Bryant Grey* (1863): *Christianity and Emancipation* (1863): — *The Holy Comforter* (1866): —Man *in Genesis and Geology* (1869): and *Life of Christ* (1875): —with a great variety of pamphlets and of contributions to periodical literature. He was understood, at his death, to be preparing a work on *The Hebrews in Egypt.* See *N. Y. Tribune,* Sept. 22,1879.

Thompson, Joseph Russell

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

Thompson, Lewis

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

Thompson, Otis

a Congregational minister, was born in 1773, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1798. After his graduation he was a tutor in the

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

Thompson, Robert Gordon

a Presbyterian minister, was born Oct. 22, 1806, in Conemaugh township, Indiana Co., Pa. His education preparatory to the college was received in part from the Rev. Jesse Smith, pastor of the Ebenezer congregation in Indiana County, and in part in the preparatory department of Jefferson. College at Canonsburg, Pa. He uited, on profession of his faith, with the Chartiers Presbyterian Church, Washington Co., in 1827. He was graduated from Jefferson College in September, 1830, and passed from college immediately into Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J., where he. spent two and a half years (1830-33) in study. . He was licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, April 19,1833; and was ordained by the same presbytery, *sine tutela*, in the Great Valley Presbyterian Church, Oct. 7, 1833. Mr. Thompson spent the first two years of his ministry (from June 1, 1833, to June 1,1835) as stated supply at Poundridge, Westchester Co., N. Y., where his labors were accompanied by a blessed revival. Having accepted a call to Yorktown, N. Y., he was installed as pastor of the Church at that place, May 18,1836; and after a most successful pastorate of ten years, having accepted, a call to Tariffville, Conn., was released Feb. 5, 1846, and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Tariffville, March 17, 1846. There he labored with ability and fidelity six and a half years, when, his health becoming impaired, he was released by his presbytery, Sept. 30, 1852, and removed to Wisconsin. His next field was Roscoe, Ill., where he preached as stated supply from Oct. 24, 1852, to Oct. 8, 1854. From 1855 to 1862 he supplied, for longer or shorter periods, as his health permitted, the churches of Rockford, Roscoe, Belvidere, and Willow Creek, Ill.; and Janesville and Brodhead, Wis. From July 1, 1862, he supplied Willow Creek Church for two years, when, having accepted a call from that Church, he was installed as pastor, July 6, 1864; and labored there very usefully until he was released, Nov. 16, 1868. He next preached as stated supply at Brodhead from Dec. 5, 1869, to Oct.

9, 1871. A few weeks after the latter date he removed to Greeley, Colossians, to take charge as pastor of a newly organized Presbyterian Church, but was never installed, although he continued as pastor elect to fill its pulpit until March 1, 1877. From this time he was without any charge, but continued to be, so far as his age and increasing physical infirmities would permit, active in laying the foundation both of the Church and of the State in that new region. He died at Greeley, March 19, 1879. Mr. Thompson's views of truth were clear and strong, and his voice gave no uncertain sound. As a preacher he was solid and able, at the same time earnest and affectionate; as a presbyter he was unsurpassed in Christian uprightness; as the head of a family he tenderly loved, and was beloved. (W. P. S.)

Thompson, Samuel

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

Thompson, Samuel H.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Westmoreland County, Pa., March 16, 1786, and carefully instructed in the principles of the Christian religion according to the views of the Presbyterian Church. In 1804 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church; was received on trial in the Western Conference in 1809; and from that time until 1836, a period of twenty-seven years, his field of labor in successive years embraced large, portions of the states of Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and the whole of the territories of Missouri and Illinois. In all this vast region he first assisted to

plant the principles of the Gospel, and afterwards continued to cultivate them with the most assiduous labor. In 1836, his health failing, he was compelled to take a superannuated relation, and, as such, for the next four years he served the Church in the stations of Alton, Vandalia, Hillsborough, and Belleville. In 1840 he was again returned effective, and appointed to Belleville station, but died March 19 of that year. He was a minister of fine abilities, and everywhere he breathed the peaceful spirit of Christianity around him. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences,* 3, 346.

Thompson, Thomas

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

Thompson, William

an eminent English Wesleyan preacher, was born in the county of Fermanagh, Ireland, in 1733. He was converted young, and in 1757 he commenced his ministry among the Methodists. In 1758 he went to England, and soon learned what kind of a work it was which he had undertaken. On one occasion, when Mr. Thompson was preaching, a mob, instigated by a minister of the Church of England, arose and carried him and the principal Methodists on board a transport which was ready to sail with a war-fleet, England then being engaged in war on the Continent. Through the exertions of lady Huntingdon, however, the government ordered their release. In 1760 Thompson labored in Scotland, but with little success. After 1782 he traveled some of the principal circuits in England. His last was Manchester. He died at Birmingham, May 1, 1799, of a disease the seeds “of which had been sown in 1764 by sleeping in a damp bed, an indiscretion which killed many of the early Methodist preachers. William Thompson was one of the men who piloted the bark of Methodism-through the troublous waters after the death of the great helmsman, Wesley. He was a man of that calmness, sagacity, and statesmanlike cast of mind which were so much needed at that time, and which led to his election as president of the first Conference (1791) after

Wesley's death. He was one of the committee appointed to converse with Kilham. With the endorsement of Benson, Bradburn, Hopper, and others, he sent out the *Halifax Circular,* which marked out a basis for the preservation and government of the infant Church. Mather and Pawson consulted him on the state of the connection. He arbitrated in regard to the settlement of the Bristol disputes in which Benson was embroiled; he approved Mather's *Letter to the Preachers*; and he gave to Methodism its district meetings and *Plan of Pacification.* He was one of the ablest speakers and closest reasoners in the British Conference. "Fewer traces," says Bunting (in his *Life* of his father, Jabez Bunting, ch. vi), "are to be found of him than of any of his eminent contemporaries. My father used to speak of the old man's gravity of speech, spirit, and demeanor, and of the advantages he himself derived from his example and ministry." See Atmore, *Meth. Memorial,* s.v.; *Minutes of Annual Conferences,* 1799; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism,* 3, 25, 33, 140; *Memoir of Entwisle,* ch. 3; Smith, *Hist. of Wesl. Methodism,* vol. 1, 2 (see Index, vol. 3).

Thompson, William J.

a clergyman of the Reformed Church, and a classical teacher of high reputation, was born at Readington, N. J., March 8, 1812. He was the grandson of John Thompson, a Scotch immigrant who was killed by the Indians near Williamsport, Pa. After graduating at Rutgers College in 1834, he taught successfully at Millston, N. J., until 1838, when he began to pursue the usual course of instruction in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. He entered the ministry in 1841, and was settled over the churches of Ponds and Wyckoff, N. J., for three years (1842-45), when he accepted the position of rector of the Grammar-school of Rutgers College. He held this important place eighteen years (1845-63), when he resigned and became principal of the Somerville Classical Institute. He died in 1867. He was a thorough student, scholar, and teacher. His standard of education was high; his drill incessant, exacting, and minute. He was never satisfied until his pupils had been made familiar with their subjects. He was also tutor in the classics in Rutgers College (1838-41), during his seminary course. Hundreds of his students have passed successfully into the learned professions and other honorable callings. A paralysis of the right side, which afflicted him at four years of age, and during his whole life, interfered materially with his pulpit efficiency, but did not affect his voice or mental powers. He was an enthusiastic teacher, sometimes stern and severe in discipline, but always conscientious, capable, and successful in

dealing with intelligent scholars who wished to learn. His mind was clear and logically exact; his knowledge was always at command. His character was distinguished for unyielding uprightness and an honorable spirit; his attainments in the sacred languages and theology were large and accurate. As a preacher, he was plain, without any ornamentation of style or force of delivery, but evangelical in doctrine and practical in his aims. See. Corwin, *Manual of the Ref*: *Ch.* p. 492. (W. J. R. T.)

Thomson, Andrew, D.D.

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

Thomson, Edward, D.D.

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

Thondracians

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

they do from their enemies, are doubtless false, or at least exaggerated. See Neander, *Hist. of the Christ. Church,* 3, 588 sq.

Thor

the god of thunder, in Northern mythology, was, next to Odin, the highest and most feared of the gods. His parents were Odin and Frigga. His wives were the beautiful gold haired Sif, by whom he had two sons, Loride and Mode; and the Jotes maiden Jarnsaxa, a giantess of such beauty that Thor, although a sworn enemy of the Jotes, could not refrain from making her his wife. She bore him his favorite son Magni, who was most like his father in courage and strength. Terrible is the flight of Thor through the heavens, rolling, thundering behind the clouds. Still more terrible is he when he has buckled his girdle Megingjardar about him, which gives him double strength. Thus ready, grasping with his iron gloves the hammer Mjl1nir, he appears as an annihilator among the enemies of the gods. Thor's kingdom is called Thrudvangr; and the palace in his realm, Bilskirnir, is the largest that was ever built, and contains five hundred and forty halls. There is no one so wise as to be able to state all of Thor's deeds, and a day would be too short to mention them all. The most remarkable, however, are the following: In company with his two bucks and the evil Loki, he made a journey. Towards evening they came to a certain man whom they asked for a night's lodging. Here Thor killed his bucks and ordered them to be fried, and then invited his host and family to partake of the repast, warning them, however, not to devour the bones, but to place them on the spread-out hides of the bucks. Before starting farther on his journey the following-morning, Thor bewitched the hides with his mighty hammer, and the bucks immediately came to life, fresh and young, with the exception that one of them limped, because Thialfi, the host's son, had broken the bone of his foot in order to get at the marrow. Now Thor, enraged, threatened to kill the whole family; but he allowed himself to be pacified, when the father offered him both his children, Thialfi and Roskva, as servants, whom Thor carried away on his journey. They lodged in the iron glove of the giant Utgartsloki, who accompanied Thor under the false name of Skirner, and sought to dissuade Thor from journeying towards his (Utgartsloki's) castle. This, however, was useless, and the trifling hindrances with which Utgartsloki sought to obstruct his path-for example, tying together his cloak-sack, in which the provisions were kept-made Thor the more zealous. Thor attempted, at three different times, to break the giant's forehead, but without success. Finally they separated, and Thor continued

his journey with his bucks and servants. About noon he noticed, in a large plain, a castle which was so high that it was impossible for Thor to look over it. The travelers arrived at a garden gate; and as Thor found it locked and was unable to open it, they managed to get through the space between the bars. Inside they found a spacious hall, in which there were seated upon two benches a great number of giants. King Utgartsloki, distinguished by his height and dignity, sat in the center but he did not even seem to notice the strangers, who saluted him. He only remarked, “This small fellow, I think, is Aukathor. Perhaps you are greater than you appear? What skilful things can you perform? In this place no one is permitted to remain who does not distinguish himself in somea art or science.” Loki answered him that he thought himself to be a great eater, and did not believe any one was able to cope with him. “We shall see immediately,” said the king, and ordered one named Logi, who sat upon the bench, to try an eating-match with Loki. Thereupon a large trough filled with meat was placed on the ground. At one end of the trough sat Logi, at the other end Loki; and as the former had eaten nothing fir quite a while, he devoured very much. But although Loki ate all the meat, Logi, besides having eaten his half, devoured the bones also. All were agreed that Loki had failed in the attempt. “What is that young man able to do?” the king inquired further. Thialfi answered he would try a walking-match with whomsoever Utgartsloki desired. The king went: out: and called a young man named Hugi to try a running-match, pointed out *a* track, and fixed the limit. But Hugi was ahead in three successive rounds. The king admitted, however, that of all previous racers, none could have beaten Thialfi. Then the king asked Thor what he was able to do, as he had a great name among the Asas. Thor answered that he would try his skill in drinking. Then the king brought a large horn, and said, “It requires great skill to empty this horn in one drink; some have accomplished it in two, yet none have been so unskillful as not to be able to empty it in three draughts.” Thor put the horn to his lips three times; but when he looked into the horn, he saw that the water had hardly diminished in quantity. Thor gave it up, and said he did not wish to attempt it any longer. Thereupon the king said, “Now it is evident that your power and skill are not so great as we supposed, and you will receive very little praise should you, in other attempts, be again unsuccessful.” Thor answered that he was willing to attempt something else, and it surprised him much that what he had done was looked upon as a small affair. Utgartsloki proposed that he should lift a cat from the ground, a feat which the smallest boy could perform, and the king added

that he should never have proposed this to Thor were he not persuaded that Thor was by no means the mighty king he had been represented. A large gray cat was then brought forth, which Thor held around the body and attempted to lift from the ground. But the more he raised the cat from the ground, the more she would curve her back; and, after having exerted himself as much as possible, he found that only one of the cat's forepaws had been lifted from the ground. "Just as I expected," said the king; "the cat is large, and Thor is much behind those who have tried to lift her before." "If I am small," answered Thor, "I challenge each of you to a prize-fight, because now, as I am angry, I feel my entire strength has returned to me." Upon this, Utgartsloki said, "There is no one here who would not consider it child's play to fight with you; however, call in my old nurse, who has fought with more men before; she will probably be his match." . The king's nurse, Elle, came, and, however much Thor exerted himself, he was not strong enough to move her one inch; and when she applied her strength, Thor fell on his knee, until the king separated them. After very hospitable treatment and a good night's rest, the strangers left the castle, much chagrined. But when they were outside the door, the king said, "Now you are out of the castle, to which, as long as I have strength, you shall never again be admitted, and into which you would not have entered had I known Thor's strength. Know now that all that has occurred was done through witchery. At first I met you in the forest under the name of Skirner; there I fastened your provision-bag with iron cords, so that you were unable to untie them; then. you struck at me thrice with your hammer, and the force with which you struck at me may be seen in the valleys hewn out of the hard rocks which, unseen, I had placed between you and me. When you subsequently came to my castle and made your attempts, I selected a man to eat who certainly could eat more than any other man, because Logi is a consuming fire that devours wood and bones and everything. Thialfi Tah with no one but my thoughts, and it is easy to conceive how these reached the limit before him. But you have accomplished something supernatural, because the horn which you attempted to empty was at one end sunk in the ocean, and you took such immense. draughts of water that the ocean for a great distance became dry, which is now called ebb. The cat which you lifted from the ground was the Midgard's "Serpent, and you were so strong as to lift her so high from the earth that only her head and tail were visible. Finally, the old nurse with whom you wrestled vas Old Age itself, and honor be to that man who flinches from decrepit old age no more than you. Now, farewell. Although

I have numerous stratagems remaining to shield my castle, still I hold it advisable that you and I should meet no more." Thor, very wroth to see himself thus fooled, grasped his hammer to strike, but immediately Utgartsloki and the castle became invisible, and afterwards they saw each other a great distance apart on the great plain. To seek revenge at least upon the Midgard's Serpent, Thor sailed shortly: afterwards upon the ocean with the giant Ymer, and went out so far that the giant became afraid. Then he threw the head of a large ox, attached to a strong rope, into the water, which the Serpent seized upon. When she felt herself wounded, she started back with such force that Thor's hands, holding the line, struck against the ship. He then applied his entire strength, and placed his foot so firmly upon the bottom of the boat that it went through, and he stood upon the bottom of the ocean. The giant was very much frightened when Thor drew up the Serpent by the line, and gazed at her with his fiery eyes, as she aimed a stream of poison at him." Then Thor raised his hammer, but, before he could strike, Ymer had cut the line, and the Serpent fell back into the water. Thor then threw the giant head-foremost into the ocean, so that his feet appeared above the water. He then waded ashore. Another deed was done by Thor under Gejwid and Hrugner. The Wends also worshipped Thor as one of the highest gods. They erected to him numerous monuments, cut from a willow-tree, which was to represent the face of the god without any form. A platform built about the monument was used as an altar to worship upon.

Thorn

is the rendering, in many passages of the A.V., of eleven different Hebrew words and two (accurately only of one) Greek words ; but, as we will see below, there are no less than twenty-two words in the original languages of the Bible variously translated "thorn," "thistle," "brier," etc., and signifying thorny ~and prickly plants. Some of these, however, are probably so interpreted only because they are unknown, and may merely denote insignificant shrubs. We have elsewhere treated most of these in detail, and we therefore briefly recapitulate them below alphabetically, though we can hardly hope to throw much additional light upon what has already baffled so many inquirers. The difficulty of identifying them does not arise from any deficiency of thorny plants to which the Biblical names might be applied, but from the want of good reasons for selecting one plant more than another; for, as Celsius has said, "Fuerunt in Judaea haud pauca loca a spinis diversorum generum denominata, quod. esset htec terra non tantum

lacte et mellefluens, sed herbis quoque inutilibus, et spinis multifariis passim infestata." As examples, we may mention the genera of which some of the species are thorny, such as Acacia, Astragalus, Acanthodium, Alhagi, Fagonia, Tribulus, Berberis, Prunus, Rubus, Cratsegus, Solanum, Carduus, Cnicus, Onopordon, Eryngium, Rhamnus, Zizyphus; and of species which are named from thischaracteristic, Anabasis spinosissima, Paliurus aculeatus, Ruscus aculeatus, Forskalea tenacissima, Aristida pungens, Salsola echinus, Echinops spinosus, Bunias spinosa, Lycium spinosum, Poterium spinosum, Atraphaxis -spinosa, Prenanthes spinosa, Ononis spinosa, Smilax asper, Spartium spinosum, Zizyphus Spina Christi. *SEE BOTANY*.

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

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

Picture for Thorn 1

1. AKANTHA (ἄκανθα.) occurs in <4076>Matthew 7:16; 13:7, 22; 27:27; and also in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke, and as forming the crown of thorns, in <4902>John 19:2, 5. The word is used in as general a sense as "thorn" is with us, and therefore it would be incorrect to confine it to any one species of plant in all the above passages, though, no doubt, some particular thorny plant indigenous in the neighborhood of Jerusalem would be selected for plaiting the crown of thorns. Hasselquist says of the *Nabca Paliurus Athencei of* Alpinus, now *Zizyphus Spina Christi*, "In all probability, this is the tree which afforded the crown of thorns put upon the head of Christ. It is very common in the East. This plant is very fit for the purpose, for it has many small and sharp spines, which are well adapted to give pain: the crown might easily be made of these soft, round, and pliant branches; and what, in my opinion, seems to be the greater proof is that the leaves very much resemble those of ivy, as they are of a very deep glossy green. Perhaps the enemies of Christ would have a plant somewhat resembling that with which emperors and generals were crowned, that there might be a calumny even in the punishment." 'This plant is the *nebk* or *dhom* of the Arabs, which grows abundantly in Syria and Palestine, both in wet and dry places. Dr. Hooker noticed a specimen nearly forty feet high, spreading as widely as a good *Quercots ilex* in England. The *nebk* fringes the banks of the Jordan, and flourishes on the marshy banks of the Lake of Tiberias; it forms either. a shrub or a tree, and, indeed, is quite common all over the country. It grows to the height of six feet or more, and yields a slightly acid fruit, about the size of the sloe, which is eaten by the Egyptians and Arabs. Like its cognate, Paliurus, it abounds in flexible twigs, which are armed with a profusion of sharp, strong prickles, growing in pairs, the one straight, the other somewhat recurved (Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 429). Some, however, have fixed upon *Paliurus aculeatus*, and others upon *Lycium horridumn*, as the plant which furnished the thorny wreath in question. *SEE CROWN OF THORNS*.

Picture for Thorn 2

2. ATID (dfa; Sept. ἡ ῥάμνος; Vulg. *rhamnus*) occurs as a proper name in Genesis 1, 10, 11: "the threshing floor of *Atad.*" *SEE ATAD*. In the fable in <7914>Judges 9:14, 15, the *atdd*, or "bramble," is called to reign over the trees. From <1589>Psalm 58:9 it is evident that the *atfd* was employed for fuel: "Before your pots can feel the *thorns.*" *Atad* is so similar to the Arabic

ausuj that it has generally been considered to mean the same plant, namely, a species of buckthorn. This is confirmed by *atadmi* being one of the synonyms of *rhamnus,* as given in the supplements to Dioscorides. A species of *rhamnus* is described both by Belon and by Rauwolf as being common in Palestine, and by the latter as found especially in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. It has been described by Alpinus as having an abundance of long branches, on which are found many long and very sharp thorns. So Rauwolf, "It puts forth long, slender, crooked switches, on which there are a great many long, strong, and acute thorns." This has been supposed by some to be the above-mentioned true Christ's thorn, *Rhamnus,* now *Zizyphus Spina Christi*; but by others the plant in question is supposed to be *Lycium Europeum, or L. afrumn* (box-thorn), both of which species occur in Palestine (see Strand, *Flor. Palaest.* Nos. 124, 125). Dioscorides (*Comm.* 1, 119) thus speaks of the ῥάμνος : "The rhamnus, which some call *persephonion,* others *leucacantha,* the Romans white-thorn, or *cerbalis,* and the Carthaginians *atadin,* is a shrub which grows around hedges; it has erect branches with sharp spines, like the *oxyacantha* (hawthorn ?), but with small, oblong, thick, soft leaves." Dioscorides mentions three kinds of rhamnus, two of which are identified by Sprengel, in his *Commentary,* with the two species of *Lycium* mentioned above. In his *Hist. Rei Herb.,* however, he refers the ῥάμνος to the *Zizyphus vulgaris.* See *Belon, Observalions de Plus. Sing.* etc., II, 78; Rauwolf, *Travels,* III, 8; Alpinus, *De Plant. Egypt.* p. 21; Celsius, *Hierob.* 1, 199.

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

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

4. BATOS (ἡ Βάτος, "bramble bush," Luke 6:44; elsewhere simply "bush"). See *Seneh,* below.

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

Picture for Thorn 3

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

7. CHEDEK (qdj,ḥ; Sept. ἄκανθα, σὴς ἐκτρώγων; Vulg. *spina, paliurus*) occurs in <20D159>Proverbs 15:19, "The way of the slothful is as a hedge of *chedek* (A.V. thorns)," and in <330704>Micah 7:4, where the A. V. has brier." The Alexand. MS., in the former passage, interprets the meaning thus, "The ways of the slothful are strewed with thorns." Celsius (*Hierob.* 2, 35), referring the Heb. term to the Arabic *chadak,* is of opinion that some spinous species of the *solanum* is intended. The Arabic term clearly denotes some species of this genus, either the *S. melongela,* var. *esculentum, or* the *S. Sodomeum* ("apple of Sodom"). *SEE VINE OF SODOM*. Both these kinds are beset with prickles, and some species *of solanum* grow to a considerable size. They are very common in dry arid situations, *S. sanctum,* the *S. spinosum* of others, is found in Palestine. Dr. Harris is of opinion that *chedek* is the *Colutea spinosav of* Forskal, which is called *heddad* in Arabic, and of which there is an engraving in Russell's *Nat. Hist. of Aleppo,* tab. 5. *SEE BRIER*.

8. CHOACH (jwøj; Sept. ἄκαν, ἄκανθα, ἀκχούχ, κνίδη ; Vulg. *paliurus, lappa, spina, tribulus*), a word of very uncertain meaning which occurs in the sense of some thorny plant, is rendered "thickets" in <091306>1 Samuel 13:6; "brambles" in <233413>Isaiah 34:13; but usually either thistle," as in <121409>2 Kings 14:9; <141518>2 Chronicles 25:18 (in both which passages it is spoken of as growing on Lebanon); <182104>Job 21:40 ("Let thistles grow instead of wheat," which shows that it was some rapidly maturing plant); or "thorns." as in <143311>2 Chronicles 33:11; <184102>Job 41:2 (which shows it had a hard spine); <202609>Proverbs 26:9; Song of Solomon 2, 2; <280906>Hosea 9:6. Celsius (*Hierob.* 1, 477) believes, from the similarity of the Arabic *khosh,* that the blackthorn (*Prunus sylvestris*) is denoted; but this would not suit the passage in Job, as it is a slow-growing tree. Perhaps the term is used in a wide sense to signify any thorny plant of quick growth in some fields and meadows. There are two classes of thorny weeds which choke the corn-fields of Palestine, the thistles and the *centaureas* or knapweeds. These last are chiefly of two kinds, both commonly called star-thistle, namely, the *Centaurea calcitrapa,* which is the most frequent and troublesome intruder in both cultivated and neglected fields in Palestine, and the *C. verutum,* which is even more formidable. *SEE THISTLE*.

Picture for Thorn 4

9. DARDIR (rDirBa) occurs in <010318>Genesis 3:18, "Thorns also and *thistles* shall it bring forth to thee;" and again in <280810>Hosea 10:8, in both of which

passages *dardir* is conjoined with *kots*. The rabbins describe it as a thorny plant which they also call *accobita*. The *akkilb* of the Arabs is a thistle ‘or wild artichoke. The Sept. and Vulg., however, render *dardir* by the word τρίβολος, *tribulus*, a caltrop, in both passages, and this will answer as well as any other thorny or prickly plant. See *Tribolos*, below.

10. KIMOSH (vwmrqæ) or *kimmosh* (v/Mqæ) occurs in <23413>Isaiah 34:13; <280906>Hosea 9:6, in both which passages it is spoken of as occupying deserted and ruined sites, and is translated “nettles.” Another form of the word, *kimashon* (ˆ/vMqæ), occurs in <202431>Proverbs 24:31, where it is used in connection with *charuil* as descriptive of the neglected field of the sluggard, and is translated “thorns.” “All commentators agree that this is the sting-nettle (*urtica*), of which there are several varieties in Palestine. The most common is *Urtica pilulifera*, a tall and vigorous plant, often six feet high, the sting of which is much moresevere and irritating than our common nettle. It particularly affects old ruins, as near Tell Hum, Beisan, and the ruined khan by the bridge over the Jordan; and forms a most annoying obstacle to the explorer who wishes to investigate old remains” (Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 474). The ordinary nettle is a well-known wild plant, the leaves of which are armed with stings, connected with a small bag of poison; and when the leaves are slightly pressed by the hand, the stings penetrate the flesh, force in the poison, and pro duce a swelling with a sharp burning pain. The leaf, when wet or dead, does not possess this power. The presence of nettles betokens a waste and neglected soil. *SEE NETTLE*.

11. KOTS (/wq) occurs in several passages of Scripture (<022206>Exodus 22:6; <070807>Judges 8:7, 16; <102306>2 Samuel 23:6; <19B812>Psalm 118:12: <233213>Isaiah 32:13; 33:12; <240403>Jeremiah 4:3; 12:13; <262824>Ezekiel 28:24; A.V. invariably “thorns”); in two (<010318>Genesis 3:18; <281008>Hosea 10:8) it is mentioned along with *dardir*, where the two words may be considered equivalent, respectively, to the English *thorns* and *thistles*. The Sept. translates it in all the passages by ἄκανθα, *and* it probably was used in a general sense to denote plants which were thorny, useless, and indicative of neglected culture or deserted habitations, growing naturally in desert situations, and useful only for fuel. But if any particular plant be meant, the *Ononis spinosa*, or “rest-harrow,” mentioned by Hasselquist (p. 289), may be selected as fully characteristic: “Spinosissima illa et perniciosa planta, campos integros tegitJEgypti et

Palestinae. Non dubutandum quinl hanc indicaverint in aliquo loco scriptores sacri."

Picture for Thorn 5

12. NAATSUTS (/Wx [n) occurs only in two passages of Isaiah, in both of which it is translated "thorn" in the A.V. Thus (2018Isaiah 7:18, 19), "Jehovah shall hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria; and they shall come, and shall rest all of them in the desolate valleys, and in the holes of the rocks, and upon all the *thorns"* (*naatsutsim*; Sept. ῥαγάς; *Vulg.frutetumn*). By. some this has been translated *crevices*; but that it is a plant of some kind is evident from 55:13: "Instead of the *thorn* (*naatsiuts*; Sept. στοιβή; Vulg. *saliunca*) shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree." Some have understood it generally as thorn, shrub, thorny shrub, small tree, or thicket. Others have attempted to define it specifically, rendering it bramble, white-thorn, etc. (Celsius, *Hierob.* 2, 190); but nothing certain has been determined respecting it. Celsius endeavors to trace it to the same origin as the Arabic *niaaz,* which he states to be the name of a plant of which the bark is employed in tanning leather. The meaning of the term, he continues in Chaldeeis *infigere, defigere*; "to stick into" or "fix," and it is therefore supposed to refer to a prickly or thorny plant, R. ben-Melech says that commentators explain *naatsuts* by the Arabic word *sidr,* which is the name of a well-known thorny bush of Eastern countries, a species of Zizyphus. This, Sprengel says, is the *Z. vulgaris,* found in many parts of Palestine, as well as in many of the uncultivated tracts of other Eastern countries. Others suppose the species to be the *nubakl* of the Arabs, which is the *Zizyphus lotus,* and considered to be the lotus of the ancients. But from the context it would appear that the plant, if a zizyphus, must have been a less highly esteemed variety or species. But ir a wild state these are very abundant, bushy, prickly, and of little value. Belon says, "Les hayes, pour la plus part, sont de tamarisques, oenoplia (i.e. zizyphi species) et rhamnes." In Freytag's *Arabic Lexicon* theabove Arabic word *naaz* is said to be the name of a thorny tree, common in the Hejaz, the bark of which is used in tanning hides, and from whose wood a dentifrice is prepared. This might be a species of acacia, of which many species are well known to be abundant in the dry and barren parts of Syria, Arabia, and Egypt.

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

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

15. SENH -(hns) occurs in the well-known passage of Exodus 3:2, where the angel of the Lord appeared unto Moses in a flaming fire out of the midst of a “bush” (*seneh*), *and* the bush was not consumed. It occurs also in ver. 3 and 4, and in Deuteronomy 33:16, but with reference to the same event. The Sept. translates *senah* by βάτος, which usually signifies the *rubus*, or *bramble*; so in the New Test. βάτος is employed when referring tothe above miracle of the burning bush. *Baroo* is likewise used to denote the *seneh* by Josephus, Philo, Clemens, Eusebius, and others (see Celsius, *Hierob.* 2, 58). The monks of the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai have a species of rubus planted in their garden near their Chapel of the Burning Bush; but this can-not be considered as any proof of its identity with the *seneh* from the little attention which they have usually paid to correctness in such points. Bove says of it, “C’est une espece de Rubus, qui est voisin de notre R. fruticosus.” The species of rubus (our *blackberry*) are not common either in Syria or Arabia. *Rubus snctus*,_ the holy bramble, is found in Palestine, and is mentioned by Dr. Russell as existing in the neighborhood of Aleppo, and Hasselquist found a rubus among the ruins of Scanderetta, and another in the neighborhood of Seide. It is also found among the ruins of Petra (?) (Calcott). Celsius and others quote Hebrew authors as stating that Mount Sinai obtained its name from the abundance of these bushes (*seneh*), “Dictus est mons Sinai de nomine ejus.” But no species of rubus seems to have been discovered in a wild state on this mountain. This was observed by Pococke. He found however, on Mount Horeb several hawthorn bushes, and says that the holy bush was more likely to have been a hawthorn than a bramble, and that this

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

Picture for Thorn 6

16. SHAMIR (רָמִיר) occurs in all the same passages as the next word, *shdyith,* below, with the addition also of Isaiah 32:13: "Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns (*kotsim*) and *briers"* (*shamir*). It is variously rendered by the Sept., χέρσος, χόρτος, δέῤῥις, ἄγρωστις, ξηρά. According to Abu'lfadl, cited by Celsius (*Hierob.* 2, 188), "the *samtr* of the Arabs is a thorny tree; it is a species of *Sidra* which does not produce fruit." No thorny plants are more conspicuous in Palestine. and the Bible lands than different kinds of *Rhamnaceae.* The Arabs have the terms *Salam, Sidra, Dhal, Nabka,* which appear to denote either varieties or different-species of *Paliurus* and *Zizyphus,* or different states, perhaps, of

the same tree; but it is a difficult matter to assign to each its particular signification. Dr. Tristram states that "the Arabs of the Jordan valley confine the name *samur* to the *Paliurus aculatus,* or Christ's Thorn" (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible,* p. 428).

Picture for Thorn 7

17. SHAYITH (tyæ) occurs in several passages of Isaiah (Isaiah 5:6; 7:23, 24, 25; 9:18; 10:17; 27:4), in all of which it is associated with *shamir,* the two being: translated *thorns* and *briers* in the A. V. From the context of all the passages, it is evident that some weed like plants are intended, either of a thorny or prickly nature, or such as spring up in neglected cultures and are signs of desolation, and which are occasionally employed for fuel. Nothing has, however, been ascertained respecting the plant intended by *shayith,* and consequently it has been variously translated in the several versions of the Scriptures. Gesenius thinks it is etymologically connected with the *shittah* tree (i.q. tnv). *SEE SHITTAH.*

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

Picture for Thorn 8

19. SIR (rys) occurs (in the plur.) in several passages, e.g. in Ecclesiastes 12:6, "as the crackling of thorns (*sirim*) under a pot," etc.;

[23414]Isaiah 34:14, “And thorns (*sirim*) shall come up in her palaces,” etc.; [28106]Hosea 11:6; [30402]Amos 4:2; [34010]Nahum 1:10. The Sept. and other translations have employed words signifying thorns as conveying the meaning of *sirim*; but the etymology does not lead us to select one plant more than another.

20. SIRPID (dP;r sa) is mentioned only once as a desert shrub ([23553]Isaiah 55:13), “And instead of the brier (*sirpad*, Sept. κονύζη, Vulg. *urtica*) shall come up the myrtle.” Though this has generally been considered a thorny and prickly plant, it does not follow from the context that such is necessarily meant. It would be sufficient for the sense that some useless or insignificant plant be understood, and there are many such in desert and uncultivated places. In addition to *Paliurus carduus, Urtica, Conyza,* species *of Polygonum, ofEuphorbia,* etc., have been adduced; and also *Ruscus aculeatus,* or butcher’s-broom. The etymology of the word is obscure.

21. TRIBOLOS (τρίβολος), Lat. *tribilus,* is found in [40716]Matthew 7:16, “Do men gather figs of *thistles?”* (τριβόλων);and again in [58808]Hebrews 6:8, ‘“But that which beareth thorns and *briers* (τριβολοι) is rejected.” The name was applied by the Greeks to two or three plants, one of which was, no doubt, aquatic, *Trapa natans.* Of the two kinds of land *tribuli* mentioned by the Greeks (Dioscorides, 4:15; Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant. 6*:7, 5), one is believed by Sprengel, Stackhouse, Royle, and others to refer to the *Tribulus terrestris,* Linn., the other is supposed to be the *Fagonia Cretica*; but see Schneider’s commentary on Theophrastus, *loc. cit.,* and Du Mo. lin (*Flore Poetique Ancienne,* p. 305), who identifies the *tribulus* of Virgil with the *Centaurea calcitraapa.* Linn. (“star-thistle”). Celsius (*Hierob.* 2, 128) argues in favor of the *Faconia Arabica,* of which a figure is given in Shaw, *Travels* (Catal. Plant. No. 229); see also Forskal, *Flor. Arab.* p. 88. Both or nearly allied species are found in dry and barren places in the East; and, as both are prickly and spread over the surface of the ground, they are extremely hurtful to tread upon. The word τρίβολος is further interesting to us as being employed in the Sept. as the translation of *darddr* (above). The presence of species of *tribulus* indicates a dry and barren uncultivated soil, covered with prickly or thorny plants. The *Tribulus terrestris,* however, is-not a spiny or thorny plant, but has spines on the fruit. The Greek word means literally *three-pronged,* and originally denoted the *caltrop,* or military crow-foot, an instrument composed of

three radiating spikes, thrown upon the ground to hinder and annoy cavalry (Veget. 3, 24; Plutarch, *Moral*. 2, 76). *SEE WEED*.

Picture for Thorn 9

22. TSEN (ˆxe) or TSENIN (ˆynæ) occurs (only in the plur.) in several passages of Scripture, as in ⁰⁴⁰³³Numbers 33:55; ⁰⁶²³³Joshua 23:13, where it is mentioned along with *sek* (*sikkim*); also in ¹⁸⁰⁰⁵Job 5:5 and ²⁰²¹⁵Proverbs 22:5. Both are invariably rendered "thorns" in the A. V. The Sept. has τρίβολος in ²⁰²¹⁵Proverbs 22:5, and βολίδες in ⁰⁴⁰³³Numbers 33:55 and ⁰⁶²³³Joshua 23:13.. It has been supposed that *zinnim* might be the *Rhamnus paliurus,* but nothing more precise has been ascertained respecting it than of so many other of these thorny plants; and we may therefore, with Michaelis, say, "Nullum simile nomen habent reliquae linguae Orientales; ergo fas est sapienti, Celsio quoque, fas sit et mihi, aliquid ignorare. Ignorantie professio via ad inveniendum rerum, si quis in Oriente quaesierit." *SEE THORN-HEDGE*.

Thorn In The Flesh

(σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί), an infliction ("a messenger of Satan to buffet me") mentioned by Paul as an offset to his extraordinary revelations (⁴⁷¹²⁷2 Corinthians 12:7). The expression has called forth very many, and some very absurd, conjectures (see the commentators, *ad loc.*), which may be resolved into the following heads, the first two of which are, from the nature of the case, out of the question:

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

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

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

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

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

Thorn, Conference Of

also known as "the *Charitable Conference"* (*Colloquium*(*Charitativum*), was one of those efforts to explain away the differences between the several bodies of Christians, with a view to religious reunion, of which the 17th century furnishes more than one example. It was appointed in the city of Thorn, in October, 1645, by Ladislaus IV, at the suggestion of the Reformed preacher at Dantzic, Bartholomew Nigrinus, who had become a Catholic, and persuaded the king that such a conference would be attended with good results. At this all religious parties were to appear and confer together on religion, and come to an agreement. On the side of the Lutherans, some Saxon divines of Wittenberg, especially, were invited

from Germany; for they were regarded as standing at the head of all the German theologians. The Konigsberg divines were accompanied and assisted by Calixtus of Brunswick, who had been invited by elector Frederick William. His conduct and the question of precedence between the Konigsberg and the Dantzic divines occupied the entire time of the conference, which broke up without any result, Nov. 21, 1645. The official account of the proceedings of the conference are printed in Calovius, *Historia Syncretistica.* See also Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation,* 4, 509; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* 3, 293,359,373, note.

Thorndike, Herbert

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

Thorn-hedge

Picture for Thorn-hedge

(hkwsm], *mesukah*; ;for hkwcm, or perhaps simply from the *interlacing* of the briers; Sept. κανών ; Vulg. *sepes*), a hedge-row of thorny plants (Micah 7:4). The formidable character of-the thorny thickets in Palestine is noted by almost every traveler. Near Jericho Mr. Tristram records as the principal tree “the *Zizyphus spina Christi,* growing twenty,

or thirty feet high, with its sub angular branches studded with long, pointed, and rather reflex thorns a true wait-a-bit tree. No one can approach it with impunity unless clad in leather; and in three days the whole party were in rags from passing through the thickets" (*Land of Israel,* p. 202). In the same way Messrs. M'Cheyne and Bonar mention how Dr. Keith was baffled in his attempt to climb a verdant-looking hill by "strong briers and thorns," through which he found it impossible to force a passage. They add, "Some time after, when sailing up the Bosphorus, conversing with a gentleman whom we had met in Palestine, who appeared to be a man of the world, we asked him if he had climbed Mount Tabor to obtain the delightful view from its summit. His answer was, 'No; why should I climb Mount Tabor to see a country of thorns?'He was thus an unintentional witness of the truth of God's Word" (*Mission of Inquiry,* p. 119). Such predictions as Isaiah 7:23, 24; 32:12-15; Hosea 9:6. acquire additional force from the circumstance that it is so often in the midst of magnificent ruins once pleasant "tabernacles" -or in regions which must formerly have been rich and fruitful fields, that these thorns and briers now maintain their undisputed and truculent empire. Thus, at Beth-nimrah, the traveler says, "The buildings may have been extensive, but-the ruins are now shapeless, and generally choked by the prickly vegetation" (Tristram, *Land of Israel,* p. 522). Again, "We rode up the Ghor, through a maze of *zizyphus* bush, which encumbers a soil of almost incredible richness; watered every mile by some perennial brook, but without trace of inhabitant or cultivation. Now and then we saw a clump of palm-trees, the ruined heap of some old village, or a piece of a broken water-course, to tell us that once the hand of civilization was here. Myriads of turtledoves peopled these thickets. We put them up absolutely by scores from every bush. The nests of the marsh-sparrow bore down the branches by their weight, and the chirping was literally deafening. The bushes and weeds were laden with seeds" (*ibid.* p. 570). In his last words king David compares the sons of Belial to "thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with hands; but the man that shall touch them must be fenced with iron and the staff of a spear" (2 Samuel 23:6, 7). A traveler tells how out of one of these bushes of *nubk* he tried to get a dove, which, when shot, had fallen into it; "but, though I had my gloves on, each attempt made my hand bleed and smart most painfully, as the thorns will not yield in the least. I failed in like manner when I tried to cut a stick" (Gadsby, *Wanderings,* 2, 60). When we remember that a single thorn is sometimes a couple, of inches long, "as sharp as a pin and as hard as a bone," we can

appreciate the force of the allusions in (Numbers 33:55; Proverbs 26:9; Ezekiel 28:24; 2 Corinthians 12:7; and we can understand what a hopeless barrier was a “hedge of thorns” (Proverbs 15:19; Hosea 2:6). The *nubk,* or *zizyphus,* is much used for fuel. Occurring everywhere, it is easily obtained; its slender twigs, intensely dry, flash up at once in a fierce, brilliant flame, and, although very different from the steady glow of *retem* charcoal, “coals of juniper,” a successive supply is sufficient to heat the kettle of the camping traveler. To its rapid ignition the psalmist alludes, “Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall sweep them away as with a whirlwind” (Psalm 58:9); where “the brightness of the flame, the height to which it mounts in an instant, the fury with which it seems to rage on all sides of the vessel, give, force and even sublimity to the image, though taken from one of the commonest occurrences of the lowest life-a cottager’s wife boiling her pot” (Horsley, *ad loc.*). Exploding so quickly, they are as speedily quenched (Psalm 118:12); and there is small result from their noisy reputation (Ecclesiastes 7:6). “Ridicule is a faculty much prized by its possessors yet, intrinsically, it is a small faculty. A scoffing man is in no lofty mood for the time; shows more of the imp than the angel. This, too, when his scoffing is what we call just and has some foundation in truth. While, again, the laughter of fools-that vain sound-said in Scripture to resemble the crackling of thorns under a pot (which they cannot heat, but only soil and begrime), must be regarded in these later times as a very serious addition to the sum of human wretchedness” (Carlyle, *Miscellanies,* 2, 119). Dr. Tristram further remarks, “I have noticed dwarf bushes of the *zizyphus* growing outside the walls of Jerusalem in the Kedron valley; but it is in the low plains that it reaches its full size and changes its name to the *dhom* tree. It is sometimes called the lotus-tree. The thorns are long, sharp, and recurred, and often create a festering wound. The leaves are a very bright green, oval, but not, as has been said, of the shape of the ivy. The boughs are crooked and irregular, the blossom small and white, and the fruit a bright yellow berry, which the tree continues to bear in great profusion from December to June. It is the size of a small gooseberry, of a pleasant, subacid flavor, with a stone like the hawthorn, and, whether fresh or dried, forms an agreeable dish, which we often enjoyed, mixing the berries with *leben,* or sour milk. There is no fence more impervious than that formed of *nubk*; and the Bedawin contrive to form one round their little corn plots with trifling labor. They simply cut down a few branches and lay them in line as soon as the barley is sown. No cattle, goats, or camels will attempt to force it, insignificant as it appears,

not more than a yard high; and the twigs and recurved spines become so interwoven that it is in vain to attempt to pull the branches aside" (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible,* p. 429). *SEE THORN*.

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

Thornton, Thomas C., D.D.

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

Thornton, William Lockwood, A.M.

a Wesleyan minister, was born in Yorkshire, Jan. 27, 1811, and. was a pupil of the venerable James Sigston, Leeds. He was accepted at the Conference in 1830, receiving as his first circuit an appointment to Glasgow, where he remained but a year, and in 1831 was stationed at Hull After a three years residence in that north-eastern seaport, he was removed to the First London Circuit in1834, from thence to the Leeds East Circuit in 1837, and to Bath in 1838. After a three years location at Bath, Mr.

Thornton's itinerant career terminated, and in 1841 he became the resident classical tutor of the first theological institute established in Methodism, which, commencing at Hoxton, was afterwards divided between Richmond and Didsbury; and in 1842 he went to its northern branch, near Manchester. He remained there till 1849, when he was appointed editor of the Wesleyan periodicals. In 1864 Mr. Thornton represented the British Conference at the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; he then proceeded to Canada, and presided over that conference, and also over that in Eastern British America. On his return home, he was elected president of the British Conference, but died very suddenly, in his presidential year, March 5,1865. Mr. Thornton was a man of fine talents and thorough culture. In early life he had given himself to hard and systematic study. As a preacher he was eloquent, his style finished and elegant; as an editor he was industrious and successful.

Thornwell, James Henry, D.D., LL.D.

an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Marlborough, District. S. C., Dec. 9,1812. He received a good common-school training; prepared for college at the Cheraw Academy, S. C.: graduated at South Carolina College in 1831; and subsequently studied at Harvard University and in Europe. After some attention to the law he devoted himself to theology, was licensed by Bethel Presbytery, and in 1834 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Lancaster Court-house, S.C.; and soon after the churches of Waxhaw and Six Mile were added to his charge. This relation existed until 1837 when he was elected to the professorship of logic, belles-lettres, and criticism in the South Carolina College, to which metaphysics was soon added. In these departments he taught with uncommon ability and success. "In America he fully deserves the distinguished title which his admirers have long bestowed upon him of the Logician." In 1840 he resigned his professorship, and was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Columbia, S. C.; in 1841 became professor of sacred literature and evidences of Christianity in South Carolina College; in 1851, pastor of the Glebe Street Church, Charleston, S. C.; in 1852 accepted the presidency of South Carolina College; in 1856 was elected professor of theology in-the Theological Seminary, Columbia, and also pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of that place, in which labors he continued until his death, Aug. 1, 1862. Dr. Thornwell published, *The Arguments of Romanists from the Infallibility of the Church and Testimony of the Fathers on behalf of the Apocrypha, Discussed and*

Refuted, etc. (N. Y. 1845). This is an answer to a series of letters by the Rev. Dr. (afterwards bishop) Lynch on the inspiration of the Apocrypha. "As a refutation, this work of Mr. Thornwell's is complete" (*Bibl. Rep. and Prince. Rev.* April, 1845, p. 268): *Discourses on Truth* (1855, 12mo; 1869, 8vo), delivered in the chapel of the South Carolina College; a work highly commended. He also published single sermons, tracts, essays, etc., and papers in the *Southern Presbyterian Review.* Dr. Thornwell was endowed with genius of an exalted character; a clear, penetrating, logical mind, which was cultivated by profound study, and consecrated to the advancement of learning and religion. "As a pastor, kind, affectionate, and worthy of all reliance; as a pulpit orator, a model of glowing zeal and fervid eloquence; as a teacher, gifted." Rev. H. W. Beecher says concerning him, "By common fame, Dr. Thornwell was the most brilliant minister, in the Old school Presbyterian Church, and the most brilliant debater in its General Assembly. This reputation he early gained and never lost." See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 209; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Duyckinck, *Cyclop. of Amer. Lit.* (1856), 2, 334; La Borde, *Hist. of South Carolina College, 1859* ; *Presb. Mag.* vol. 7. (J.L.S.)

Thorp, Constitutions of

SEE YORK, COUNCIL OF, 1363.

Thorwaldsen, Albert Bertel

the renowned Danish sculptor, was born at Copenhagen, Nov. 19, 1770, and was the son of Gottschalk Thorwaldsen, a native of Iceland. A tradition had long been preserved in his family that "the gods had promised Harold (king Harold Hildetand, who was killed in the battle of Bravalla, in 735) a descendant whose fame should spread from the extremities of the North even to the sunny regions of the South." He assisted his father (a carver in wood) at a very early age, and when eleven years old attended the free school of the Academy of Arts, Copenhagen, receiving when seventeen a silver medal from the academy for a bas-relief of *Cupid Reposing*, and at twenty the small gold medal for a sketch of *Heliodorus Driven from the Temple.* Two years later he drew the grand prize entitling him to the royal pension, but, this being then enjoyed by another, he was obliged to wait three years, during which time he continued his professional pursuits and engaged in general study. Thorwaldsen set out

for Italy May 20, 1796, arrived at Naples in January, 1797, and reached Rome March 8. After struggling against many discouragements, success waited upon him; his fame spread far and wide; and Christian (then crown-prince) of Denmark wrote him a pressing invitation to return to Copenhagen, telling him of the discovery of a white marble quarry in Norway in July, 1819, he started to make his first visit to his native land, and arrived at Copenhagen Oct. 3. He was entertained with public feasts and other expressions of gratitude for about a year, and then returned to Rome. There he remained until 1838, when he decided to return to Copenhagen, and the Danish government sent a frigate to convey him and his works to Denmark. In 1841, finding the climate to disagree with him, he felt compelled to return to Italy, but returned to Denmark in the following year. He died suddenly, March 24, 1844. The favorite style of Thorwaldsen was *basso-rilievo,* in which he was the greatest master of his age. His principal works are, *Christ and the Twelve Apostles* : —*Procession to Golgotha*: —*John the Baptist Preaching in the Wilderness,* in the Church of Notre Dame, Copenhagen: —En*try into Jerusalem*: —*Rebecca at the Well.* See *English Cyclop. of Biog.* s.v.: —Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts,* s.v.

Thoth

Picture for Thoth

The Egyptian deity of written learning, the author of the mystical treatises on medicine and sacred literature, called by the Greeks the Hermetic books, and himself, as the author of them, *Hermes Trismeegistus,* and, in his character of introducer of souls in Hades, *Hermes Psychopompos.* He had many names and occupations, which led to his identification with many of the chief divinities by virtue of a parity of offices. He was called on a statue in the Leyden Museum “He who is the good Savior;” and on some of the funeral papyri he takes the place of Anubis, or even Horus, with respect to the souls of the deceased. In the Hall of the Two Truths it was the duty of Thoth to weigh the souls of the deceased, and to read from his tablets a record of their actions in the past life. Thoth was also the god of all writing, and founder of all the sciences. He brought to the gods a translation of all the sacred books, and he was called the “Scribe of the Gods.” and the “Lord of the Divine Words.” In another form the god Thoth was identified with the moon, when he would be represented with the head of an ibis, surmounted by the horns and lunar disk; but oftentimes

he was figured with a human head, having-that of the ibis as a *coiffure,* and wearing the *Atef* crown. As Thoth Axah, or Thoth the Moon, he was generally entirely naked, and in the figure of an infant with thin bowed thighs, possibly to indicate the moon in its first quarter. At other times he was represented as an adult man, bearded,-and wearing the short loin-cloth, or *shenti,* of the Egyptians; sometimes he carried in his hand the eye of Horus, the symbol of the full moon, the *Cucufa* or *Uas* scepter, and the *crux ansata.* In his latter characteristics Thoth was regarded as one and the same with *Khonsu* of Thebes. The Cynocephalus ape was also sacred to the god Thoth, and hieroglyphically figured for him. It was Thoth who revealed to the initiated certain mysterious words and formulas, thus imparting a knowledge of divine things which was supposed to elevate man to the height of the gods. It was only necessary to pronounce these formulas in the name of the deceased over his mummy, and to place a copy of them by his side in the coffin, to insure for him the benefit of their influence in the dangers which he had to combat in the lower regions. Should any one take possession of the magic-book composed by the god Thoth before he has been initiated supernatural catastrophes will assail him. He was also worshipped by the Phoenicians, Scythians, Germans, Gauls, and other ancient nations. His symbol was the ibis; and his festival was celebrated on the first day of the first moon in the year. —Cooper, *Archaic Dict.* s.v. *SEE EGYPT*.

Thra'cia, or Thrace

(θρᾴκη), occurs in the Bible in one passage of the Apocrypha only (2 Macc. 12:35), where a Thracian horseman (τῶν ἱππέων θρᾳ̂ῶν τις, "a horseman of Thracia") is incidentally mentioned, apparently one of the body-guard of Gorgias, governor of Idumsea under Antiochus Epiphanes (comp. Josephus, *War,* 2, 16,4; Appian, *Syr. 1*; *Civ. 4*:88). . Thrace at this period included the whole of the country within the boundary of the Strymon, the Danube, and the coasts of the AEgean, Propontis, and Euxine (Herod. 4:99; Pliny, 4:18); all the region, in fact, now comprehended in Bulgaria and Rumelia. Under the Romans, Maesia Inferior was separated from it (Ptolemy, 3, 11, 1). In the early times it was inhabited by a number of tribes, each under its own chief, having a name of its own and preserving its own customs, although the same general character of ferocity and addiction to plunder prevailed throughout (Herod. 5, 3). Thucydides (2, 97) describes the limits of the country at the period of the Peloponnesian war, when Sitalces, king of the Odrysse, who inhabited the valley of the

Hebrus (Maritza), had acquired a predominant power in the country, and derived what was for those days a large revenue from it. This revenue, however, seems to have arisen mainly out of his relations with the Greek trading communities established on different points of his seaboard. Some of the clans, even within the limits of his dominion, still retained their independence; but after the establishment of a Macedonian dynasty under Lysimachus, the central authority became more powerful; and the wars on a large scale which followed the death of Alexander furnished employment for the martial tendencies of the Thracians, who found a demand for their services as mercenaries everywhere. Cavalry was the arm which they chiefly furnished (see Homer, *Odyss. 9*:49), the rich pastures of Rumelia abounding in horses. From that region came the greater part of Sitalces's cavalry, amounting to nearly fifty thousand (see Herod. 1, 94; 5, 3 sq.; Tacitus, *Annal. 4*:35; Horace, *Sat.* 1, 6; Pliny, *Hist. Nat. 17*:3, 5, 2; 18:12,1; Justin. 8:3; Mela, 2, 2; Cellarii *Notitia,* 2, 15; Mannert, *Geogr. 7*:1 sq.; Gatterer, in the *Comment. Soc. Götting.* 4 and 5 [Germ. by Schlickhorst, Götting. 1800]; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.*).

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

Thrase'as, or rather Thras'us

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

Three (Thirty, etc.)

(*Shalosh*, v l v ; vwOl v ;etc.) frequently occurs as a cardinal number; thus, µynv ; v l v ; *three* years (<031923>Leviticus 19:23); as an ordinal, v l v ;A t nivBæ; in the *third* year (<121801>2 Kings 18:1); in combination with other numbers, as h r æ][, v l v ; thirteen; and it is also used in the plural as an ordinal for thirty, µyvOlv](<111623>1 Kings 16:23). For other forms and uses of the words, see the Hebrew lexicons.

The nouns v l v ; vy l æ; and: vwOl v ;literally, according to one derivation, a *third man*, are used in the sense of a commander or general, sometimes as connected with war-chariots or cavalry. Thus (<021407>Exodus 14:7), “Pharaoh took all the chariots of Egypt and captains (µvOlæ; *third men*) over all this armament” (wOLK] l [æ)eno, as in our translation, “over every one of them;” Sept. τρι στάτας ἐπὶ πάντων, *tristatce* over all; Vulg. *duces totius exercitus.* So it is said (<021504>Exodus 15:4) that “the choice of all Pharaoh’s captains” (yvæl v]), or third men, were drowned; Sept. ἀναβάτας τριστάτας; *Vulg. principes.* The Septuagint word seems chosen upon the assumed analogy of its etymology to the Hebrew, *quasi* τριτο στάτης, “one who stands third.” According to Origen, *tristates* has this meaning, because there were three persons in each chariot, of whom the first fought, the second protected him with a shield, and the third guided the horses. Wilkinson, however, says, “There were seldom three persons in an Egyptian war-chariot, except in triumphal processions. In the field each one had his own car with a charioteer” (*Ancient Egyptians*, 1, 335). Jerome, *on Ezekiel 23*:says, “*Tristatce*, among the Greeks, is the name of the *second* rank after the royal dignity.” But it is possible that the *ideal* meaning of the verb v l v may be to *rule* or *direct*, as appears from its share in such words as µyv l æ; “excellent things,” or rather “rules and directions” (<202220>Proverbs 22:20), and l vm,” a proverb,” from l vm, “to rule,” hence an *authoritative* precept. According to this sense, our translation renders the word vy l æ;“lord:” “a *lord* on whose hand the king leaned” (<120702>2 Kings 7:2; comp. <120517>2 Kings 5:17,19). If the latter derivation of the Hebrew word be admitted, it will cease to convey any allusion to the number three; of which allusion Gesenius speaks doubtingly of any instance, but which he decidedly pronounces to be unsuitable to the

first passage, where the word evidently stands in connection with war-chariots (see Gesenius, s.v. vylv). *SEE CAPTAIN*.

Three days and three nights. "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The apparent difficulty in these words arises from the fact that our Lord continued in the grave only one day complete, together with a part of the day on which he was buried and of that on which he rose again. The Hebrews had no word expressly answering to the Greek word νυχθήμερον, or natural day of twenty-four hours, an idea which they expressed by the phrases *a night and a day* or a *day and a night.* Thus (<270814>Daniel 8:14), "Unto two thousand and three hundred *evening mornings* (i.e. days, as it is in our translation), then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Thus, also, what is called "forty days and forty nights" in <010712>Genesis 7:12, is simply "forty days" in ver. 17; wherefore, as it is common in general computations to ascribe a whole day to what takes up only a part of it, when this was done in the Jewish language it was necessary to mention both *day and night*; hence a part of three days was called by them three days and three nights. We have another example in <091312>1 Samuel 30:12, where the Egyptian whom David's men found in the field is said to have *eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights.* Nevertheless, in giving an account of himself, the Egyptian told them that his master had left him "because three days ago I fell sick;" in the Hebrew it is I *fell sick this third day,* that is, this is the third day since I fell sick. Indeed, among the Hebrews, things were said to be done *after three days,* which were done on the third day (comp. <140105>2 Chronicles 10:5 with ver. 12; <051428>Deuteronomy 14:28 with 26:2). Agreeably to these forms of speech, the prophecy of our Lord's resurrection from the dead-is sometimes represented as taking place *after three days,* sometimes *on the third day* (see Whitby, Macknight, Wakefield, Clarke, *ad loc.*).

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

Three has also been considered, both by Jews and Christians, as a distinguished or *mystical* number, like "seven," Ainsworth, on <012204>*Genesis 22*:4, has collected many such instances, but they appear to be somewhat fanciful. A ternary or trial arrangement of subjects, however, is very

prevalent in the Bible (see an anonymous monograph on *The Triads of Scripture* [Lynchburg, 1866]). *SEE NUMBER*.

Three Chapters

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

Three Denominations, a name given to the Independents, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians at the time when these three sects represented the great body of English Dissenters. They were the Dissenters recognized by the Act of Toleration (1 William and Mary, c. 18), and had the privilege

granted to them of presenting corporate addresses to the sovereign. — Blunt, *Dict. of Sects,* s.v.

Three Taverns

(Τρεῖς Ταβερναί, Graecized from the Latin *Tres Tabernce*), a station on the Appian Road, along which Paul traveled from Puteoli to Rome (<44815>Acts 28:15). The Roman Christians went, in token of respect, to meet Paul at these places, having been probably apprised of his approach by letters or express from Puteoli (ver. 13-15) one party of them resting at the Three Taverns, and the other going on to Appii Forum. When the apostle saw this unequivocal token of respect and zeal, he took fresh courage. There is no doubt that the Three Taverns was a frequent meeting place of travelers. A good illustration of this kind of intercourse along the Appian Way is supplied by Josephus (*Ant. 17*:12, 1) in his account of the journey of the pretender Herod Alexander. He landed at Puteoli (Dicaearchia) to gain over the Jews that were there; and "when the report went about him that he was coming to Rome, the whole multitude of the Jews that were there went out to meet him, ascribing it to Divine Providence that he had so unexpectedly escaped." *SEE PAUL*.

The word ταβέρνα is plainly the Latin *taberna* in Greek letters, and denotes a house made with boards or planks; quasi *trabena.* Wooden houses, huts, etc., are called *tabernae.* Thus Horace, "Pauperum tabernas regumque turres" (*Carm.* 1, 14,13). Hence the word also means *shops,* as distinguished from dwelling-houses. Horace uses it for a bookseller's shop (*Sat.* 1, 4, 71), and for a wine-shop (*Ep.* 1, 14, 24). The shops at Pompeii are booths, connected in almost every case with dwellings behind, as they were in London three centuries ago. When eatables or drinkables were sold in a Roman shop, it was called *taberna,* tavern, victualling house. Grotius observes that there were many places in the Roman empire at this time which had the names of Forum and Tabernae, the former from having *Markets* of all kinds of commodities, the latter from furnishing wine and eatables. The place or village called "Three Taverns" probably, therefore, derived its name from three large inns, or eating-houses, for the refreshment of travelers passing to and from Rome. Zosimus calls it τρία καπηλεῖα (2, 10). Appii Forum appears to have been such another place. Horace mentions the latter, in describing his journey from Rome to Brundusium, as "differtum nautis, cauponibus atque malignis" stuffed with rank boatmen, and with vintners base (*Sat.* 1, 5, 3). That the Three Taverns

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