

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Threshing- Tongues, Gift of

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

Threshing

(prop. **vWh**; but sometimes **Ëyrah** to tread out, **ἀλοάειν**; and occasionally **f bj**). The Hebrews made use of three different-processes for separating the grain from the stalk (comp. ^{<2387>}Isaiah 28:27 sq.), an operation always carried on in the open air. **SEE STRAW**.

1. In the earliest period, and even later for small quantities, especially in the former part of the harvest season, and for the frailer kinds of grain, the seed was beaten out with sticks (**f bj** ; Sept. **ῥαβδίζειν**). This was a process applied to other agricultural products (Jerome, *ad Isaiah* loc. cit.), as well as to field grain (^{<1061>}Judges 6:11; . Ruth 2, 17; ^{<2387>}Isaiah 28:27; comp. Columel. 2, 21; Strabo, 4:201). It is a method still in use in the East (Robinson, 2, 650; 3, 233). **SEE HARVEST**.

2. Usually, however, horned cattle (Mishna, *Shebiith*, 5, 8, as still in Egypt, Arabia, and Syria), seldom asses or (in modern times) horses (Shaw, p. 124; Buckingham, p. 288), were driven around, usually yoked in pairs or several abreast, and these, by means of their hoofs (^{<3043>}Micah 4:13), cut up and separated the chaff and straw from the grain (^{<2388>}Isaiah 28:28; ^{<4511>}Jeremiah 50:11; ^{<2801>}Hosea 10:11; comp. Varro, *De Re Rust.* 1, 51; Homer, 11. 20:495 sq.; Pliny, 18:72). So also in ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, 2nd ser. 1, 87, 90). **SEE THRESHING-FLOOR**.

3. The most, effectual method of threshing was by means of threshing-machines (**/Wrj igrʻm** [Arab. *noraj*], or simply **/Wrj** ; ^{<2387>}Isaiah 28:27; 41:15; ^{<1842>}Job 41:22; also **qrβi** ^{<1087>}Judges 8:7,16; see Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 244; **τρίβολον**, *tribulum*, Pliny, 18:72; Talm. **l byrf**). These consisted sometimes of a wooden plank (*trahea*, or *traha*) set with sharp stones or iron points, which was dragged over the sheaves (Rashi, on ^{<2415>}Isaiah 41:15; comp. Varro, 1, 52; Columel. 2, 21; Virgil, *Georg.* 1, 164), sometimes of a sort of cart or wheeled sledge (*plostellum Phanicum*; comp. Jerome, *ad* ^{<2251>}Isaiah 25:10, and 28:27). Such a wagon is mentioned in ^{<2387>}Isaiah 28:27 sq. (**hl g[] pwa** and **hl g[] l G l**). **SEE THRESHING-INSTRUMENT**.

Cattle were used for this vehicle, as usually still among the Arabians (Wellsted, 1, 194); and the Mosaic law forbade the yoking-together of various kinds of beasts, as well as the muzzling of the animals

(^{<1624>}Deuteronomy 25:4; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 21; ^{<400>}1 Corinthians 9:9; Talmud, *Kelim*, 16:7; comp. Elian, *Anim.* 4:25), a usage prevalent among the ancient Egyptians and other nations (Bochart, *Hiero.* 1, 401; comp. Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, 3, 130). **SEE MUZZLE.**

Threshing is frequently employed by the Hebrew poets as a figure of the divine or providential chastisements, especially national invasion (^{<23415>}Isaiah 41:15; Jeremiah 51: 33; ^{<3043>}Micah 4:13; ^{<3182>}Habakkuk 3:12). In one passage (^{<2210>}Isaiah 21:10), the bruised grain is made an image of the captive Jews. See generally Schöttgen, *Triturce et Fullonice Antiquitates* (Tr. ad Rh. 1727; Lips. 1763); Paulsen, *Ackersbau*, p. 110 sq. **SEE AGRICULTURE.**

Threshing-floor

Picture for Threshing-floor

(^{<1606>}ῥῆγoren, ἄλων; Chald. ^{<1606>}rDaaiddr, ^{<2125>}Daniel 2:35), a level and hard-beaten plot in the open air (^{<1067>}Judges 6:37; ^{<1066>}2 Samuel 6:6), on which the sheaves of grain (^{<3042>}Micah 4:12) were threshed (^{<2210>}Isaiah 21:10; ^{<2513>}Jeremiah 51:33;.: Matthew 3, 12; the Mishna remarks that the threshers wore gloves, *Kelim*, 16:6), so that the wind had free play (^{<3138>}Hosea 13:3; ^{<3044>}Jeremiah 4:41; comp. Varro, *De Re Rust.* 1, 51,1, “Aream esse oportet in agro sublimiore loco, quam perflare possit ventus”). The top of a rock is a favorite spot for this purpose. The sheaves were carried straight from the field either in carts, or, as more commonly happens in the present day, on the backs of camels and asses, to the threshing-floor. On this open space the sheaves were spread out, and sometimes beaten with flails—a method practiced especially with the lighter kinds of grain, such as fitches or cumin (^{<2327>}Isaiah 28:27) but more generally by means of oxen. For this purpose the oxen were yoked side by side, and driven round over the corn, by a man who superintended the operation, so as to subject the entire mass to a sufficient pressure; or the oxen were yoked to a sort of machine (what the Latins called *tribulunm* or *trahea*) which consisted of a board or block of wood, with bits of stone or pieces of iron fastened into the lower surface to make it rough, and rendered heavy by some weight, such as the person of the driver, placed on it; this was dragged over the corn, and hastened the operation (ver. 27; 41, 15). The same practices are still followed, only mules and horses are occasionally employed instead of oxen, but very rarely. Dr. Robinson describes the operation as he witnessed it near

Jericho: "Here there were no less than five floors, all trodden by oxen, cows, and younger cattle, arranged in each case five abreast, and driven round in a circle, or rather in all directions, over the floor. The sled, or sledge, is not here in use, though we afterwards met with it in the north of Palestine. By this process the straw is broken up and becomes chaff. It is occasionally turned with a large wooden fork having two prongs; and, when sufficiently trodden, is thrown up with the same fork against the wind, in order to separate the grain, which is then gathered up and winnowed. The whole process," he adds, "is exceedingly wasteful, from the transportation of the corn on the backs of animals to the treading-out upon the bare ground" (*Researches*, 2, 277). During this operation the Mohammedans, it seems, generally observe the ancient precept of not muzzling the oxen while treading out the corn; but the Greek Christians as commonly keep them tightly muzzled. *SEE THRESHING*.

As in the East there is no rain during the harvest season (Hesiod, *Opp.* 558), the threshing-floors were in the open field, and were carefully selected and managed (Virgil, *Georg.* 1, 178 sq.; Pallad. 7:1; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 12:32; 15:8; 17:14; 18:71, etc.). The farmers remained on the corn-floor all night in order to guard the product (Ruth 3, 4, 6, 14). The threshing-place was of considerable value, and is often named in connection with the wine-press (^{<1613>}Deuteronomy 16:13; ^{<1167>}2 Kings 6:27; ^{<3912>}Hosea 9:2; Joel 2, 24), since wheat and wine and oil were the more important products of the land (Mishima, *Baba Bathra*, 2, 8). They often bore particular names, as that of Nachon (^{<1016>}2 Samuel 6:6) or Chidon (^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 13:9), of Atad (Genesis 1, 10), of Ornan, or Araunab (^{<1248>}2 Samuel 24:18, 20; ^{<1215>}1 Chronicles 21:15; Josephus, *Ant.* 7:13, 4). See Thomson, *Hand Book*, 2, 314; Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 160; Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, p. 79; Conder, *Tent-Work in Palestine*, 2, 259. *SEE AGRICULTURE*.

Threshing-instrument

Picture for Threshing-instrument 1

was a *sledge* for driving over the sheaves and separating the grain. These sledges, called among the Hebrews by the general term **ynær Bî** *badrkanim*, rendered "briers" in ^{<1017>}Judges 8:7, 16, were of two kinds, corresponding respectively with two words, the first of which alone is rendered as above in the, A.V. *SEE THRESHING*.

Picture for Threshing-instrument 2

1. *Morag* (gr̄m, so called from *trituration*; ^{<1022>}2 Samuel 24:22; ^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 21:23; ^{<2415>}Isaiah 41:15; by ellipsis *charults, pointed*. ^{<1842>}Job 41:22; ^{<1982>}Psalms 28:27; Amos 1, 3) was a threshing instrument still in use in the north of Palestine. Prof. Robinson, who frequently saw this rustic threshing-sledge, says, "It consists chiefly of two planks fastened together side by side, and bent upwards in front; precisely like the common stone-sledge of New England. Many holes are bored in the bottom underneath, and into these are fixed sharp fragments of hard stone. The machine is dragged by oxen as they are driven round upon the grain; sometimes a man or a boy sits upon it. The effect of it is to cut up the straw quite fine" (*Researches*, 2, 306).

2. *Agalah* (hl g[] rendered "cart" or "wagon") was a threshing-sledge with wheels or rollers of wood, iron, or stone, made rough and joined together in the form of a sledge (^{<2327>}Isaiah 28:27, 28). Mr. Lane found it still in use in Egypt, perhaps somewhat improved. He says,

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

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

1. *Saph* (āsī; so called perhaps from the *attrition* there, ^{<0797>}Judges 19:27; ^{<1147>}1 Kings 14:17; ^{<2505>}Ezekiel 40:6, 7; 43:8; ^{<3124>}Zephaniah 2:14; elsewhere door" or "door-post"), *the-sill*, or bottom, of a door-way. See GATE.

2. *Miphtan* (ṭpīnās; so called apparently from its *firmness* or *stretch*), obviously to be interpreted of the *sill*, or bottom beam, of a door (^{<0874>}1 Samuel 5:4, 5; ^{<3109>}Zephaniah 1:9; ^{<2571>}Ezekiel 47:1); but perhaps meaning sometimes, as the Targum explains it, a projecting beam, or corbel, at a higher point than the threshold properly so called (^{<2495>}Ezekiel 9:3; 10:4, 18). See DOOR.

3. *Asoph* (*āsa*; only in the plur. *Asuppim*, אַשׁוּפִּים) *collections*; Sept. σινναγαγεῖν; Vulg. *vestibula*; ^{<4625>}Nehemiah 12:25), a storehouse or depository (“*Asuppim*,” ^{<1367>}1 Chronicles 26:17), especially as connected with the western gates of the Temple, hence called *beth-Asuppim* (ver. 15). *SEE ASUPPIM*.

Throne

Picture for Throne 1

(*aSkakisse*; θρόνος, a *seat*, as often rendered; twice *hSkakisseh*, ^{<1109>}1 Kings 10:19; ^{<1319>}Job 26:9; Chald. *asek*; *horse*, ^{<2761>}Daniel 5:20; 7:9, so called as being *covered*, i.e. either the seat itself or with a canopy) applies to any elevated seat occupied by a person in authority, whether a high-priest (^{<9009>}1 Samuel 1:9), a judge (^{<3025>}Psalms 122:5), or a military chief (^{<2415>}Jeremiah 1:15). In ^{<4607>}Nehemiah 3:7 the term is applied to the official residence of the governor, which appears to have been either on or near to the city wall. In the holy of holies, between the cherubim, was the throne of Jehovah, the invisible king of the Hebrews (^{<1052>}Exodus 25:22). *SEE PAVILION*.

The use of a chair in a country where the usual postures were squatting and reclining was at all times regarded as a symbol of dignity (^{<1240>}2 Kings 4:10; ^{<1094>}Proverbs 9:14). In order to specify a throne in our sense of the term, it was necessary to add to *kiss* the notion of royalty; hence the frequent occurrence of such expressions as “the throne of the kingdom” (^{<6778>}Deuteronomy 17:18; 1 Kings 1, 46; ^{<4078>}2 Chronicles 7:18). The characteristic feature in the royal throne was its elevation: Solomon’s throne was approached by six steps (^{<1109>}1 Kings 10:19; ^{<4098>}2 Chronicles 9:18); and Jehovah’s throne is described as “high and lifted up” (^{<2301>}Isaiah 6:1; comp. Hom. *Odys.* 1, 130; 4:136; Curtius, 5, 2, 13). The materials and workmanship were costly: that of Solomon is described as a “throne of ivory” (i.e. inlaid with ivory), and overlaid with pure gold in all parts except where the ivory was apparent. It was furnished with arms or “stays,” after the manner of an Assyrian chair of state (see Rawlinson, *Herod.* 4:15). The steps were also lined with pairs of lions, the number of them being perhaps designed to correspond with that of the tribes of Israel. As to the form of the chair, we are only informed in ^{<1109>}1 Kings 10:19 that “the top was round behind” (apparently meaning either that the back was rounded off at the top or that there was a circular canopy over it). In lieu

of this particular, we are told in ^{<408>}2 Chronicles 9:18 that “there was a footstool of gold fastened to the throne.” but the verbal agreement of the descriptions in other respects leads to the presumption that this variation arises out of a corrupted text (Thenius, *Comm. on 1 Kings*, loc. cit.) a presumption which is favored by the fact that the terms **vbK**, and the Hop-hal-form **pyzpaam**; occur nowhere-else. — The king sat on his throne on state occasions, as when granting audiences (1 Kings 2, 19; 22:10; Esther 5, 1), receiving homage (2 Kings, 11:19), or administering justice (^{<308>}Proverbs 20:8). At such times he appeared in his royal robes (^{<120>}1 Kings 22:10; ^{<306>}Jonah 3:6; ^{<421>}Acts 12:21). Archelaus addressed the multitude from “an elevated seat and a throne of gold” (Josephus, *War*, 2, 1, 1). A throne was generally placed upon a dais or platform, and under a canopy; and in the sublime description of the King of kings (Revelation 4), this latter is compared to the emerald hue of the rainbow. In Rev. 4:4; 11:16 the elders who represent the Church as reigning with Christ are seated on thrones placed around his; and in 2, 13 Satan is represented as imitating the royal seat of Christ. For modern Oriental thrones, see Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, p. 643.

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

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

Picture for Throne 2

The throne was the symbol of supreme power and dignity (^{<044>}Genesis 41:40), and hence was attributed to Jehovah both in respect to his heavenly abode (^{<910>}Psalms 11:4; 103:19; ^{<361>}Isaiah 66:1; ^{<474>}Acts 7:49;

^{<604E>}Revelation 4:2) and to his earthly abode at Jerusalem (or 3:17), and more particularly in the Temple (17:12; ^{<260D>}Ezekiel 43:7). Similarly, “to sit upon the throne” implied the exercise of regal power (^{<617B>}Deuteronomy 17:18; ^{<1161>}1 Kings 16:11; ^{<121R>}2 Kings 10:30; Esther 1, 2), and “to sit upon the throne of another person” succession to the royal dignity (1 Kings 1, 13). The term “throne” is sometimes equivalent to “kingdom” (^{<400B>}2 Chronicles 9:8; ^{<442B>}Acts 2:30; ^{<500B>}Hebrews 1:8). So, also, “thrones” designates earthly potentates and celestial beings, archangels (^{<5016>}Colossians 1:16). *SEE SEAT.*

Throne, Episcopal,

Picture for Throne

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

Thrupp, Frances Joseph

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

Thrym

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

Thugs

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

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

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

sobriety; and was submitted to special purifications each time after it had been used in the preparation of a grave.

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

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

Thumbstall

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

Thum'mim

SEE URIM AND THUMMIM.

Thunder

(prop. $\mu[\ddot{r}i]$ *rdam*, $\beta\rho\nu\nu\acute{\tau}\eta$; occasionally [^{<01928>}Exodus 9:28, 29, 33, 34; 19:16; 20:18; ^{<0070>}1 Samuel 7:10; 12:17, 18; ^{<1836>}Job 28:26; 38:25] | $\omega\acute{q}$, *kôl*, *voice*, as an elliptical expression for *Jehovah's voice* [^{<12918>}Psalms 29:3 sq., etc.]; so also in the plur. $\mu\upsilon\lambda$ $\omega\acute{q}$, *thunders*, [^{<01923>}Exodus 9:23, etc.]; which is likewise elliptical for the full *voices of God* [9, 28]; once [^{<1899>}Job 39:19 (23)] erroneously in the A. V. for $hm[\ddot{r}i]$ *raamâh*, a *shuddering*, i.e. probably the *mane* of a horse as bristling and streaming in the wind). This sublimest of all the extraordinary phenomena of nature is *poetically* represented as the voice of God, which the waters obeyed at the Creation (^{<19447>}Psalms 104:7; comp. ^{<0009>}Genesis 1:9). For other instances see [^{<18704>}Job 37:4, 5; 40:9; ^{<01813>}Psalms 18:13; and especially ch. 29 which contains a magnificent description of a thunder-storm. Agreeably to the popular speech of ancient nations, the poet ascribes the effects of lightning to the thunder, “The voice of the Lord breaketh the cedars” (ver. 5; comp. 1 Samuel 2, 19). In [^{<24013>}Jeremiah 10:13 the production of rain by lightning is referred to: “When he uttereth his voice, there is a multitude of waters in the heavens, he maketh lightnings with (or for) rain.” SEE RAIN. Thunder is also introduced into the poetical allusion to the passage of the Red Sea in [^{<19501>}Psalms 67:18. The plague of hail on the land of Egypt is very naturally represented as accompanied with “mighty thunderings,” which would be *literally* incidental to the immense agency of the electric fluid on that occasion (^{<01922>}Exodus 9:22-29, 33, 34). It accompanied the lightnings at the giving of the law (^{<02916>}Exodus 19:16; 20:18). See also [^{<18807>}Psalms 81:7, which probably refers to the same occasion, “I answered thee in the secret place

of thunder,” literally, “in the covering of thunder,” $\mu[r\ rtsb]$, i.e. the thunder-clouds. It was also one of the grandeurs attending the divine interposition described in ^{<1024>}2 Samuel 22:14; comp. ^{<983>}Psalm 18:13. The enemies of Jehovah are threatened with destruction by thunder; perhaps, however, lightning is included in the mention of the more impressive phenomenon (1 Samuel 2, 10). Such means are represented as used in the destruction of Sennacherib’s army (^{<2915>}Isaiah 29:5-7; comp. 30:30-33). Bishop Lowth would understand the description as metaphorical, and intended, under a variety of expressive and sublime images, to illustrate the greatness, the suddenness, the horror of the event, rather than the manner by which it was effected (new transl., and notes *ad loc.*). Violent thunder was employed by Jehovah as a means of intimidating the Philistines in their attack upon the Israelites, while Samuel was offering the burnt-offering (^{<970>}1 Samuel 7:10; Ecclus. 46:17). Homer represents Jupiter as interposing in a battle with thunder and lightning (*Iliad*, 8:75, etc.; 17:594; see also Spence, *Polymetis, Dial.* 13:211). The term thunder was transferred to the war-shout of a military leader (^{<825>}Job 39:25), and hence Jehovah is described as “causing his voice to be heard” in the battle (Isaiah 30,30). Thunder was miraculously sent at the request of Samuel (^{<927>}1 Samuel 12:17,18). It is referred to as a natural phenomenon subject to laws originally appointed by the Creator (^{<836>}Job 28:26; 38:25; Ecclus. 43:17); and is introduced in *visions* (^{<645>}Revelation 4:5; 6:1; 8:5; 11:19; 14:2; 16:18; 19:6; Esther [Apoc.] 11:5). So in ^{<618>}Revelation 10:3,4, “seven thunders.” *SEE SEVEN*. It is adopted as a *comparison*. Thus” as lightning is seen before the thunder is heard, so modesty in a person before he speaks recommends him to the favor of the auditors” (Ecclus. 32:10; Rev. 19:6,etc.). The sudden ruin of the unjust man is compared to the transitory noise of thunder (Ecclus. 40:13); but see Arnald, *ad loc.* One of the sublimest *metaphors* in the Scriptures occurs in ^{<834>}Job 26:14,” Lo, these are parts of his ways; but how little a portion is heard of him [/ $m\zeta$, a mere whisper]; but the *thunder* of his power, who can understand?” Here the whisper and the thunder are admirably opposed to each other. If the former be so wonderful and overwhelming, how immeasurably more so the latter? In the sublime description of the war-horse (Job 39), he is said to perceive the battle afar off “by the thunder of the captains, and the shouting” (ver. 25). That part of the description, however (ver. 19), “hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?” appears to be a mistranslation. To the class of mistranslations must be referred every instance of the word “thunderbolts”

in our version, a word which corresponds to no reality in nature. *SEE THUNDERBOLT.*

It is related (^{<4128>}John 12:28) that Jesus said, "Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." Some of the people that stood by, but had not heard the words distinctly, said it had "thundered," for the voice came from heaven; others who had caught the words supposed that God had spoken to Jesus by an angel, conformably to the Jewish opinion that God had never spoken but by the ministry of angels. Perhaps, however, thunder attended the voice, either a little before or after; comp. ^{<4296>}Exodus 19:16, 19; ^{<4645>}Revelation 4:5; 6:1. *SEE BATH-KOL.*

Thunder enters into the appellative or surname given by our Lord to James and John-Boanerges, ὄ ἔστιν, υἱοὶ βροντῆς, says Mark, "sons of thunder" (3, 17). Schleusner here understands the thunder of eloquence as in Aristoph. (*Achar.* 530). Virgil applies a like figure to the two Scipios, "Duo fulmina belli" (En. 6:842). Others understand the allusion to be to the energy and courage, etc., of the two apostles (Lardner, *Hist. of the Apostles and Evangelists*, 9:1; Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s.v. Βροντή). Theophylact says they were so called because they were great preachers and divines, ὡς μεγαλοκήρυκας καὶ θεολογικοτάτους. Others suppose the allusion to be to the proposal of these apostles to call fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritans (^{<4485>}Luke 9:53, 54). It is not certain *when* our Lord so surnamed them. *SEE BOANERGES.*

In a physical point of view, the most noticeable feature in connection with thunder is the extreme rarity of its occurrence during the summer months in Palestine and the adjacent countries. From the middle of April to the middle of September it is hardly ever heard. Robinson, indeed, mentions an instance of thunder in the early part of May (*Researches*, 1, 430), and Russell in July (*Aleppo*, 2, 289); but in each case it is stated to be a most unusual event. Hence it was selected by Samuel as a striking expression of the Divine displeasure towards the Israelites: "Is it not wheat harvest to-day? I will call upon the Lord, and he shall send thunder and rain" (^{<4927>}1 Samuel 12:17). Rain in harvest was deemed as extraordinary as snow in summer (^{<4304>}Proverbs 26:1), and Jerome asserts that he had never witnessed it in the latter part of June, or in July (*Comment. on* ^{<4047>}Amos 4:7); the same observations apply equally to thunder, which is rarely unaccompanied with rain (Russell, 1, 72; 2, 285). Lieutenant Lynch, in the

month of May, witnessed a thunder storm in the mountains of Moab, near the Dead Sea. He, says, “Before we had half ascended the pass, however, there came a shout of thunder from the dense cloud which had gathered at the summit of the gorge, followed by a rain, compared to which the gentle showers. of our more favored clime are as dew-drops to the overflowing cistern. The black and threatening cloud soon enveloped the mountain-tops, the lightning playing across it in incessant flashes, while the loud thunder reverberated from side to side of the appalling chasm. Between the peals we soon heard a roaring: and continuous sound. It was the torrent from the rain-cloud, sweeping in a long line of foam down the steep declivity, bearing along huge fragments of rock, which, striking against each other, sounded like mimic thunder” (*Expedition*, p. 353). *SEE LIGHTNING*.

Thunderbolt

(*ἄντρ*, *risheph*, a *flame*, or “coal,” ^{<21816>}Song of Solomon 8:6; hence *lightning*; fig. for *arrow*, ^{<19718>}Psalm 76:3; *or, fever*, ^{<1524>}Deuteronomy 32:24). In accordance with the popular notion, “hot thunderbolts” (^{<19818>}Psalm 68:48, *γρῆρ*, Sept. τῶ πυρί, Vulg. *igni*) means “lightnings.” “Then shall the right-aiming thunderbolts go abroad” “(Wisd. 5, 21), βολίδες ἀστραπῶν, “flashes” or “strokes of lightning.” “Threw stones like thunderbolts” (2: Macc. 1, 16), *συνεκεραύνωσαν*. The word conveys an allusion to the mode in which lightning strikes the earth. *SEE LIGHTNING*.

Thundering Legion

SEE LEGION, THUNDERING.

Thurarii

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

Thurible,

Picture for Thurible

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

Thurifer

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

Thurificati, or Thurificatores

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

Thuringia, Council of

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

Thuroferary

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

Thursday

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

Thursday Of The Great Canon,

an Eastern phrase for the Thursday after Trinity Sunday.

Thurston, David, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born in Georgetown, Mass., Feb. 6, 1779. He was the uncle of the Rev. R. B. Thurston and half-brother of the Rev. Stephen Thurston, D.D. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1804, and was ordained at Winthrop, Me., in 1807, where he remained pastor until 1851, with no intermission except the year in which he was agent for the American Antislavery Society (1837), and the four months in 1850 when he attended the Peace Congress in Frankfort, Germany. During the remainder of his life he labored four years each at Vassalborough, Searsport, and Litchfield, Me. He died at the latter place, May 7, 1865. Dr. Thurston was a man of eminent piety, an earnest speaker, and no mean theologian. In 1819 he declined a professorship in Bangor Theological Seminary, and in 1853 wished to decline the degree of D.D. from Dartmouth College. He published twenty-two sermons, some in pamphlet

form and some in periodicals: —*Growth in Grace: —History of Winthrop* (247 pp.): —*Letters of a Father to a Son*: —and newspaper articles without number. See *Cong. Quarterly*, 1867, p. 313-328.

Thyati'ra

Picture for Thyatira 1

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

During the continuance of the Attalic dynasty, Thyatira scarcely appears in history; and of the various inscriptions which have been found on the site, not one unequivocally belongs to earlier times than those of the Roman empire. The prosperity of the city seems to have received a new impulse under Vespasian, whose acquaintance with the East, previously to mounting the imperial throne, may have directed his attention to the development of the resources of the Asiatic cities. A bilingual inscription, in Greek and Latin, belonging to the latter part of his reign, shows him to

have restored the roads in the domain of Thyatira. From others, between this time and that of Caracalla, there is evidence of the existence of many corporate guilds in the city. Bakers, potters, tanners, weavers, robe makers, and dyers (οἱ βαφεῖς) are specially mentioned. Of these last there is a notice in no less than three inscriptions, so that dyeing apparently formed an important part of the industrial activity of Thyatira, as it did of that of Colosse and Laodicea. With this guild there can be no doubt that Lydia, the seller of purple stuffs (πορφυρόπωλις), from whom Paul met with so favorable a reception at Philippi (~~4164~~ Acts 16:14), was connected. The country around this city is fertile and well watered, abounding in oaks and acacias, and in its numberless streamlets are found the leeches used in medicine throughout Austria and the east of Europe in general. The mode of taking them is curious; a number of children are sent to walk barefooted among the brooks, and come back to their employers with their feet covered with leeches. The waters here are said to be so well adapted for dyeing that in no place can the scarlet cloth out of which fezzes are made be so brilliantly or so permanently dyed as here. The place still maintains its reputation for this manufacture, and large quantities of scarlet cloth are sent weekly to Smyrna.

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

Thyatira was never a place of paramount political importance, and hence her history is less interesting to the classical student than those of Ephesus, Sardis, and Pergamos, which were the capitals of great kingdoms. Her

chief hold on our consideration is that at Thyatira was seated one of those churches to which the Spirit sent prophetic messages by the beloved apostle. The message itself is one of peculiar interest, but presenting at the same time a remarkable difficulty. After much commendation on the virtues and progress of the Church or the elder, pastor, bishop, or angel-the epistle continues, "Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman (or as the correct text has it, thy wife) Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols" (~~(v.2)~~ Revelation 2:20). This is followed by threats of judgment upon herself, her lovers, and her children. The question naturally arises, What party is represented by this Jezebel? To understand this message rightly, it will have to be borne in mind that Thyatira was very near Pergamos and that the latter was by far the more important city, and probably possessed the more numerous Church; the influence and example of Pergamos would be likely to have a great influence on the smaller city and Church.. *SEE PERGAMOS*. Now, at Pergamos, the Balaamites, who taught precisely the doctrine here attributed to Jezebel, were numerous, as well as the Nicolaitans (q.v.); We are not, therefore, at all to be surprised at finding a party espousing and endeavoring to propagate similar sentiments in Thyatira; but it would be a miserable literalism, and contrary to the whole genius of the Apocalyptic imagery, to suppose the leader of this heretical sect to be a woman of the name of Jezebel. We can only understand by this a person holding substantially the same relation to the official head of the Church in Thyatira which Jezebel of old did to the king of Israel; that is, a party that ought to have been in subjection usurping it, for wicked purposes, over the proper ruler. For this the leader is severely rebuked, and the heaviest judgments threatened both against him and the usurping party unless they repent. There was still, however, a faithful portion who stood aloof from the licentious teaching which was propagated. To them the Lord turns with words of encouragement, and exhorts them to hold fast what they had received. There is a small error also in the text at the commencement of this address. It should be "But unto you I say, the rest in 'Thyatira;'" those, namely, who resisted the pollution. The received text confuses the meaning by putting it, "But unto you I say, and to the rest," as if both parties were alike called to continue steadfast. *SEE JEZEBEL*.

The principal deity of the city was Apollo, worshipped as the sun-god under the surname Tyrimnas. He was no doubt introduced by the

Macedonian colonists, for the name is Macedonian. One of the three mythical kings of Macedonia, whom the genealogists placed before Perdiccas — the first of the Temenidae that Herodotus and Thucydides recognize — is so called; the other two being *Carants* and *Ccenus*, manifestly impersonations of the *chief* and the *tribe*. The inscriptions of Thyatira give Tyrimnas the titles of **πρόπολις** and **προπάτωρ θεός**, and a special priesthood was attached to his service. A priestess of Artemis is also mentioned, probably the administratrix of a cult derived from the earlier times of the city, and similar in its nature to that of the Ephesian Artemis. Another superstition of an extremely curious nature which existed at Thyatira, seems to have been brought thither by some of the corrupted Jews of the dispersed tribes. A fane stood outside the walls dedicated to *Sambatha* the name of the sibyl who is sometimes called Chaldean, sometimes Jewish, sometimes Persian in the midst of an enclosure designated “the Chaldaean court” (**τοῦ Χαλδαίου περίβολος**). This lends an additional illustration to the above passage (**ῥ** Revelation 2:20, 21), which seems to imply a form of religion that had become condemnable from the admixture of foreign alloy, rather than one idolatrous *ab initio*. Now there is evidence to show that in Thyatira there was a great amalgamation of races. Latin inscriptions are frequent, indicating a considerable influx of Italian immigrants; and in some Greek inscriptions many Latin words are introduced. Latin and Greek names, too, are found accumulated on the same individuals, such as Titus Antonius Alfeus Arignotus and Julia Severina Stratonicis. But amalgamation of different races in pagan nations always went together with a syncretism of different religions, every relation of life having its religious sanction. If the sibyl *Sambatha* was really a Jewess, lending her aid to this proceeding, and not discountenanced by the authorities of the Judaeo-Christian Church at Thyatira, both the censure and its qualification become easy of explanation. It seems also not improbable that the imagery of the description in **ῥ** Revelation 2:18, **ὁ ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ὡς φλόγα, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ**, may have been suggested by the current pagan representations of the tutelary deity of the city. . See a parallel case at Smyrna (q.v.). Besides the cults which have been mentioned, there is evidence of a deification of Rome, of Hadrian, and of the imperial family. Games were celebrated in honor of Tyrimnas, of Hercules, and of the reigning emperor. On the coins before the imperial times, the heads of Bacchus, of Athena, and of Cybele are also found; but the inscriptions only indicate a cult of the last of these.

Picture for Thyatira 2

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

Thy'ine Wood

Picture for Thyine Wood

(ξύλον θύϊνον ; Vulg. *lignum thyinum*) occurs once in ^{<6812>}Revelation 18:12 (margin "sweet" [wood]), where it is mentioned as one of the valuable articles of commerce that should be found no more in Babylon (Rome), whose fall is there predicted by John. Symmachus and the Vulg. also understand it to be meant by the algum-trees of ^{<1101>}1 Kings 10:11. There can be little doubt that the wood here spoken of is that of the *Thuja articulata*, Des Font., the *Callitris quadrivalvis* of present botanists. Most of our readers are familiar with the "arbor vite," *Thuja occidentalis*, so common in our shrubberies. Closely allied to this in the same cypress-like division of the Coniferae; indeed, until lately included in the genus Thuja-is the tree in question. This wood was in considerable demand by the Romans, being much employed by them in the ornamental wood-work of their villas, and also for tables, bowls, and vessels of different kinds. It was also fragrant (Elian, *Var. Hist.* 5, 6). It is noticed by most ancient authors from the time of Theophrastus (*Plait.* 5, 5; see Elian, *Animn.* 2, 11; Strabo, 4:202). It was the citron-wood of the Romans; thus Salmasius, **θύα** Theophrasti est illa citrus, quae *citreas mensas* dabat Romahis inter lautissima opera" (Celsius, *Hierobot.* 2, 25). It was produced only in Africa, in the neighborhood of Mount Atlasi and in Granada, "citrum, arborem Africae peculiarem esse, nec alibi nasci." It grew to a goodly size, "quarum amplitudo ac radices aestimari possunt ex orbibus" (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 13:15). Fabulous prices were given for tables and other ornamental furniture made of citrus-wood (see Pliny, *loc. cit.*).

This cedar or citron-wood (*Callitris quadrivalvis*, the *Thuja articulata* of Linnaeus) is a native of Mount Atlas, and of other uncultivated hills on the

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

Thym, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm

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

Thyrori

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

Thysiasterium

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

Tiamat

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

Tiara,

Picture for Tiara

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

Tibe'rias

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

1. Origin and Early Associations. —The place is first mentioned in the 'New Test. (^{<BIB>}John 6:1, 23; 21:1), and then by Josephus (*Ant.* 18:2, 3; *War*, 2, 9, 1), who states that it was built by Herod Antipas, and was named by him in honor of the emperor Tiberius. It was probably not a new town, but a restored or enlarged one merely; for *Rakkath* (^{<BIB>}Joshua 19:35), which is said in the Talmud (*Jerusalem Megillah*, fol. 701; comp; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 755) to have occupied the same position, lay in the tribe of Naphtali (if we follow the boundaries as indicated by the clearest passages), and Tiberius appears to have been within the limits of the same tribe (^{<BIB>}Matthew 4:13). If the graves mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* loc.

cit.) are any objection, they must militate against this assumption likewise (Lightfoot, *Chorog. Cent.* c. 72-74). The same remark may be made, respecting Jerome's statement that Tiberias succeeded to the place of the earlier *Chinnereth* (*Onomasticon*, s.v.); but this latter town has been located by some farther north and by others farther south than the site of Tiberias. The tenacity with which its Roman name has adhered to the spot (see below) indicates its entire reconstruction; for, generally speaking, foreign names in the East applied to towns previously known under names derived from the native dialect-as, e.g., Epiphania for Hammath (^{469B}Joshua 19:35), Palmyra for Tadmor (^{480B}2 Chronicles 8:4), Ptolemais for Akko (^{420C}Acts 21:7)--lost their foothold as soon as the foreign power passed away which had imposed them, and gave place again to the original appellations.

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

Picture for Tiberias 1

2. Scriptural Mention. —It is remarkable that the Gospels give us no information that the Savior, who spent so much of his public life in Galilee, ever visited Tiberias. The surer meaning of the expression, "He went away beyond the sea of Galilee of Tiberias," in ^{480B}John 6:1 (περὰν τῆς

θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος), is not that Jesus embarked from Tiberias, but, as Meyer remarks, that he crossed from the west side of the *Galilean sea of Tiberias* to the opposite side. A reason has been assigned for this singular fact, which may or may not account for it. As Herod, the murderer of John the Baptist, resided most of the time in this city, the Savior may have kept purposely away from it, on account of the sanguinary and artful (⋈ Luke 13:32) character of that ruler. It is certain, from ⋈ Luke 23:8, that though Herod had heard of the fame of Christ, he never saw him in person until they met at Jerusalem, and never witnessed any of his miracles. It is possible that the character of the place, so much like that of a Roman colony, may have been a reason why he who was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel performed so little labor in its vicinity. The head of the lake, and especially the Plain of Gennesaret, where the population was more dense and so thoroughly Jewish, formed the central point of his Galilean ministry. The feast of Herod and his courtiers, before whom the daughter of Herodias danced, and, in fulfillment of the tetrarch's rash oath, demanded the head of the dauntless reformer, was held in all probability at Tiberias, the capital of the province. If, as Josephus mentions (*Ant. 18:5, 2*), the Baptist was imprisoned at the time in the castle of Machaerus beyond the Jordan, the order for his execution could have been sent thither, and the bloody trophy forwarded to the implacable Herodias at the palace where she usually resided. Gams (*Johannes der Tauffer im Gefangniss*, p. 47, etc.) suggests that John; instead of being kept all the time in the same castle, may have been confined in different places at different times. The three passages already referred to are the only ones in the New Test. which mention Tiberias by name, viz. ⋈ John 6:1; 21:1 (in both instances designating the lake on which the town was situated), and ⋈ John 6:23, where boats are said to have come from Tiberias near to the place at which Jesus had miraculously supplied the wants of the multitude. Thus the lake in the time of Christ, among its other appellations, bore also that of the principal city in the neighborhood; and in like manner, at the present day, *Bahr Tubarieh*, "Sea of Tiberias," is almost the only name under which it is known among the inhabitants of the country.

3. Later Jewish Importance. —Tiberias has an interesting history, apart from its strictly Biblical associations. It bore a conspicuous part in the wars between the Jews and the Romans, as its fortifications were an important military station (Josephus, *War*, 2, 20, 6; 47, 10, 1; *Life*, § 8 sq.). The

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

Picture for Tiberias 2

4. Position and Present Condition. — As above intimated, the ancient name has survived in that of the *modern Tubarieh*, which occupies unquestionably the original site, except that it is confined to narrower limits than those of the original city. According to Josephus (*Life*, § 65), Tiberias was 30 stadia from Hippos, 60 from Gadara, and 120 from Scythopolis; according to the Talmud, it was 13 Roman miles from Sepphoris. The place is four and a half hours from Nazareth, one hour from Mejdal,

possibly the ancient Magdala, and thirteen hours, by the shortest route, from Banias or Caesarea Philippi. Near Tuibarieh, about a mile farther south along the shore, are the celebrated warm baths, which the Roman naturalists (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 5, 15) reckoned among the greatest known curiosities of the world. The intermediate space between these baths and the town abounds with the traces of ruins, such as the foundations of walls, heaps of stone, blocks of granite, and the like; and it cannot be doubted, therefore, that the ancient Tiberias occupied also this ground, and was much more extensive than its modern successor. From such indications, and from the explicit testimony of Josephus, who says (*Ant.* 18:2, 3) that Tiberias was near Ammaus (Ἀμμαοῦς), or the Warm Baths, there can be no uncertainty respecting the identification of the site of this important city. (See also the Mishna, *Shabb.* 3, 4; and other Talmudical passages in Lightfoot's *Horas Heb.* p. 133 sq. Comp. Wichmannshausen, *De Thermnis Tiberiensibus*, in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* tom. 7.) These springs contain sulfur, salt, and iron; and were employed for medicinal purposes. **SEE HAMMATH.**

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

The present Tubarleh has a rectangular form, is guarded by a strong wall on the land side, but is left entirely open towards the sea. A few palm-trees still remain as witnesses of the luxuriant vegetation which once adorned this garden of the Promised Land, but they are greatly inferior in size and beauty to those seen in Egypt. The oleander grows profusely here, almost rivaling that flower so much admired as found oil the neighboring Plain of Gennesaret. The people, as of old, draw their subsistence in part from the adjacent lake. The spectator from his position here commands a view of almost the entire expanse of the sea, except the southeast part, which is cut off by a slight projection of the coast. The precipices on the opposite side" appear almost to overhang the water, but, on being approached, are found

to stand back at some distance, so as to allow travelers to pass between them and the water. The lofty Hermon, the modern Jebel esh-Sheikh, with its glistening snow-heaps, forms a conspicuous object of the landscape in the north-east. Many rocktombs exist in the sides of the hills, behind the town, some of them, no doubt, of great antiquity, and constructed in the best style of such monuments. The climate here in the warm season is very hot and unhealthy; but most of the tropical fruits, as in other parts of the valley of the Jordan, become ripe very early, and, with industry, might be cultivated in great abundance and perfection.

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

Tiberias is fully described in Raumer's *Pallstina*, p. 125; *Robinson's Biblical Researches*, 2, 380 sq.; Porter's *Handbook*, p. 421 sq.; Thomson's *Land and Book*, 2, 71 sq.; and most books of travel in Palestine. **SEE TIBERIAS, THE SEA OF** (ἡ θαλάσση τῆς Τιβεριάδος ; Vulg. *mare Tiberiadis*). This term is found only in ⁴²¹⁰John 21:1, the other passage in which it occurs in the A. V. (vi, 1) being, if the original is accurately rendered, "the sea of Galilee, of Tiberias." John probably uses the name as more familiar to non-residents in Palestine than the indigenous name of the "sea of Galilee:" or "sea of Gennesaret," actuated, no doubt, by the same motive which has induced him so constantly to translate the Hebrew names and terms which he uses (such as Rabbi, Rabboni, Messias, Cephas, Siloam, etc.) into the language of the Gentiles. **SEE GALILEE, SEA OF.**

Tibe'rius

Picture for Tiberius

(Τιβέριος), in full, TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS NERO CASESAR, the Roman emperor, successor of Augustus, who began to reign A.D. 14, and reigned until 37. He was the son of Tiberius Claudius Nero and Livia, and hence a stepson of Augustus. He was born at Rome Nov. 16, B.C. 45. He became emperor in his fifty-fifth year, after having distinguished himself as a commander in various wars, and having evinced talents of a high order as

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

It will be seen that the Savior's public life, and some of the introductory events of the apostolic age, must have fallen within the limits of his administration. The memorable passage in Tacitus (*Annal.* 15; 44) respecting the origin of the Christian sect places the crucifixion of the Redeemer under Tiberius: "Ergo abolendo rumori (that of his having set fire to Rome) Nero subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis pœnis affecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat" (see the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 95; **SEE CHRESTUS**). In Luke 3, 1 he is termed Tiberius Caesar; John the Baptist, it is there said, began his ministry in *the fifteenth year* of his reign (ἡγεμονία). This chronological notation is an important one in determining the year of Christ's birth and entrance on his public work. **SEE JESUS CHRIST**. Augustus admitted Tiberius to a share in the empire two or three years before his own death; and it is a question, therefore, whether *the fifteenth year* of which Luke speaks should be reckoned from the time of the co-partnership or from that when Tiberius began to reign alone. The

former is the computation justified by other data. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. The other passages in which he is mentioned under the title of Caesar offer no points of personal allusion, and refer to him simply as the emperor (^{<127>}Matthew 22:17 sq.; ^{<124>}Mark 12:14.sq.; ^{<12>}Luke 20:22 sq.; 23:2 sq.; ^{<12>}John 19:12 sq.). *SEE CESAR*.

Tib'hath

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

Tib'ni

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

Tickets of Membership

(English Wesleyan). The possession of a "ticket" is one of the evidences of membership in the Methodist society. Wesley decided, in 1743, to meet

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

Ti'dal

(Heb. *Tidal'*, תִּדְאֵל [d], if Shemitic=fear [Gesenius] or *renown* [Fürst]; but, according to Lenormant, *Accadian (greatson)*; Sept. θαργάλ v.r. θαλγά ; Josephus, θάδαλος, *Ant.* 1, 9, 1; Vulg. *Thadal*), the last named (^{-0140E}Genesis 14:1, 9) of the three subordinate "kings" who, in confederation with Chedorlaomer, attacked and defeated the rebellious princes of the Sodomitic pentarchy in the days of Abraham, B.C. cir. 2070. He is called "king of nations" (μυθῶν *goyim*), which Symmachus interprets *Scythians*, and others *Galilee*, both on very slender, if not inaccurate, grounds. Rawlinson suggests, for equally precarious reasons (*Ancient Monarchies*, 1, 55, note), that the name is probably Turanian; but he justly remarks that, from the title given to Tidal, "it is reasonable to understand that he was a chief over various nomadic tribes to whom no special tract of country could be assigned, since at different times of the year they inhabited different portions of Lower Mesopotamia. This is the case with the Arabs of these parts at the present day." **SEE CHEDORLAOMER.**

Tidhar

SEE PINE.

Tiedebaik

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

Tierce

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

Tiercilits

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

Tiffin, Edward, M.D.

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

held the office of surveyor-general for nearly fifteen years, when he obtained leave to retire, July 1, 1829. He died Aug. 9 of the same year. Three of his *Sermons*, preached in 1817, were published in the *Ohio Conference Offering*, (1851). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:205.

Tig'lath-pile'ser

(Heb. *Tiglath'Pile'ser*, tl̥g̥T̥æsa| Pæ⁽²¹⁵⁹⁾ 2 Kings 15:29; 16:10; or briefly *Tiglath'Pele'ser*, rs| Petl̥g̥æ^{ver. 7}), or (less correctly) *Til'gath-pilne'ser* (Heb. *Tilgath'Pilne'ser*, rsan| Pæt̥Gi̥æ⁽¹³¹⁶⁾ 1 Chronicles 5:6; ⁽⁴⁸⁰⁾2 Chronicles 28:20; or briefly *Tilgath'Pilne'ser*, rsn| Pæt̥Gi̥T̥æ).

Chronicles 5, 26), an Assyrian king. The Sept. Graecizes the name θαλαθφελλα σάρ (v.r. θαλαγαφελλασάρ, Ἀλαθφελλασάρ, Ἄγλαθ Φαλλασάρ), Josephus, θεγλαφαλασσάρης (*Ant.* 9:12., 3), and the Vulg. *Theglath-Phalasar*. The monumental name is, according to Rawlinson, *Tukulti-pal-zira*; according to Oppert, *Tuklat-pal-asar* (i.e. *assur*); according to Hincks, *Tiklat-pal-isri*; according to others, *Tigulti-pal-tsira*. The signification of the name is somewhat doubtful. M. Oppert renders it, “Adoratio [sit] filio Zodiaci,” and explains “the son of the Zodiac” as *Nin*, or *Hercules* (*Expedition Scientifique en Mesopotamie*, 2, 352). It would seem to signify “worship of the son of Assur,” perhaps as a royal sobriquet. The Assyrian king of this name mentioned in Scripture is Tiglath-pileser II, an earlier king of the same name having ascended the Assyrian throne about B.C. 1130; of whose reign, or a portion of it, two cylinders are preserved in the British Museum (Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, 2, 62-79). We here condense all the information accessible, from whatever source, concerning the later monarch of this name.

1. Biblical Statements. —*Tiglathi-pi' eser* is the second; Assyrian king mentioned in Scripture as having come into contact with the Israelites, the first being Put (q.v.). He attacked Samaria in the reign of Pekah (B.C. 756-736), on what ground we are not told, but probably because Pekah had withheld his tribute, and, having entered his territories, took Ijon, and Abel-bethmaachah, and Janoah and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, and all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria” (⁽²¹⁵⁹⁾2 Kings 15:29) thus “lightly afflicting the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali” (⁽²³⁰⁰⁾Isaiah 9:1) the most northern, and so the most exposed, portion of the country.. The date of this invasion cannot at present be

fixed; but it was apparently many years afterwards that Tiglath-pileser made a second expedition into these parts, which had more important results than his former one. It appears that after the date of his first expedition a close league was formed between Rezin, -king of Syria, and Pekah, having for its special object the humiliation of Judaea, and intended to further generally the interests of the two allies. At first great successes were gained by Pekah and his confederate (^{<1257>}2 Kings 15:37; ^{<1406>}2 Chronicles 28:6-8); but on their proceeding to attack Jerusalem itself, and to threaten Ahaz, who was then king, with deposition from his throne, which they were about to give to a pretender, “the son of Tabeal” (^{<2306>}Isaiah 7:6), the Jewish monarch applied to Assyria for assistance, and Tiglath-pileser, consenting to aid him, again appeared at the head of an army in these regions. He first marched, naturally, against Damascus, which he took (^{<1260>}2 Kings 16:9), razing it (according to his own statement) to the ground, and killing Rezin, the Damascene monarch. After this, probably, he proceeded to chastise Pekah, whose country he entered on the northeast, where it bordered upon “Syria of Damascus.” Here he overran the whole district to the east of Jordan, no longer “lightly afflicting” Samaria, but injuring her far “*m more grievously*, by the way of the sea, in Galilee of the Gentiles” (^{<2301>}Isaiah 9:1), carrying into captivity “the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh” (^{<1333>}1 Chronicles 5:26), who had previously held this country, and placing them in Upper Mesopotamia from Harran to about Nisibis (ibid.). Thus the result of this expedition was the absorption of the kingdom of Damascus, and of an important portion of Samaria, into the Assyrian empire; and it further brought the kingdom of Judah into the condition of a mere tributary and vassal of the Assyrian monarch.

Before returning into his own land, Tiglath-pileser had an interview with Ahaz at Damascus (^{<1260>}2 Kings 16:10). Here, doubtless, was settled the amount of tribute which Judaea was to pay annually; and it may be suspected that here, too, it was explained to Ahaz by his suzerain that a certain deference to the Assyrian gods was due on the part of all tributaries, who were usually required to set up in their capital “the laws of Asshur,” or “altars to the great gods.” The “altar” which Ahaz “saw at Damascus,” and of which he sent the pattern to Urijah the priest (ver. 10, 11), has been conjectured to have been such a badge of subjection; but it seems to have been adopted only out of love for a prevalent fashion.

This is all that Scripture tells us of Tiglath-pileser. He appears to have succeeded Pul, and to have been succeeded by Shalmaneser; to have been contemporary with Rezin, Pekah, and Ahaz; and therefore to have ruled Assyria during the latter half of the 8th century before our era. *SEE ASSYRIA.*

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

The circumstances under which Tiglath-pileser obtained the crown have not come down to us from any good authority; but there is a tradition on the subject which seems to deserve mention. Alexander Polyhistor, the friend of Sylla, who had access to the writings of Berosus, related that the first Assyrian dynasty continued from Ninus, its founder, to a certain belief

(Pul), and that he was succeeded by Beletaras, a man of low rank, a mere vine-dresser (φυτουργός), who had the charge of the gardens attached to the royal palace. Beletaras, he said, having acquired the sovereignty in an extraordinary way, fixed it in his own family, in which it continued to the time of the destruction of Nineveh (*Fr. Hist. Gr.* 3, 210). It can scarcely be doubted that Beletaras here is intended to represent Tiglath-pileser, Beltar being, in fact, another mode of expressing the native *Pal-tsira* or *Palli-tsir* (Oppert), which the Hebrews represented by Pileser. Whether there is any truth in the tradition may, perhaps, be doubted. It bears too near a resemblance to the Oriental stories of Cyrus, Gyges, Amasis, and others, to have in itself much claim to our acceptance. On the other hand, as above mentioned, it harmonizes with the remarkable fact-unparalleled in the rest of the Assyrian records that Tiglath-pileser is absolutely silent on the subject of his ancestry, neither mentioning his father's name nor making any allusion whatever to his birth, descent, or parentage.

Tiglath-pileser's wars do not generally appear to have been of much importance. In Armenia he reduced the rebel princes, and afterwards conquered the city of Arpad after a year's resistance. In Babylonia he took Sippara (Sepharvaim) and several places of less note in the northern portion of the country; but he does not seem to have penetrated far, or to have come into contact with Nabonassar, who reigned from B.C. 747 to 733 at Babylon. In Media and Upper Mesopotamia he obtained certain successes, but made no permanent conquests. It was on his western frontier only that his victories advanced the limits of the empire. Among the conquered cities appear to be reckoned Megiddo (Magidu) and Dor (Duru), both connected with Manasseh (Manatsuah). Before he left Syria, Tiglathpileser received submission, not only from Ahaz, but from the kings of the neighboring countries. He records his taking tribute from a king of Judah called Yahu-khazi—a name which might represent Jehoahaz; but, as shown by the chronology, it probably stands for Ahaz, whose name may have been changed by his Assyrian suzerain, as happened afterwards to Eliakim and Zedekiah (~~2~~¹²³⁴ 2 Kings 23:34; 24:17). The destruction of Damascus, the absorption of Syria, and the extension of Assyrian influence over Judaea are the chief events of Tiglath-pileser's reign, which seems to have had fewer external triumphs than those of most Assyrian monarchs. Probably his usurpation was not endured quite patiently, and domestic troubles or dangers acted as a check upon his expeditions against foreign countries.

No palace or great building can be ascribed to this king. His slabs, which are tolerably numerous, show that he must have built or adorned a residence at Calah (? Nimrid), where they were found; but, as they were not discovered *in situ*, we cannot say anything of the edifice to which they originally belonged. They bear marks of wanton defacement; and it is plain that the later kings purposely injured them; for, not only is the writing often erased, but the slabs have been torn down, broken, and used as building materials by Esar-haddon in the great palace which he erected at Calah, the southern capital. The dynasty of Sargon was hostile to the first two princes of the Lower Kingdom, and the result of their hostility is that we have far less monumental knowledge of Shalmaneser and Tiglath-pileser than of various kings of the Upper Empire. *SEE NINEVEH.*

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

Tigré Version

Tigré is a language spoken throughout Eastern Abyssinia, from the eastern banks of the River Tacazze to the Shoho country, which separates Abyssinia from the Red Sea. Consequently, the Tigré is spoken throughout five degrees of latitude, beginning three days journey from the Red Sea, and by a population amounting to about three millions. The characters of the Tigré alphabet are, like the Amharic, of Ethiopic origin, and the Tigré language itself is more closely related to the Ethiopic than the Amharic or any other dialect of Abyssinia. The first attempt to translate the New Test. into that language was made by an Englishman named Nathaniel Pearce about the year 1819. He had acquired varied and extensive information by constant wanderings through various countries, and had resided for fourteen years in Abyssinia. He translated Mark and John; but as, owing to his restless habits, he had never acquired skill in forming the Ethiopic characters, he was obliged to write his translation in Roman characters. His MS. is in the possession of the British and Foreign Bible Society; it has never been published, and its comparative value is still unascertained. In 1831 part of Luke was translated by Mr. Kugler, a missionary of the Church Missionary Society; and after his death the work was continued by Mr. Isenberg, of the same society, who, at his death, in 1863, left a revised manuscript copy of the four gospels. This MS. having been put into the hands of the Rev. Dr. Krapf, the colleague of the deceased in Abyssinia, an

application was made at once to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society to have this translation printed. Dr. Krapf, who is well versed in the African languages, accompanied his application with a commendation of the character of Mr. Isenberg's translation. The committee consented to meet the expense of an edition of the four gospels, and thus for the first time a portion of the word of God was published in this vernacular in 1865. Since that time nothing further has been done towards completing the New Test. See *Bible of Every Land*, p. 60. (B. P.)

Ti'gris

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

1. The Tigris, like the Euphrates, rises from two principal sources. The most distant, and therefore the true, source is the western one, which is in lat. 38° 10', long. 39° 20' nearly, a little to the south of the high mountain lake called Goljik, or Golenjik, in the peninsula formed by the Euphrates, where it sweeps round between Palou and Telek. The Tigris's source is near the south-western angle of the lake, and cannot be more than two or three miles from the channel of the Euphrates. The course of the Tigris is somewhat north of east, but, after pursuing this direction for about twenty-five miles, it makes a sweep round to the south and descends by Arghani Maden upon Diarbekr. Here it is already a river of considerable size, and is crossed by a bridge of ten arches a little below that city (Niebuhr, *Voyage en Arabie*, p. 326). It then turns suddenly to the east and flows in this

direction past Osman Kieui to Til, where it once more alters its course and takes that south-easterly direction which it pursues, with certain slight variations, to its final junction with the Euphrates. At Osman Kieui it receives the second, or Eastern, Tigris which descends from Niphates (the modern Ala-Tagh) with a course almost due south, and, collecting on its way the waters of a large number of streams, unites with the Tigris half-way between Diarbekr and Til, in long. 41° nearly. The courses of the two streams to the point of junction are respectively 150 and 100 miles. A little below the junction, and before any other tributary of importance is received, the Tigris is 150 yards wide and from three to four feet deep. Near Til, a large stream flows into it from the north-east, bringing almost as much water as the main channel ordinarily holds (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 49). This branch rises near Billi, in northern Kurdistan, and runs at first to the north-east, but presently sweeps round to the north and proceeds through the districts of Shattak and Boktan with a general westerly course, crossing and re-crossing the line of the 38th parallel, nearly to Sert, whence it flows south-west and south to Til. From Til the Tigris runs southward for 20 miles through a long, narrow, and deep gorge, at the end of which it emerges upon the comparatively low, but still hilly, country of Mesopotamia, near Jezireh. Through this it flows with a course which is south-southeast to Mosul, thence nearly south to Kileh-Sherghat, and again south-southeast to Samara, where the hills end and the river enters on the great alluvium. The course is now more irregular. Between Samara and Baghdad a considerable bend is made to the east; and, after the Shat el-Hie is thrown off in lat. $32^{\circ} 30'$, a second bend is made to the north, the regular southeasterly course being only resumed a little above the 32nd parallel, from which point the Tigris runs in a tolerably direct line to its junction with the Euphrates at Kurnah. The length of the whole stream, exclusive of, meanders, is reckoned at 1146 miles. It can be descended on rafts during the flood season from Diarbekr, which is only 150 miles from its source; and it has been navigated by steamers of small draught nearly up to Mosul. From Diarbekr to Samara the navigation is much impeded by rapids, rocks, and shallows, as well as by artificial *bunds*, or dams, which in ancient times were thrown across the stream, probably for purposes of irrigation. Below Samara there are no obstructions; the river is deep, with a bottom of soft mud, the stream moderate, and the course very meandering. The average width of the Tigris in this part of its course is 200 yards, while its depth is very considerable.

Besides the three head-streams of the Tigris which have already been described, the river receives, along its middle and lower course, no fewer than five important tributaries. These are, the river of Zakko, or Eastern Ktabfir, the Great Zab (Zab Ala), the Lesser Zab (Zab Asfal), the Adhem, and the Diyaleh, or ancient Gyndes. All these rivers flow from the high range of Zagros, which shuts in the Mesopotamian valley on the east, and is able to sustain so large a number-of great streams from its inexhaustible springs and abundant snows. From the west the Tigris obtains no tributary of the slightest importance, for the Tharthar, which is said to have once reached it, now ends in a salt lake a little below Tekrit. Its volume, however, is continually increasing as it descends in consequence of the great bulk of water brought into it from the east, particularly by the Great Zab and the Diyaleh; and in its lower course it is said to be a larger stream and to carry a greater body than the Euphrates (Chesney, *Euphrates Expedition*, 1, 62).

2. The Tigris, like the Euphrates, has a flood season. Early in the month of March, in consequence of the melting of the snows on the southern flank of Niphates, the river rises rapidly,. Its breadth gradually increases at Diarbekr from 100 or 120 to 250 yards. The stream is swift and turbid. The rise continues through March and April, reaching its full height generally in the first or second week of May. At this time the country about Baghdad is often extensively flooded, not, however, so much from the Tigris as from the overflow of the Euphrates, which is here poured into the eastern stream through a canal. Farther down the river, in the territory of the Beni-Lam Arabs, between the 32nd and 31st parallels, there is a great annual inundation on both banks. About the middle of May the Tigris begins to fall, and by midsummer it has reached its natural level. In October and November there is another rise and fall in consequence of the autumnal rains; but, compared with the spring flood, that of autumn is insignificant.

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

3. The Tigris, in its upper course, anciently ran through Armenia and Assyria. Lower down, from about the point where it enters on the alluvial

plain, it separated Babylonia from Susiana. In the wars between the Romans and the Parthians we find it constituting for a short time (from A.D. 114 to 117) the boundary line between these two empires. Otherwise it has scarcely been of any political importance. The great chain of Zagros is the main natural boundary between Western and Central Asia; and beyond this the next defensible line is the Euphrates. Historically it is found that either the central power pushes itself westward to that river, or the power ruling the west advances eastward to the mountain barrier.

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

4. The most important notices of the Tigris to be found in the classical writers are the following: Strabo, 11:14, 8, and 16:1, 9-13; Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* 7:7; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 6:27. See also Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Geog.* s.v. Among modern writers may be mentioned Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 49-51, 464-476; Loftus, *Chaldea and Susiana*, p. 3-8; Jones,

in, *Transactions of the Geog. Soc. of Bombay*, vol. 9; Lynch, in *Journ. of Geog. Soc.* vol. 9; Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1, 552, 553. *SEE EUPHRATES.*

Tikkûn Sopherim

($\mu\gamma\rho\pi\omega\varsigma \hat{\omega}qyt$), or *Emendations of the Scribes*, refer to eighteen alterations which the scribes decreed should be introduced into the text, in order to remove anthropomorphisms and other indelicate expressions. These eighteen emendations, or $\hat{\gamma}l m j 8 8y$, are as follows, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible, ^{<0182>}Genesis 18:22, where, for the original reading, $hw\text{h}yw hrba ynpl dm[yndw[$, “and Jehovah *still stood* before Abraham,” is now substituted, by the decree of the scribes = *Tikkûn Sopherim*, $hw\text{h}y ynpl dm[wndw[\mu hrba\omega$, “and Abraham *still stood* before Jehovah,” because it appeared offensive to say that the Deity stood before Abraham.

2. ^{<04115>}Numbers 11:15, where Moses addresses God, “Kill me, I pray thee... that I may not see *thy* evil” ($\hat{U}t[rb$), i.e. the punishment wherewith thou visitest Israel, is altered to “that I may not see *my* evil” ($yt[rb$), because it might seem as if evil were ascribed to the Deity.

3, 4. ^{<04122>}Numbers 12:12, where the original reading, “Let her not be as one *dead* who proceeded from the womb of *our* mother ($w\text{nw}ma$), and half of *our* flesh ($w\text{nr}\check{c}b$) be consumed,” is changed to “Let her not be as one *dead-born*, which when it proceeds from the womb of *its* mother (wma) has half of *its* flesh ($wr\check{c}b$) consumed.”

5. 1 Samuel 3, 13, where the original, “for his sons cursed *God*” ($\mu\gamma\text{h}l a$) — the Sept. has it still $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$ is altered to “for his sons cursed *themselves*” ($\mu\text{h}l$), because it was too offensive to say that Eli’s sons cursed God without being reprimanded by their father.

6. ^{<0162>}2 Samuel 16:12, where “*will God see with his eye*” ($y\text{ny}[b$) is made to read “*will God look at my affliction*” ($y\text{nw}[b$). The Seventy probably read $y\text{yn}[b$, for they translate $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\sigma}\acute{\omega}\epsilon\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$.

7. ^{<0126>}1 Kings 12:16, where “*to his God* ($y\text{h}l al$), O Israel... and Israel went to *their God*” ($w\text{y}h\text{h}l al$) is given “*to your tents* ($\hat{\gamma}l hal$)... *to their*

tents” (wyl hal), because the separation of Israel from the house of David was regarded as a necessary transition to idolatry; it was looked upon as leaving God and the sanctuary for the worship of idolatry in tents.

8. ^{<406>}2 Chronicles 10:16 concerns the parallel passage, which is similarly altered for the same reason.
9. Jeremiah 2, 11, where “my glory” (ydwbk) reads “their glory” (wdwbk), because it was too offensive to say that God’s glory was changed for an idol.
10. ^{<87>}Ezekiel 8:17, where “my nose” (ypa) is changed into “their nose” (µpa);
11. ^{<307>}Hosea 4:7, where the same change is made as in 9. 12. Habakkuk 1, 12, where “thou diest not” (twmt al) is converted into “we shall not die” (twmn al).
13. ^{<812>}Zechariah 2:12, where “mine eye” (yny [) is varied by his eye” (wny [), to avoid too gross an anthropomorphism.
14. ^{<303>}Malachi 1:13, where “you make me” (yty [) is changed to “you make it” (ytwa); reason as in 13.
15. ^{<461>}Psalms 106:20, where the same alteration is made as in 9 and 11.
16. ^{<871>}Job 7:20, where “a burden to thee” (yl [) is changed to” to myself” (yl [). That yl [was the Original reading we see also from the Sept. εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ φορτίον.
17. ^{<873>}Job 32:3, where “they condemned God” (ta yhl a) is altered to they “condemned Job” (bwyta ta).
18. ^{<819>}Lamentations 3:19, where “and thy soul will mourn over me” (Úçpñiy [j yçtw) reads “and my soul is humbled within me” (yçpñiy [j Wçtw), because of the remark that God will mourn.

These eighteen decrees of the Sopherim are enumerated in the *Massora Magna* on Numbers 1, 1, and on ^{<461>}Psalms 106:20; they are also given in the book *Ochlah ve-Ochath*, p. 37, 113 (ed. Frensdorff, Hanover, 1864). The whole question on these *Tikkûn Sopherim* is discussed by Pinsker in

Kherem Chemed, 9:53 sq. (Berlin, 1856); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 308 sq. (Breslau, 1857); Wedell, *De Emendationibus a Sopherim in Libris Sacris Veteris Testamenti Propositis* (Vratislavise, 1869). **SEE OCLAH**. (B. P.)

Tik'vah

(Heb. *Tikvah'*, תִּקְוָה *æa cord* [as in ^{<1028>}Joshua 2:18,21], or *hope* [as often]), the name of two Israelites.

1. (Sept. θεκκούε v.r. θεκούάν; *Vulg. Thecua*.) The son of Harhas and father of Shallum, which last was the husband of the prophetess Huldah (^{<1224>}2 Kings 22:14). B.C. ante 632. He is elsewhere (^{<1482>}2 Chronicles 34:22) called TIKVATH **SEE TIKVATH** (q.v.).
2. (Sept. θεκούε v.r. θέκώε; *Vulg. Thecue*.) The father of Jahaziah, which latter was one of the “rulers” appointed to carry out the divorce of the Gentile wives after the Captivity (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:15). B.C. 458.

Tik'vath

(Heb. text *Toka'hath*, תִּקְוָה, marg. *Tokhath'*, תִּקְוָה; *assemblage* [Gesen.], or *firminess* [Fürst]; Sept. θακούαθ v.r. θεκώε and Καθουάλ; *Vulg. Thecuath*), the father of Shallum (^{<1482>}2 Chronicles 34:22); elsewhere (^{<1224>}2 Kings 22:14) called TIKVAH **SEE TIKVAH** (q.v.).

Til

SEE VAN TIL.

Tile

Picture for Tile 1

Picture for Tile 2

(**hnbē**] *lebenâh*, so called from the *whitish* clay), a *brick* (^{<2001>}Ezekiel 4:1), as elsewhere rendered. **SEE BRICK**; **SEE TILING**. The above passage illustrates the use of baked clay for the delineation of figures and written characters among the ancient nations, especially the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Babylonians. Not only were ordinary building bricks stamped with the name of the founder of the edifice, as well as with other devices, but clay

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

Tile, In Architecture

Picture for Tile 1

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

Picture for Tile 2

The Romans used flat tiles turned up at the edges, with a row of inverted, semi-cylindrical ones over the joint to keep out the wet. In the Middle Ages tiles were extensively employed in England for covering buildings, though they seem always to have been considered an inferior material to lead. It does not appear that any but flat, plain tiles, with such others as

were requisite for the ridges, hips, and valleys, were used. The ridge-tiles, or crest, formerly also called *roof-tiles*, were sometimes made ornamental. It is not unusual to find the backs of fireplaces formed of tiles, and in such situations they are sometimes laid in herring bone courses, as in the great hall, Kenilworth: most of the fireplaces in Bodiam Castle, Sussex, are constructed in this manner, and the oven by the side of the larger fireplace in the hall is also built of tiles.

Picture for Tile 3

Glazed decorative tiles were anciently much used for paving sacred edifices. They are sometimes called Norman tiles, possibly from the supposition that they were originally made in Normandy; and, considering the age and variety of specimens that exist in Northern France; this idea may not be wholly erroneous. It is doubtful, however, whether any tiles have been discovered in England that present the features of the Norman style of architectural decoration, the most ancient being apparently of the 13th century. The name of *encaustic* has also been given to these tiles, and it would not be inappropriate were it not applied already to denote an antique process of art of a perfectly different nature; whereas a method wholly distinct, and peculiar to the glazed tiles of the Middle Ages, was commonly adopted in Northern Europe. The process of manufacture which, as it is supposed, was most commonly employed may be thus described: The thin squares of well-compacted clay having been fashioned, and probably dried in the sun to the requisite degree, their ordinary dimension being from four to six inches, with a thickness of one inch, a stamp which bore a design in relief was impressed upon them, so as to leave the ornamental pattern in *cavetto*. Into the hollows thus left on the face of the tile clay of another color, most commonly white, or pipe-clay, was then inlaid or impressed. Nothing remained except to give a richer effect, and, at the same time, insure the permanence of the work by covering the whole in the furnace with a thin surface of metallic glaze, which, being of a slightly yellow color, tinged the white clay beneath it, and imparted to the red a more full and rich tone of color. In the success of this simple operation much depended upon this that the quality of the two kinds of clay that were used should be as nearly similar as possible, or else, if the white was liable to shrink in the furnace more than the red, the whole work would be full of cracks; in the other case, the design would bulge and be thrown upward imperfections, of which examples are not wanting. To

facilitate the equal drying of the tile, deep scorings or hollows were sometimes made on the reverse, and by this means, when laid in cement, the pavement was more firmly held together. Occasionally, either from the deficiency of white clay of good quality, or perhaps for the sake of variety, glazed tiles occur which have the design left hollow, and not filled in, according to the usual process, with clay of a different color. A careful examination, however, of the disposition of the ornament will frequently show that the original intention was to fill these cavities, as in other specimens; but instances also present themselves where the ornamental design evidently was intended to remain in relief, the field, and not the pattern, being found in *cavetto*. It must be observed that instances are very frequent where, the protecting glaze having been worn away, the white clay, which is of a less compact quality than the red, has fallen out and left the design hollow, so that an impression or rubbing may readily be taken. It appears probable that the origin of the fabrication of decorative pavements by the process which has been described is to be sought in the medieval imitations of the Roman mosaic-work by means of colored substances inlaid upon stone or marble. Of this kind of marquetry in stone, few examples have escaped the injuries of time; specimens may be seen on the eastern side of the altar-screen in Canterbury Cathedral, and at the abbey church of St. Denis and the cathedral of St. Omer.

Picture for Tile 4

Picture for Tile 5

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

Picture for Tile 6

Picture for Tile 7

A profusion of good examples still exists of single tiles, and sets of four, nine, sixteen, or a greater number of tiles, forming by their combination a complete design, and presenting, for the most part the characteristic style of ornament which was in vogue at each successive period, but examples

of general arrangement are very rare and imperfect. To this deficiency of authorities it seems to be due that modern imitations of these ancient pavements have generally proved unsatisfactory in the resemblance, which they present to oil-cloth or carpeting; and the intention of producing richness of effect by carrying the ornamental design throughout the pavement without any intervening spaces has been wholly frustrated. Sufficient care has not been given to ascertain the ancient system of arrangement: it is, however, certain that a large proportion of plain tiles, black, white, or red, were introduced, and served *to* divide the various portions which composed the general design. Plain diagonal bands, for instance, arranged fret wise intervened between the compartments, or panels, of tiles ornamented with designs; the plain and the decorated quarries were laid alternately, or in some instances longitudinal bands were introduced in order to break that continuity of ornament which, being uniformly spread over a large surface, as in some modern pavements, produces a confused rather than a rich effect. It has been supposed, with much probability, that the more elaborate pavements were reserved for the decoration of the choir, the chancel, or immediate vicinity of an altar, while in the aisles or other parts of the church more simple pavements of plain tiles, black, white, or red, were usually employed. It may also deserve notice that in almost every instance when the ornamented tiles have been accidentally discovered or dug up on the site of a castle or mansion there has been reason to suppose a consecrated fabric had there existed, or that the tiles had belonged to that portion of the structure which had been devoted to religious services. We often meet with the item "Flanders tiles" in building-accounts of castles, but these were for the fireplace only. The lower rooms were usually "earthed," the upper rooms boarded. Parker, *Gloss. of Architect.* s.v.

Picture for Tile 8

Most of the tiles in England were made in the county of Worcester. Examples may be found in almost every parish church. Occasionally the patterns were alternately raised and sunk, so that the surface of the tiles was irregular. Examples of this sort were found at St. Alban's Abbey, and have been recently reproduced, and laid before the high-altar. From the 13th century to the 16th encaustic tiles were commonly used for the floors of churches and religious houses. Tiles have been used for wall-decoration, and for the adornment of tombs on the Continent; and this custom has

likewise been restored in England. Since the manufacture of tiles has been carried out so efficiently in Worcestershire, their use has been common for all restored churches *in* that county. Modern specimens in some cases are remarkably fine, though sometimes wanting in that grace and character which were so remarkable in the old examples. —Lee, *Gloss. of Liturg. Terams* s.v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archceöl.* s.v.

Tilenus, Daniel

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

Til' gath-pilne'ser

(1 Chronicles 5, 6, 26; ~~4230~~2 Chronicles 28:20). *SEE TIGLATH-PILESER.*

Tiling

(**κέραμος**, *pottery-ware*, hence a *roof-tile*; zomp. Xenoph. *Mem.* 3, 1. 7). The rendering of the V. at ^{<1819>}Luke 5:19, “through the tiling” (**διὰ τῶν κεράμων**), occasions difficulty when we remember that houses in Palestine are not covered with tiles, as they frequently are in Asia Minor and in Western countries. Hence many have suggested that Luke, being a native probably of Antioch, used the word “tile” in the general sense of roof-material (Eusebius; *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 4; Jerome, *Prol. to Com. on St. Matthew*, 7:4; Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1. 367). As to the particular part or substance thus “broken up,” most interpreters have thought that it was the layer of sticks, brush, and hard-rolled clay which constitutes the ordinary flat roof of an Oriental house (Arundell, *Tray. in Asia Minor*, 1, 1171; Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 35), which Dr. Thomson says he has often seen thus removed for letting down grain, straw, or other articles (*Land and Book*, 2, 7). But this “operation would have raised an intolerable dust, such as to drive the audience entirely away. Some suppose, therefore, that it was merely the scuttle through which *the paralytic was lowered (Lightfoot, *Horaе Hebraicae*, *ad loc.*), an explanation that scarcely meets the terms of the narrative. It probably was the awning (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 211) or rather board or leafy screen over the gallery or interior veranda (Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* *ad loc.*), which was easily removed and as easily replaced. **SEE HOUSE.**

Tillage

(prop. **hd/b[]** *abodah*, ^{<1326>}1 Chronicles 27:26; ^{<1607>}Nehemiah 10:37, *work*, i.e. “service” or “bondage,” as elsewhere rendered; so occasionally **db[]**; to “till,” “tilleth,” “tiller,” etc., lit. *worker*; but **ryn**, *nir*, ^{<1133>}Proverbs 13:23, means *fallow ground*, as elsewhere rendered). **SEE AGRICULTURE.**

Tillemont, Louis Sebastien Le Nain de

a French divine and scholar, was born in Paris, Nov. 30, 1637, and at the age of ten years entered the famous seminary of Port-Royal. He soon manifested great proficiency in the study of history, and at the age of eighteen began to read the fathers, the lives of the apostles, and their successors in the primitive Church, and drew up for himself an account of early ecclesiastical history, in the manner of Usher’s *Annals*. When twenty-three, he entered the Episcopal seminary at Beauvais, where he remained

three or four years, and then went to reside with Godefroi Hermant, a canon of the Cathedral of Beauvais, with whom he remained five or six years he then returned to Paris, and, after receiving the other orders of the Church, was ordained priest in 1676, and settled at Tillemont, whence he took his name. About this time he was employed, along with M. de Sacy, on a *Life of St. Louis*, and two years after traveled in Flanders and Holland. Returning, he continued his studies, and in 1690 began to publish his *History of the Emperors*. To a complete knowledge of ecclesiastical history he joined an exemplary humility and regularity of conduct; and, regardless of dignities, wished for nothing but retirement. The practicing of watchings and austerities brought upon him a disease, of which he died Jan. 10, 1698. He published, *Lives of the Emperors* (1690-1701, 5 vols. 4to): —*Memoires pour servir al'Histoire Ecclesiastique des six premiers Sicles*, etc. (1693, 16 vols. 4to): —and supplied materials for several works published by others: *Life of St. Louis*, begun by De Sacy and finished and published by La Chaise; *Lives of St. Athanasius* and *St. Basil*, Toby G. Hermant; *Lives of Tertullian* and *Origen*, by Forse, under the name of La Mothe He left in MS. a *Memoir concerning William de Saint-Amour*, and the *Disputes between the Dominicans and the University*: —*Lie of Isabella*, sister of St. Louis: —*Remarks on the Breviaries of Mans and Paris*: —*A Legend for the Breviary of Evreux*: —and *History of the Sicilian Kings of Anjou*.

Tillemont, Pierre Le Nain de

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

Tillet, Jean du

a French prelate, was born in Paris about the beginning of the 16th century; and by the influence of his brother, the earl of Brussiere (himself a learned historiographer), he became prothonotary of the cardinal of Lorraine, who rewarded him with the bishopric of Saint-Brieuc in 1553. The following

year he exchanged this see for that of Meaux. He died at Paris, Nov. 19, 1570. He was the author of many works on French Church history, for which see Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Tillinghast, Nicholas Power

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

Tillotson, John

archbishop of Canterbury, was born at Sowerby, Yorkshire, in October, 1630. He entered Clare Hall, Cambridge, April 23, 1647, and, graduating in 1650, was made a fellow in 1651. He left college in 1656, and became tutor to the son of Edmund Prideaux, Cromwell's attorney-general. Receiving his first impression among the Puritans, he was led to conformity by the works of Chillingworth and the influence of scholars with whom he had become intimate. He submitted to the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and became curate of Cheshunt, in Hertfordshire. He was chosen (Dec. 16)

minister of St. Mary's, Aldermanbury; but, declining this, was presented, in June, 1663, to the rectory of Kiddington, Suffolk. His residence there was short, he being made preacher of the Society of Lincoln's Inn on the 26th of the same month. In 1664 he was appointed Tuesday lecturer at St. Lawrence's, in the Jewry, and was now recognized as a distinguished preacher. He received his degree of D.D. in 1666, and in 1668 preached the sermon at the consecration of Wilkins to the bishopric of Chester. In 1670 he was made a prebendary of Canterbury, in 1672 was advanced to a deanery of that Church, and in 1673 was preferred to a prebend in the Church of St. Paul. When a declaration of liberty of conscience was published in 1672, with a view to indulge the papists, Tillotson and the clergy were directed by their bishops to preach against popery; and when archbishop Sheldon advised with the clergy as to what reply he should make to the king if his majesty should disapprove their course, Dr. Tillotson suggested this answer: "Since his majesty professed the Protestant religion, it would be a thing without precedent that he should forbid his clergy preaching in defense of it." On April 2, 1680, he preached before the king, at Whitehall, a sermon on ⁽¹⁶²⁴⁵⁾Joshua 24:15, in which he expressed a sentiment of intolerance that exposed him to heavy censure. He was afterwards admitted into a high degree of confidence with king William and queen Mary; was appointed clerk of the closet to the king, March 27, 1689; and was authorized, in August, by the chapter of his cathedral, to exercise archiepiscopal jurisdiction over the province of Canterbury, Sancroft having been suspended for refusing the new oath. His ambition had never extended further than to desire the exchange of his deanery of Canterbury for that of St. Paul's, which was granted him in September. The king, however, nominated him to the archbishopric of Canterbury, April 23, 1691, and he was consecrated (May 31) in Bow Church. The rest of his life was spent in laboring for the good of the Church and the reformation of all abuses among the clergy. He died Nov. 24, 1694. He published, *The Rule of Faith* (1666, 8vo), and several volumes of *Sermons*. A collective edition of his works, *254 Sermons, Rule of Faith, and Prayers*, composed for his use, etc., was published in 1707 (3 vols. fol.). There have been later editions both of his complete works and of selections there from. His *Works*, with *Life* by Thomas Birch, D.D., were published by Ravenet (1752, 3 vols. fol.). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Ti'lon

(Heb. marg. *Tilon'*, [^]wbyTætext, *Tulon'*, [^]wbWT, *gift* [Simonis] or *scorn* [Gesenius]; Sept. **θιλών** v.r. **Ἴνών**; Vulg. *Thiilon*), the last named of the four sons of Shimon, a descendant of Judah (^{<100>}1 Chronicles 4:20). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

Tilton, Albert Freeman

a Baptist minister, was born in Deerfield, N. H., Oct. 15, 1809. He was a graduate of Water Tille College in the class of 1835. He taught the next two years, first, in Townshend, Vt., where he was the principal of an academy in that place, and then in Boone County, Ky. For four years—(1837-41) he was the principal of a Baptist institution in Franklin, Ind., which became Franklin College in 1844. In 1841 he was ordained as an evangelist at Franklin, and preached in two or three places in Indiana. He was pastor of the Baptist Church in West Waterville for two years (1844-46), and for the next three years he supplied two or three churches. In 1849 he returned to Franklin, Ind., where he died Sept. 26, 1850. (J. C. S.)

Tilton, David

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

Tilton, Nathan

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

Timae'us

(Τιμαῖος), father of the blind beggar cured by Christ (^{<4106>}Mark 10:46), the son being thence called Bartimaeus (q.v.). B.C. ante 29.

Timberlake, John W.

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

Timbrel

Picture for Timbrel 1

(ἄΤροφῆ, ^{<2153>}Exodus 15:20; ^{<0713>}Judges 11:34; ^{<1015>}2 Samuel 6:5; ^{<1338>}1 Chronicles 13:8; ^{<1812>}Job 21:12; ^{<1882>}Psalms 81:2; 149:3; 150:4; elsewhere rendered “tabret;” also. the cognate verb ἄρῖ; *taphâph*, ^{<1985>}Psalms 68:25; rendered “tabor,” Nehemiah 2, 7; *τύμπανον*, Jude 3:7) The Heb. word is an imitative one occurring in many languages not immediately connected with each other. It is the same as the Arabic and Persian *duf*, which in the Spanish becomes *adufe*, a tambourine. The root, which signifies to *beat* or *strike*, is found in the Greek *τύπανον* or *τύμπανον*, Lat. *tympanum*, Ital. *tamburo*, Span. *tambor*, Fr. *tambour*, Proverbs *tabor*, Engl. *tabor*, *tabouret*, *timbrel*, *tambourine*, A. S. *dubban*, to strike, Engli *tap*, and many others. It is usual for etymologists to quote likewise the Arab. *tunbur* as the original of *tambour* and *tabor*; but, unfortunately, the *tunbur* is a guitar, and not a drum (Russell, *Aleppo* [2nd ed.], 1, 152). The parallel Arabic word is *tabl*, which denotes a kind of drum, and is the same with the Rabb. Heb. *tabla* and (Span. *atabal*, a-kettle-drum. The instrument and the word may have come to us through the Saracens. In old English *tabor* was used for any drum. Thus Robof Gloucester (ed. Hearne, 1810), p. 396:

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

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

Picture for Timbrel 2

*"Or Minoe's whistling to his tabouret,
Selling a laughter for a cold meal's meat"*
(*Hall, Sat. 4:1, 78*).

Tabret is a contraction of *tabouret*. The word is retained in the A.V. from Coverdale's translation in all passages except ^{<2312>}Isaiah 30:32, where it is omitted in Coverdale, and ^{<2513>}Ezekiel 28:13, where it is rendered "beauty."

The Heb. *toph* is undoubtedly the instrument de-scribed by travelers as the *dufor dif* of the Arabs. It was used in very early times by the Syrians of Padanaram at their merry-makings (^{<0317>}Genesis 31:27). It was played principally by women (^{<0151>}Exodus 15:20; ^{<0713>}Judges 11:34; ^{<0806>}1 Samuel 18:6; ^{<0825>}Psalms 68:25 [26]) as an accompaniment to the song and dance (comp. ud. 3, 7), and appears to have been worn by them as an ornament: (^{<2806>}Jeremiah 31:4). The *toph* was one of the instruments, played by the young prophets whom Saul met on his return from Samuel (^{<0905>}1 Samuel 10:5), and by the Levites in the Temple-band (^{<1005>}2 Samuel 6:5; ^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 13:8). It accompanied the merriment of feasts (Isaiah 5, 12; 24, 8), and the joy of triumphal processions (^{<0713>}Judges 11:34; ^{<0806>}1 Samuel 18:6), when the women came out to meet the warriors returning from victory, and is everywhere a sign of happiness and peace (^{<0812>}Job 21:12; ^{<2312>}Isaiah 30:32; ^{<2806>}Jeremiah 31:4). So in the grand triumphal entry of God into his Temple, described in strong figures in Psalm 18, the procession is made up by the singers who marched in front, and the players on stringed instruments who brought up the rear, while on either side danced the young maidens with their timbrels (ver. 25 [26]).

The passage of Ezekiel, 28:13, is obscure, and appears to have been early corrupted. Instead of $\dot{U}yP,T\mu$ "thy tabrets," the Vulg. and Targ. Read $\dot{U}2\partial y p j$; "thy beauty," which is the rendering adopted in Coverdale's and Cranmer's Bible. The Sept. seems to have read $\dot{U}k\psi\delta$, as in ver. 16. If the

ordinary text be adopted, there is no reason for taking *toph*,; as Jerome suggests, in the sense of the setting of a gem, “pala qua gemma continetur.” *SEE TABRET*.

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

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

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

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

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

Time

(the proper and usual rendering of *t* [*eeth* [later *ˆmz*] *zemdna*]. a general word, Gr. *χρόνος*, *space* of duration; while *d* [*moed*, *Katpoe*, signifies a *fixed* time, either by human or divine appointment, or the natural

seasons). A peculiar use of the term occurs in the phrase “a time, times, and a half” (Heb. ⲙⲓⲃⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲛ ⲁⲓⲃⲉⲓⲛ ^{<27137>} Daniel 12:7; Chald. ⲓⲗ ⲡⲓⲛⲉⲛ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛ ^{<61214>} Revelation 12:14), in the conventional sense of *three years and a half* (see Josephus, *War*, 1, 1). The following are the regular divisions of time among the Hebrews, each of which invariably preserves its strict literal sense, except where explicitly modified by the immediate context. We here treat them severally but together, in the order of their extension, and refer to the several articles for more detailed information. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

1. Year (ⲏⲛⲥ;, so called from the *change* of the seasons). The years of the Israelites, like those of the modern Jews, were *lunar* (Rabbinical ⲏⲛⲉⲃⲉⲓⲛ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛ), of 354 d. 8 h. 48 min. 38 sec., consisting of twelve (unequal) lunar months; and as this falls short of the true year (an astronomical month having 29 d. 12 h. 44 min. 2.84 sec.), they were obliged, in order to preserve the regularity of harvest and vintage (^{<12316>} Exodus 23:16), to add a month occasionally, so as to make it on the average coincide with the solar year (Rabbinical ⲏⲛⲉⲃⲉⲓⲛ ⲏⲓⲛⲉⲃⲉⲓⲛ), which has 365 d. 5 h. 48 min. 45 sec. The method of doing this among the very ancient Hebrews is entirely unknown (see a conjecture in Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 490; another in Credner, *Joel*, p. 218). The Talmudists find mention of an intercalation under Hezekiah (^{<43112>} 2 Chronicles 30:2; see Mishna, *Pesach.* 4:9), but without foundation (see, however, on the reconcilment of the lunar with the solar year, Galen, *Comment.* 1, in Hippoc. *Epidem.* [Opp. ed. Kihn. 13:23]). Among the later Jews (who called an intercalated year ⲧⲣⲃⲓⲛ ⲏⲓⲛⲉⲃⲉⲓⲛ, in distinction from a common year, or ⲏⲓⲛⲉⲃⲉⲓⲛ ⲏⲓⲛⲉⲃⲉⲓⲛ), an intercalary month was inserted after Adar, and was hence called Vedar (ⲣⲃⲱⲛ), or second Adar (ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲃⲉⲓⲛ ⲣⲃⲱⲛ) (Mishna, *Eduyoth*, 7:7; see the distinctions of the Gemarists in Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 4:1; comp. Ben David, *Zur Berechn. u. Gesch. d. jüd. Kalend.* [Berl. 1817]; Ideler, *ut sup.* p. 537 sq.; Anger, *De Temp. in Act. Ap. Ratione*, 1, 31 sq.). The intercalation (ⲣⲱⲃⲓⲛ) was regularly decreed by the Sanhedrim, which observed the rule never to add a month to the sabbatical year. It usually was obliged to intercalate every third year, but occasionally had to do so in two consecutive years.

The Israelitish year began, as the usual enumeration of the months shows (^{<10234>} Leviticus 23:34; 25:9; ^{<04911>} Numbers 9:11; ^{<12218>} 2 Kings 25:8; ^{<23112>} Jeremiah 39:2; comp. 1 Macc. 4:52; 10:21), with Abib or Nisan (see Esther 3, 7),

subsequent to and in accordance with the Mosaic arrangement (^{<0212>}Exodus 12:2),’ which had a retrospective reference to the departure out of Egypt (9, 31; see Baihr, *Symbolik*, 2, 639). Yet as we constantly find this arrangement spoken of as a *festal* calendar, most Rabbinical and many Christian scholars understand that the *civil* year began, as with the modern Jews, with Tisri (October), but the *ecclesiastical* year with Nisan (Mishna, *Rosh Hash-shanah*, 1, 1; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 3,3. See also Rosenmüller, on ^{<0212>}Exodus 12:2; Hitzig, *Jesa.* p. 335; Seyffarth, *Chronol. Sacra*, p. 34 sq.). But this distinction is probably a post-exilian reckoning (Havernick argues against its inference from ^{<2610>}Ezekiel 40:1), which was an accommodation to the time of the arrival of returned exiles in Palestine (Ezra 3, 1 sq.; ^{<4073>}Nehemiah 7:73; 8:1 sq.), and later fell into harmony with the Seleucid era, which dated from October (see Benfey, *Monats-nam.* p. 217; and comp. 1 Macc. 4:52; 10:21; 2 Macc. 15:37). Yet this has little countenance from the enactment of the festival of the seventh new moon (^{<0234>}Leviticus 23:24; ^{<0206>}Numbers 29:1-6), which has in the Mosaic legislation certainly a different import from the Rabbinical ordinance (see Vriemoet, *Observ. Misc.* p. 284 sq.; Gerdes, *De Festo Clangoris* [Duisb. 1700; also in his *Exercit. Acad.*]). **SEE NEW MOON.** Nor does the expression “in the end of the year” (**hnVhi t aæB**), with reference to the Feast of Tabernacles (^{<0236>}Exodus 23:16), favor this assumption (see Ideler, p. 493). Other passages adduced (^{<4304>}Job 29:4; Joel 2, 25), as well as the custom of many other nations (Credner, *ut sup.* p. 209 sq.), are a very precarious argument. Nevertheless, it is clear that even in the pre-exilian period of the theocracy, the autumn, as being the close of the year’s labor, was often regarded among the agrarian population as a terminal date (Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 493 sq.; see Dresde, *Annus Jud. ex Antiq. Illust.* [Lips. 1766; merely Rabbinic]; Selden, *De Anno Civili Vett. Hebr.* [Lond. 1644; also in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 17] Nagel, *De Calendario Vett. Ebr...* [Altdorf, 1746]). Seyffarth maintains that even prior to the destruction of Jerusalem the Israelites reckoned by lunar months (*Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 2, 344 sq.). The prevailing belief, however, that they had from the first such a year has been of late combated by Bottcher (*Prob. alttest. Schrifterkldr.* p. 283; *De Inferis*, 1, 125) and Credner (*Joel*, p. 210 sq.), and most stoutly by Seyffarth (*Chronol. Sacra*, p. 26 sq.). Credner holds that the Israelites originally had a solar year of thirty-day months, and that this was exchanged for the lunar year when the three great festivals were accurately determined, i.e. about the time of king Hezekiah and Josiah (on the contrary, see Von Bohlen, *Genes.* p. 105 sq.; Benfey and Stern, *Ueber*

die Monatsnamen, p. 5 sq.). Seyffarth, however, ascribes the solar year to the Jews down to about 200 B.C.

A well-defined and universal era was unknown among the ancient Hebrews. National events are sometimes dated from the departure out of Egypt (^{<1290>}Exodus 19:1; ^{<4633>}Numbers 33:38; ^{<1000>}1 Kings 6:1), usually from the accession of the kings (as in Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah), later from the beginning of the exile (^{<2632>}Ezekiel 33:21; 40:1). Jeremiah reckons the Captivity according to the years of Nebuchadnezzar (^{<2520>}Ezekiel 25:1; 52:12, 28 sq.), but Ezekiel (1, 1) otherwise. The post-exilic books date according to the regal years of the Persian masters of Palestine (^{<1040>}Ezra 4:26; 6:15; 7:7 sq.; ^{<4000>}Nehemiah 2:1; 5, 4; 13:6; ^{<3000>}Haggai 1:1; 2:11; ^{<3000>}Zechariah 7:1). But as Syrian vassals the Jews adopted the Greek (1 Macc. 1, 10) or Seleucid era (^{two f v}] ^{yin} ~~era~~ *contractum*, since it was used in contracts generally, Arab. *karyakh ahu-ikerfin*), which dated from the overthrow of Babylon by Seleucus Nicator I (Olymp. 117, 1), and began with the autumn of B.C. 312 (see Ideler, *Handb. d. Chronol.* 1, 448). This reckoning is employed in the books of the Maccabees, which, however, singularly differ by one year between themselves, the second book being about one year behind the first in its dates (comp. 1 Macc. 6:16 with 2 Macc. 11:21; 1 Macc. 6:20 with 2 Macc. 13:1); from which it would seem that the author of 2 Macc. had a different epoch for the ser. Seleuc. from the author of 1 Macc., with the latter of whom Josephus agrees in his chronology. Inasmuch as 1 Macc. always counts by Jewish months in the Seleucid sera (1, 57; 4:52, 59; 7:43; 14:27; 16:14), and these are computed from Nisan (10, 21; 16:14)-the second book likewise counts by Jewish months (1, 18; 10:5; 15:37: on the contrary 11:21) we might suppose that the former begins the Seleucid sera with the spring of B.C. 312, while the latter begins it with the autumn of the same year (Petav. *Raionar.* 10:45; Prideaux, 2, 267, etc.), a conclusion to which other circumstances likewise point (Ideler, *ut sup.* p. 531 sq.; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopsis*, p. 451 sq.). What Wernsdorf objects' (*De Fide Maccab.* p. 19 sq.) is not of much importance; but we cannot thence infer that the Babylonians began the Seleucid sera with the autumn of 3) 1 (Seyffarth, *Chronol. Sacra*, p. 20). See Hosmann, *De Aera Seleucid. et Regum Syriae Successione* (Kil. 1752). Still another national reckoning is given in 1 Macc. 13:41 sq., namely, from the year of the deliverance of the Jews from the Syrian yoke, i.e. seventeen era Seleuc., or from the autumn of B.C. 143 (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:6, 6), and this era appears upon Samaritan coins

(Eckhel, *Doctrina Numor. Vett.* I, 3, 463 sq.). On other Jewish eras see the Mishna (*Götting*, 8:5). *SEE YEAR*.

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

Prior to the exile the individual months were usually designated by numbers (the twelfth month occurs in ^{<1257>}2 Kings 25:27, ^{<2521>}Jeremiah 52:31; ^{<3911>}Ezekiel 29:1; comp. ^{<1047>}1 Kings 4:7); yet we find also the following names: *Earn-month* (**bybāh**; **vdj** ^{<1034>}Exodus 13:4; 23:15; ^{<5101>}Deuteronomy 16:1, etc.), corresponding to the later Nisan; *Bloom-month* (**wzā** ^{or} **wyzā**; **vdj** ^{<1081>}1 Kings 6:1, 37), the second month; *Rain-month* (**l wB j rj**, 6:38), the eighth (connected by Benfey, p. 182, with the word **l Bd** ^[Bi]; see the Talmudic interpretation cited by him, p. 16); *Freshet-month* (**μyntāh**; **j rj**, 8:2), the seventh; all of which seem to be mere appellatives (see. Benfey and Stern, *Ueber die Monatsnamen einiger*

alten Vilker [Berl. 1836], p. 2). After the exile the months received the following names (Gemara, *Pesach.* 94:2; Targ. *Sheni* on Esther 3, 7 sq.; comp. Mishna, *Shekal.* 3, 1): 1. *Nisan* ([˘]*syna* Nehemiah 2, 1; Esther 3, 7), the first month, in which the Passover (q.v.) was held (and in which the vernal equinox fell, Joseph us, *Ant.* 3, 10, 5), corresponding, in general, to our April (Ideler, *Chronol.* 1. 491), and answering (Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 10, 5; *War.* 5, 3, 1) to the Macedonico-Syrian *Xanthicus*, also (*Ant.* 2, 14, 6) to the Egyptian month *Pharmuthi*, which last, however, was March 27-April 25 of the Julian calendar (Ideler, ut *sup.* 1, 143); 2. *lydr* (*γλαδ* Targ. on ^{<402>}2 Chronicles 30:2); 3. *Sivan* ([˘]*wys* Est, ^{<709>}Esther 8:9; *Σειουάλ*, Bar. 1, 8); 4. *Tammuz* (*zMMT*); 5. *Ab.* (*ba*); 6. *Elul* (*l w l ē*, ^{<465>}Nehemiah 6:15; *Ἐλουάλ*, 1 Macc. 14:27), the last month of the civil year in the post-exilian age (Mishna, *Shebiith*, 10:2; *Erubin*, 3, 7); 7. *Tishri* (*yræſ*), in which the festivals of Atonement and Tabernacles fell (also the autumnal equinox); 8. *Marcheshvdn* ([˘]*wv* *rihi* *Μασουάν* or *Μαρσουάνη*, Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 3, 3); 9. *Kislev* (*wl sKa* Nehemiah 1, 1; ^{<307>}Zechariah 7:1; *Χασλεῦ*, 1 Macc. 1, 54); 10. *Tebeth* (*tbæ* Esther 2, 16); 11. *Shebat* (*fbv*) ^{<307>}Zechariah 1:7; *Σαβάτ*, 1 Macc. 16:14); 12. *Addr* (*r22da*) Esther 3, 7; 8:12; *Ἀδάρ*, 2 Macc. 15:37); 13. *Ve-A ddr* (*rdaw*, strictly *Va-Adar*, *rdaw*), or *second Adar* (*rda;ynæ* or *hartB*). Occasionally, however, the months were newly numbered in the post-exilian period likewise (^{<500>}Haggai 1:1; 2:1 sq.; ^{<307>}Zechariah 1:1; 8:19; ^{<473>}Nehemiah 7:73; 8:3, 14; ^{<704>}Daniel 10:4; 1 Macc. 9,-3, 54; 10:21; 13:51). On the origin and signification of those names, see Benfey, *op. cit.* p. 24 sq.; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 702, 947. From the fact that the second book of Maccabees and Josephus reckon according to the Syro-Macedonian months (*Dioscurus*, *Xanthicus*, etc.) it does not follow that the Jews adopted this calendar in the Seleuciderm. In 2 Macc. the Egyptian months (*Epiphi*, *Pachon*) are named. See Pott, in the *Hall. Lit.* — *Zeit.* 1839, No. 4650; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 356 sq.; Michaelis, *Comment.* 1763-68, *Oblat.* p. 16 sq.; Langhausen, *De Maense Vett. Hebr. Lunari* (Jen. 1713; also in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 17); Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 448 sq. 509 sq. **SEE MONTH.**

3. Week (*[wbv*; lit. *sevened*). This division of the synodal lunar month into seven days (whence the Heb. name) early prevailed among the Israelites, as among other Shemitic people and the Egyptians (Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 178; 2, 473); but only among the Israelites was this arrangement associated with

cosmogony, with law, and with religion itself, so as to enter into real civil life and form the basis of the whole cycle of festivals. *SEE SABBATH*. But ordinarily, days rather than weeks (as also among the Greeks and Romans) constituted the conventional mode of computing time (but see ^{<182B>}Leviticus 12:5; ^{<270B>}Daniel 10:2 sq.). In the post-exilian period the reckoning by weeks became more customary, and at length special names for particular week-days came into use, enumerated after the formula ἐν μιᾷ, or πρώτῳ σαββάτων, or σαββάτου, etc. (^{<416B>}Mark 16:2, 9; ^{<240B>}Luke 24:1; ^{<400B>}Acts 20:7; ^{<644B>}1 Corinthians 16:2; see Epiphanius, *Hcer.* 70, 12; so also in Chald. with **atBḡ**ior **aTBi**; see Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 273. The word ἑβδομάς does not occur in the New Test.; see also Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 481). The astronomical derivation of the week naturally grows out of the obvious fact (*Chronol.* 1, 60) that the moon changes about every seven (properly seven and three eighths) days, so that the lunar month divides itself into four quarters. Hence nations which have no historical relation in this respect nevertheless agree in the observance (*Chronol.* 1, 88). The days of the week were named long before the Christian era on regular astrological principles from the seven planets (Lobeck, *Aglaopham.* p. 933 sq.), which (according to Dion Cass. 37:18) was an Egyptian invention. They began with Saturn's day (Saturday), inasmuch as Saturn was the outermost planet; but among the Jews this day (the Sabbath) was the last of the week, and so the Jewish (and Christian) week commences with Sunday. But these heathenish names were never in general use among the Jews (see Bahr, *Symbol.* 2, 585 sq.). Weeks or heptads of years belong, among the Jews, to prophetic poetry; but in one instance they occur in a literal sense in prose (^{<2072B>}Daniel 7:24-27), as also among the Romans such *annorum hebdomades* were known (Gell. 3, 10; Censorinus, *De Die Nat.* 14). *SEE WEEK*.

4. Day (μῦθ so called from its *heat*; ἡμέρα). The civil day (νοχθήμερον, ^{<4712B>}2 Corinthians 11:25) was reckoned by the Hebrews from sundown to sundown (^{<1832B>}Leviticus 23:32); most other ancient nations computed time according to the moon's course (Pliny, 2, 79; Tacitus, *Germ.* c. 11; Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 6:18; Isidore, *Orig.* 5, 30; Censorinus, *De Die Nat.* 23); but before the exile they seem not to have divided the day into special or well-defined portions beyond the natural divisions of morning (ῥαβ see the definition for the Temple-service in the Mishna, *Tamid*, 3, 2), noon (μῦαθx; ^{<14516B>}Genesis 43:16; ^{<1839B>}Deuteronomy 28:29; comp. μῦθi μῦθj ,

^{<0081>}Genesis 18:11 Samuel 11:11; and **μῶθι ῥῆτι** ^{<008>}Proverbs 4:18), and evening (**br** [, comp. also **ἄνῃ**, the morning and evening breeze), which were in general use, as among the modern Arabs (Niebuhr, *Bedouin*, p. 108 sq.). During the exile the Jews appear to have adopted the division into regular hours (Chald. **h**[**v**] (^{<006>}Daniel 4:16; 5, 5; 2 Esdr. 6:24), as (according to Herod. 2, 109) the twelve hours of the day originated among the Babylonians; and in the New Test. the hours are frequently enumerated. As, however, every natural day of the year was divided into twelve hours (^{<010>}John 11:9; see Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 84 sq.), they must have been unequal at different seasons of the year, since in the latitude of Palestine the longest summer day lasts from about four A.M. to eight P.M. (Mayr, *Reis.* 3, 15), being about four hours longer than the shortest. The hours of the day (for those of the night, **SEE NIGHT-WATCH**) were naturally counted from sunrise (cock-crowing, **rbgh tayrq**, was a designation of time observed in the Temple, Mishna, *Tamid*, 1, 2); whence the *third* hour (^{<008>}Matthew 20:3; Acts 2, 15) corresponds about to our nine o'clock A.M. (the time when the market-place was full of men, **πλήθουσα ἀγορά**; see Kype, *Observat.* 1, 101 sq.; also the first hour of prayer, Acts 2, 15); the end of the *sixth* hour (^{<006>}Matthew 20:5; ^{<004>}John 19:14) to midday; with the *eleventh* hour (^{<006>}Matthew 20:6; ^{<054>}Mark 15:34) the day inclined to a close and labor ceased (see also John 1, 40; 4:52; Acts 3, 1; 10:3). There were three daily hours of prayer morning, noon, and night; besides, there is occasionally mention of prayer four times a day (^{<008>}Nehemiah 9:3); but a quarterly division of the day (as inferred by Lücke, *Joh.* 2, 756) is not certain in the New Test. Yet it is somewhat doubtful whether the evangelists, John at least, always reckon according to the Jewish hours (Clericus, *Ad Joan.* 19:14; Michaelis, in the *Hamb. verm. Bibliothek*, 3, 338 sq.; Rettigin the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, 1, 101 sq.; Hug, in the *Freiburger Zeitschr.* 5, 90 sq.). **SEE DAY.**

5. Hour (Chald. **h**[**v**]; Gr. **ῥα**). The Oriental Asiatics, especially the Babylonians (Herod. 2, 109, Vitruv. 9:9), had from early times sundials (*horologiasolaria*) or shadow-measures (Pliny, 36:15); and hence, from the intercourse with Babylon, this useful contrivance may have been introduced into Palestine even before the exile. At all events, something of the kind seems to be meant by the “degrees of Ahaz” (**zj a;t/I [ῥῆti** ^{<008>}Isaiah 38:8; comp. ^{<009>}2 Kings 20:9), either an obelisk which cast its shade upon the steps of the palace, or perhaps a regular gnomon with

degrees marked on it (Targ. Jonath. **ay[ç ^ba It**; Symmachus, **ὥρολόγιον**; Jerome, *horologium* ; see Salmas. *Ad Solin.* p. 447 sq.; Martini, *Abhandl. v. d. Sonnenuhren der Alten* [Leips. 1777]; also *De Haeroloogiis Vett. Sciothericis* [Amst. 1797]). The Romans after U. C. 595 used water-clocks (*clepsydrae*, Vitruv. 9:9, Pliny, 7:60) for the watch room of post-courses (Veget. *Mil.* 3, 8) and for regulating the continuance of speaking (Philo, *Opp.* 2, 597; Becker, *Gallus*, 1, 187). Whether this practice prevailed among the Jews in the time of Christ, we know not (Zeltner, *De Horologio Caiaphae* [Altdorf. 1721], does not: touch the point); but they could not have been ignorant of some means of measuring time, whether dials or water-clocks, since the latter are in frequent use in the modern East (Niebuhr, *Reis.* 2, 74). For a peculiar device for dividing the hours mentioned by the Talmudists, see Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 282; see also Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 230 sq. **SEE HOUR.**

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

Times, Regarder of

SEE OBSERVER OF TIMES.

Tim'na

(Heb. *Timna*, [nmT] ~~rest~~ *restraint*), the name of a woman and also of a man.

1. (Sept. **θαμνά**) A concubine of Eliphaz, son of Esau, and by him mother of Amalek (⁻⁰¹³⁶²Genesis 36:12; named [apparently only] in 1 Chronicles 1, 36 [by an ellipsis] as a *son* of Eliphaz); probably the same as the sister of Lotan, and daughter of Seir the Horite (⁻⁰¹³⁶²Genesis 36:22; 1 Chronicles 1, 39). B.C. considerably post 1963.

2. (Sept. **θαμνά** *v.r.* **θαμνόν**; “Timnah.”) The first named of the Esauite “dukes” or sheiks in Mount Seir (⁻⁰¹³⁶⁴Genesis 36:40; 1 Chronicles 1, 51). B.C. long post 1963.

Tim'nah

(Heb. *Timnah'*, hnmT] ~~port~~ *portion*), the name of several places in Palestine, which appears in the original, either simple or compounded, in several

forms, not always accurately represented in the A. V. We treat under this head only the simple name, reserving the compounds for a separate article. *SEE TIMNA.*

1. The place near which Tamar entrapped Judah into intercourse with her (⁽⁻⁰⁶⁸²⁾Genesis 38:12, 13, 14; Heb. with **h** directive, *Timnathah*, **ht**;^{*} **nm**ⲓⲁ Sept. **θαμνά**; Vulg. *Thamnatha*; A.V. “to Timnath”). It had a road leading to it (ver. 14), and as it lay on high ground (ver. 12), it probably was the same with the Timnah in the mountain district of the tribe of Judah (⁽⁻⁰⁶⁵⁷⁾Joshua 15:57; Sept. **θαμνά** v.r. **θαμναθά**; Vulg. *Thamna*). As it lay in the same group with Maon, Ziph, and Carmel, south-east of Hebron (Keil, *Comment. ad loc.*), it may perhaps be identical with a ruined site upon a low hill on the west of the road between Ziph and Carmel, “called *Um el-Amod* (‘mother of the pillar’). Foundations and heaps of stones, with some cisterns, cover a small tract of ground, while two or three coarse columns mark the site probably of a village church, and give occasion for the name” (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 192; comp. p. 629).

2. A town near the north-west border of Judah, between Beth-shemesh and Ekron (⁽⁻⁰⁶⁵⁰⁾Joshua 15:10; Sept. **λίψ** v.r. **Νότς**; Vulg. *Thamna*). It is doubtless the same with the place of the same name in Dan (⁽⁻⁰⁶⁹³⁾Joshua 19:43, Heb. with **h** paragogic, *Timnathah*, **ht**;^{*} **nm**ⲓⲁ Sept. **θαμνά**; Vulg. *Themna*; A. V. “Thimnathah”), which lay in the vicinity of Ekron; and likewise with the residence of Samson’s first wife (⁽⁻⁰⁷⁴⁰⁾Judges 14:1, 2, 5; Heb. likewise with **h** appended; Sept. **θαμναθά**; Vulg. *Thamnatha*; A.V. “Timnath;” Josephus, **θαμνά**, *Ant.* 5, 8,5), which lay on the Philistine edge of the Shephelah (⁽⁻⁰⁷⁴⁴⁾Judges 14:1); and both are therefore the same place that was invaded by the Philistines in the time of Ahaz (⁽⁻⁴²⁸⁸⁾2 Chronicles 28:18; Sept. **θαμνά** ; Vulg. *Thamnan*). At this last date it had suburbs adjoining (“villages”); and in Samson’s day it contained vineyards, haunted, however, by such savage animals as indicate that the population was but sparse. It was on higher ground than Ashkelon (⁽⁻⁰⁷⁴⁹⁾Judges 14:19), but lower than Zorah, which we may presume was Samson’s ‘starting-point’ (⁽⁻⁰⁷³⁵⁾Judges 13:25). After the Danites had deserted their original allotment for the north, their towns would naturally fall into the hands of Judah, or of the Philistines, as the continual struggle between them might happen to fluctuate. In the later history of the Jews, Timnah must have been a, conspicuous place. It was fortified by Bacchides as one of the most important military posts of Judaea (**θαμνάθα**, 1 Macc. 9:50), and it

became the head of a district or toparchy, which was called after its name, and was reckoned the fourth in order of importance among the fourteen into which the whole country was divided at the time of Vespasian's invasion (Θαμνά, Josephus, *War*, 3, 3, 5; see Pliny, 5, 14). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Θαμνά, Thamna") confound it with the Timnah of Judah's adventure with Tamar, but say that it still existed as a large village near Diospolis on the road to Jerusalem. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 106), it is likewise mentioned in the Talmud (*Sotah*, fol. 10 b). The modern representative of all these various forms of the same name is probably *Tibneh*, a deserted village about two miles west of Ain Shems (Bethshemesh), among the broken undulating country by which the central mountains of this part of Palestine descend to the maritime plain (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 342; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 361).

Tim'nath-he'res

(Heb. *Timndth Cheres*, תִּנְנַתְחֵרֶשׁ , *Timnah of Heres*; Sept. Θαμναθαρές v.r. Θαμναθάρ ἕως ; Vulg. *Thamnatsare*; Judges 2, 9), or Tim'nath-se'rah (Heb. *Timndth-Serach*, יִרְסַח תִּנְנַתְחֵרֶשׁ *Timnah of Serah*; Sept.

Θαμναθσάρά and Θαμναθσασχάς, v.r. Θαμναθσασράχ and Θαμναθσασχάρη or Θαμναθσασχάρα; Vulg. *Thamnath Sara* and *Thamnath Sare*; ^{<6915>}Joshua 19:5; 24:30; Josephus, Θαμνά, *Ant.* 5, 1, 29), the name (varied only by the transposition of the last two consonants of the latter part) by which the city and burial-place of Joshua was known. The Jews adopt *Heres* as the real name; interpret it to mean "the sun;" and see in it a reference to the act of making the sun stand still, which is to them the greatest exploit of Joshua's life, as they state that the figure of the sun (*temunath ha-cheres*) was carved upon the sepulcher (Rashi, *Comment.* ad loc.). Others (as Fürst, 1, 442), while accepting *Heres* as the original form, interprets that word as "clay," and as originating in the character of the soil. Others, again, like Ewald (*Gesch.* 2, 347, 8) and Bertheau (*On Judges*), take *Serach* to be the original form, and *Heres* an ancient but unintentional error. It was the spot which at his own request was presented to Joshua after the partition of the country was completed (^{<6915>}Joshua 19:50), and in "the border" of which he was buried (24, 30). It is specified as "in Mount Ephraim on the north side of Mount Gaash." Timnathserah and the tomb of its illustrious owner were shown in the time of Jerome, who mentions them in the *Epitaphium Paulae* (§ 13). Beyond its being south of Shechem, he gives no indication of its position, but he dismisses it

with the following characteristic remark, a fitting tribute to the simple self-denial of the great soldier of Israel: “Satisque mirata est, quod distributor possessionum sibi montana et aspera delegisset. Hebrew tradition, in accordance with the above Rabbinical interpretation, identifies the place with *Kefar Cheres*, which is said by rabbi Jacob (Carmoly, *Itinéraires*, etc. p. 186), Hap-Parchi (Asher, *Benj. of Tudela*, p. 434), and other Jewish travelers down to Schwarz in our own day (*Palest.* p. 151), to be about five miles south of Shechem (Nablus) this is doubtless the present *Kefr-Harit*, or *Kefr-Haris*, which, however, is more nearly double that distance S.S.W. of Nablus. The modern village has three sacred places—one of Nebi Nan, i.e. the tomb of Nun; the second, Nebi Lusha, i.e. the tomb of Joshua; and the third, Nebi Kifl, i.e. the tomb of the “division by lot” (Conder, *Tent-Work in Palest.* 1, 78). Another and more promising identification has, however, been suggested in our own day by Dr. Smith (*Bibl. Sacra* [1843], p. 478 sq.). In his journey from, Jifna to Mejdél-Yaba, about six miles from the former, he discovered the ruins of a considerable town by the name of *Tibneh* on a gentle hill on the left (south) of the road. . Opposite the town (apparently to the south) was a much higher hill, in the north side of which are several excavated sepulchers, which in size and in the richness and character of their decorations resemble the so-called “Tombs of the Kings” at Jerusalem. The mound or tell stands on the south bank of a deep valley, surrounded by desolate mountains; by it a clear spring issues from a cave; to the south-west is a beautiful arid immense oak-tree, called by the natives Sheik et-Teim, “the chief, the servant of God.” South of the tell the hillside is hollowed out with many tombs, most of which are choked up. One of these has a porch with two rude pilasters, and along the façade are over two hundred niches ‘for lamps; the trailing boughs of the bushes above hang down picturesquely, and half cover the entrance. Within are three *kokim*, or cells, and through the central one it is possible to creep into a second chamber with only a single grave. Other tombs exist farther east, one having a sculptured facade; but the tomb described is the one popularly supposed to be that of Joshua (Conder, *ut sup.* p. 228). **SEE JOSHUA.**

Tim'nite

(Heb. *Timni'*, ϣⲏⲙⲏ Sept. θαμναθαῖος v.r. θαμνί), a designation of Samson's son's father-in-law, from his residence in Timnah (⁴⁷⁵⁶Judges 15:6).

Ti'mon

(Τίμων, a common Greek name), the fourth named of the seven, commonly called “deacons”, *SEE DEACON*, who were appointed to act as almoners on the occasion of complaints of partiality being raised by the Hellenistic Jews at Jerusalem (~~4m5~~ Acts 6:5). A.D. 29. Like his colleagues, Timon bears a Greek name, from which, taken together with the occasion of their appointment, it has been: inferred with much probability that the seven were themselves Hellenists. Nothing further is known of him with certainty; but in the *Synopsis de Vita et Morte Prophetarum, Apostolorum, et Discipulorum Domini*, ascribed to Dorotheus of Tyre (*Bibl. Max. Patrum*, 3, 149), we are informed that he was one of the “seventy-two” disciples (the catalogue of whom is a mere congeries of New-Test. names), and that he afterwards became bishop of Bostra (? “Bostra Arabum “), where he suffered martyrdom by fire.

Timotheans

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

Timo'theüs

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

1. A "captain of the Ammonites" (1 Macc. 5, 6), who was defeated on several occasions by Judas Maccabaeus (ver. 6,11, 34-44). B.C. 164. He was probably a Greek adventurer (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 12:8, 1) who had gained the leadership of the tribe. Thus Josephus (*ibid.* 13:8, 1, quoted by Grimm, *On 1 Macc.* 5, 6) mentions one "Zeno, surnamed Cotylas, who was despot of Rabbah" in the time of Johannes Hyrcanus.
2. In 2 Macc. a leader named Timotheus is mentioned as having taken part in the invasion of Nicanor (8, 30; 9:3). B.C. 166. At a later time he made great preparations for a second attack on Judas, but was driven to a stronghold, Gazara, which was stormed by Judas, and there Timotheus was taken-and slain (10, 24-37). It has been supposed that the events recorded in this latter narrative are identical with those in 1 Macc. 5, 6-8, an idea rendered more plausible by the similarity of the names Jazer and Gazara (in Lat. Gazer, Jazare, Gazara). But the name Timotheus was very common, and it is evident that Timotheus the Ammonitish leader was not slain at Jazer (1 Macc. 5, 34); and Jazer was on the east side of Jordan, while Gazara was almost certainly the same as Gezer. **SEE GAZARA; SEE JAAZER.** It may be urged further, in support of the substantial accuracy of 2 Macc., that the second campaign of Judas against the first-named Timotheus (1 Macc. 5, 27-44) is given in 2 Macc. 12:2-24 after the account of the capture of Gazara and the death of the second-named Timotheus there. Wernsdorf assumes that all the differences in the narratives are blunders in 2 Macc. (*De Fide Libr. Macc.* § 70), and in this he is followed by Grimm (*On 2 Macc.* 10, 24, 32). But, if any reliance is to be placed on 2 Macc., the differences of place and circumstances are rightly taken by Patricius to mark different events (*De Libr. Macc* § 32, p. 259).
3. The Greek form of the name of TIMOTHY **SEE TIMOTHY** (q.v.), the special follower of Paul (~~4401~~ Acts 16:1; 17 14, etc.). He is called by this name in the A. V. in every case except ~~4000~~ 2 Corinthians 1:1; Philenm, 1; ~~58123~~ Hebrews 13:23, and the epistles addressed to him (~~54002~~ 1 Timothy 1:2, 18; 6:20; ~~51002~~ 2 Timothy 1:2).

Tim'othy

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

1. His Early Life. —The disciple thus named was the son of one of those mixed marriages which, though condemned by stricter Jewish opinion, and placing their offspring on all but the lowest step in the Jewish scale of precedence, were yet not uncommon in the later periods of Jewish history. The children of these marriages were known as *manmerim* ("bastards"), and stood just above the Nethinim. This was, however, *caeteris paribus*. 'A bastard who was a wise student of the law was, in theory, above an ignorant high-priest (Gem. Hieros. *Horayoth*, fol. 84, in Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in Matthew 23:14); and the education of Timothy (2 Timothy 3, 15) may therefore have helped to overcome the prejudice, which the Jews would naturally have against: him on this ground. The mother was a Jewess, but the father's name is unknown; he was a Greek, i.e. a Gentile, by descent (Acts 16:1, 3). If in any sense a proselyte, the fact that the issue of the marriage did not receive the sign of the covenant would render it probable that he belonged to the class of half-converts, the so-called Proselytes of the Gate, not those of Righteousness, if such a class as the former existed. **SEE PROSELYTE.** The absence of any personal allusion to the father in the Acts or Epistles suggests the inference that he must have died or disappeared during his son's infancy. The care of the boy thus devolved upon his mother, Eunice, and her mother, Lois, who are both mentioned as sincere believers (2 Timothy 1:5). Under their training his education was emphatically Jewish. "From a child" he learned (probably in the Sept. version) to "know the Holy Scriptures" daily. The language of the Acts leaves it uncertain whether Lystra or Derbe was the residence of the devout family. The latter has been inferred, but without much likelihood, from a possible construction of Acts 20:4, the former from 16:1,2 (see Neander, *Pflanz. und Leit.* 1, 288; Alford and Huther, *ad loc.*). In either case the absence of any indication of the existence of a synagogue

makes this devout consistency more noticeable. We may think here, as at Philippi, of the few devout women going forth to their daily worship at some river-side; oratory (Conybeare, and Howson, 1, 211). The reading **παρὰ τίνων** in ^{<5184>}2 Timothy 3:14, adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, indicates that it was from them as well as from the apostle that the young disciple received his first impression of Christian truth. It would be, natural that a character thus fashioned should retain throughout something of a feminine piety. A constitution far from robust (^{<5483>}1 Timothy 5:23), a morbid shrinking from opposition and responsibility (^{<5042>}1 Timothy 4:12-16; 5, 20, 21; 6:11-14; 2 Timothy 2, 1-7), a sensitiveness even to tears (1:4), a tendency to an ascetic rigor which he had not strength to bear (^{<5483>}1 Timothy 5:23), united, as it often is, with a temperament exposed to some risk (see the elaborate dissertation *De Νεωτερικῆς Ἐπιθυμίας*, by Bosius, in Hase, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2) from “youthful lusts” (^{<5122>}2 Timothy 2:22) and the softer emotions (^{<5484>}1 Timothy 5:2) these we may well think of as characterizing the youth as they afterwards characterized the man.

2. His Conversion and Ordination. — The arrival of Paul and Barnabas in Lycaonia (^{<4416>}Acts 14:6) brought the message of glad tidings to Timothy and his mother, and they received it with “unfeigned faith” (^{<5106>}2 Timothy 1:5). A.D. 44. If at Lystra, as seems probable from ^{<5181>}2 Timothy 3:11, he may have witnessed the half-completed sacrifice, the half-finished martyrdom of Paul (^{<4419>}Acts 14:19). The preaching of the apostle on his return from his short circuit prepared him for a life of suffering (ver. 22). From that time his life and education must have been under the direct superintendence of the body of elders (ver. 23). During the interval of three years between the apostle’s first and second journeys, the youth had greatly matured. His zeal, probably his asceticism, became known both at Lystra and Iconium. The mention of the two churches as united in testifying to his character (16, 2) leads us to believe that the early work was prophetic, of the later, that he had already been employed in what was afterwards to be the great labor-of his life, as “the messenger of the churches,” and that it was his tried fitness for that office which determined Paul’s choice. Those who had the deepest insight into character and spoke with a prophetic utterance pointed to him (^{<5018>}1 Timothy 1:18; 4:14), as others had pointed before to Paul and Barnabas (^{<4432>}Acts 13:2), as specially fit for the missionary work in which the apostle was engaged. Personal feeling led Paul to the same conclusion (16, 3), and he was solemnly set apart (the

whole assembly of the elders laying their hands on him, as did the apostle himself) to do the work, and possibly to bear the title, of evangelist (~~5044~~1 Timothy 4:14; ~~5006~~2 Timothy 1:6; 4:5). Iconium has been suggested by Conybeare and Howson (*I*, 289) as the probable scene of the ordination.

A great obstacle, however, presented itself. Timothy, though inheriting, as it were, from the nobler side (Wettstein, *ad loc.*), and therefore reckoned as one of the seed of Abraham, had been allowed to grow up to the age of manhood without the sign of circumcision, and in this point he might seem to be disclaiming the Jewish blood that was in him and choosing to take up his position as a heathen. Had that been his real position, it would have been utterly inconsistent with Paul's principle of action to urge on him the necessity of circumcision (~~4378~~1 Corinthians 7:18; ~~808B~~Galatians 2:3 ; 5:2). As it was, his condition was that of a negligent, almost of an apostate, Israelite; and, though circumcision was nothing, and uncircumcision was nothing, it was a serious question whether the scandal of such a position should be allowed to frustrate all his efforts as an evangelist. The fact that no offence seems to have been felt hitherto is explained by the predominance of the Gentile element in the churches of Lycaonia (~~4447~~Acts 14:27). But his wider work would bring him into contact with the Jews, who had already shown themselves so ready to attack, and then the scandal would come out. They might tolerate a heathen, as such, in the synagogue or the church, but an uncircumcised Israelite would be *to* them a horror and a portent. With *a* special view *to* their feelings, making no sacrifice of principle, the apostle, who had refused to permit the circumcision of Titus, "took and circumcised" Timothy (16:3); and then, as conscious of no inconsistency, went on his *was* distributing the decrees of the council of Jerusalem, the great charter of the freedom of the Gentiles (ver. 4),

Henceforth Timothy was one of his most constant companions. Not since he parted from Barnabas had he found one whose heart so answered to his own. If Barnabas had been as the brother and friend of early days, he had *now* found one whom he could claim as his own by a spiritual parentage (~~5002~~2 Timothy 1:2). He calls him "son Timothy" (~~5018~~1 Timothy 1:18); "my own son in the faith" (ver. 2); "my beloved son" (~~4047~~1 Corinthians 4:17); "my workfellow" (~~5162~~Romans 16:21); "my brother" (which is probably the sense of *Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός* in ~~5001~~2 Corinthians 1:1).

3. His Evangelistic Labors and Journeys. —Continuing his second missionary tour, Paul now took Timothy with him, and, accompanied by

Silvanus, and probably Luke also, journeyed at length to Philippi (^{<4162>}Acts 16:12), where the young evangelist became conspicuous at once for his filial devotion and his zeal (^{<3162>}Philippians 2:22). His name does not appear in the account of Paul's work at Thessalonica, and it is possible that he remained some time at Philippi, and then acted as the messenger by whom the members of that Church sent what they were able to give for the apostle's wants (4, 15). He appears, however, at Beroea, and remains there when Paul and Silas are obliged to leave (^{<4174>}Acts 17:14), going on afterwards to join his master in Greece (1 Thessalonians 3, 2). Meanwhile he is sent back to Thessalonica (ibid.) an having special gifts for comforting and teaching. 'He returns from Thessalonica, not to Athens, but to Corinth, and his name appears united with Paul's in the opening words of both the letters written from that city to the Thessalonians (1 Thessalonians 1, 1; ^{<3001>}2 Thessalonians 1:1). 'Dr. Wordsworth infers from ^{<4701E>}2 Corinthians 9:11 and ^{<4185E>}Acts 18:5 that; Timothy brought contributions to the support of the-apostle from the Macedonian churches, and thus released him from his continuous labor as a tent-maker. Here, also, he was apparently active as an evangelist (^{<47019>}2 Corinthians 1:19), and on him, probably, with some exceptions, devolved the duty of baptizing the *new* converts. (^{<4014>}1 Corinthians 1:14). Of the next four or five years of his life we have no record, and can infer nothing beyond a continuance of his active service as Paul's companion. When we again meet with him, it is as being sent on in advance while the apostle was contemplating the long journey which was to include Macedonia, Achaia, Jerusalem, and Rome (^{<4192>}Acts 19:22). A.D. 54. He was sent to "bring" the churches "into remembrance of the ways" of the apostle (^{<4017>}1 Corinthians 4:17). We trace in the words of the "father" an anxious desire to guard the son from the perils which, to his eager but sensitive temperament, would be most trying (^{<4650>}1 Corinthians 16:10). His route would take him through the churches which he had been instrumental in founding, and this would give him scope for exercising the gifts which were afterwards to be displayed in a still more responsible office. It is probable, from the passages already referred to, that, after accomplishing the special work assigned *to* him, he returned by the same route and met Paul according to a previous arrangement (ver. 11), and was thus with him when the second epistle was written to the Church of Corinth (^{<4001>}2 Corinthians 1:1). He returns with the apostle to that city, and joins in messages of greeting to the disciples whom he had known personally at Corinth and who had since found their way to Rome (^{<4612>}Romans 16:21). He forms one of the company of friends who go with

Paul to Philippi and then sail by themselves, waiting for his arrival by a different ship (^{<400>}Acts 20:3-6). Whether he continued his journey to, Jerusalem, and what became of him during Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea, are points on which we must remain uncertain. The language of Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus (ver. 17-35) renders it unlikely that he was then left there with authority. The absence of his name from ch. 27 in like manner leads to the conclusion that he did not share in the perilous voyage to Italy. He must have joined him, however, apparently, soon after his arrival in Rome, and was with him when the epistles to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon were written (^{<500>}Philippians 1:1; 2:19; ^{<500>}Colossians 1:1; ^{<500>}Philemon 1:1). All the indications of this period point to incessant missionary activity. As before, so now, he is to precede the personal coming of the apostle, inspecting, advising, reporting (^{<3769>}Philippians 2:19-23), caring especially for the Macedonian churches as no one else could care. The special messages of greeting sent to him at a later date (^{<502>}2 Timothy 4:21) show that at Rome also, as elsewhere, he had gained the warm affection of those among whom he ministered. Among those most eager to be thus remembered to him we find, according to a fairly supported hypothesis, the names of a Roman noble, Pudens (q.v.), of a future bishop of Rome, Linus (q.v.), and of the daughter of a British king, Claudia (Williams, *Claudia and Pudens*; Conybeare and Howson, 2, 501; Alford, *Excursus*" *in Greek Test.* 3, 104). It is interesting to think of the young evangelist as having been the instrument by which one who was surrounded by the fathomless impurity of the Roman world was called to a higher life, and the names which would otherwise have appeared only in the foul epigrams of Martial (1, 32; 4:13; 5, 48; 11:53)-raised to a perpetual honor in the salutations of an apostolic epistle. An article (*They of Caesar's Household*) in *Journ. of Class. and Sacred Philology*, No. 10 questions this hypothesis, on the ground that the epigrams are later than the epistles, and that they connect the name of Pudens with heathen customs and vices. On the other hand, it may be urged that-the bantering tone of the epigrams forbids us to take them as evidences of character. Pudens tells Martial that he does not "like his poems." "Oh, that is because you read too many at a time" (4, 29). He begs him to correct their blemishes. "You want an autograph copy, then, do you?" (7, 11). The slave En or Eucolpos (the name is possibly a willful distortion of Eubulus) does what *might* be the fulfillment of a Christian vow (^{<4818>}Acts 18:18), and this is the occasion of the suggestion which seems most damnatory (Martial, 5, 48). With this there mingles, however,

as in 4:13; 6:58, the language of a more real esteem than is common in Martial (comp. some good remarks in Galloway, *A Clergyman's Holidays*, p. 35-49).

To the close of this period of Timothy's life we may probably refer the imprisonment of Heb. 13:23, and the trial at which he "witnessed the good confession" not unworthy to be likened to that of the Great Confessor before Pilate (^{<5463>}1 Timothy 6:13). Assuming the genuineness and the later date of the two epistles addressed to him (see below), we are able to put together a few notices as to his later life. It follows from ^{<5403>}1 Timothy 1:3 that he and his master, after the release of the latter from his imprisonment, revisited the proconsular Asia; that the apostle then continued his journey to Macedonia, while the disciple remained, half reluctantly, even weeping at the separation (^{<5404>}2 Timothy 1:4), at Ephesus, to check, if possible, the outgrowth of heresy and licentiousness which had sprung up there. The time during which he was thus to exercise authority as the delegate of an apostle — a vicar apostolic rather than a bishop — was of uncertain duration (^{<5484>}1 Timothy 3:14). The position in which he found himself might well make him anxious. He had to rule presbyters, most of whom were older than himself (^{<5402>}1 Timothy 4:12), to assign to each a stipend in proportion to his work (^{<5487>}1 Timothy 5:17), to receive and decide on charges that might be brought against them (^{<5409>}1 Timothy 1:19, 20), to regulate the almsgiving and the sisterhoods of, the Church (ver. 3-10), to ordain presbyters and deacons (^{<5401>}1 Timothy 3:1-13). There was the risk of being entangled in the disputes, prejudices, covetousness, sensuality, of a great city. There was the risk of injuring health and strength by an overstrained asceticism (^{<5406>}1 Timothy 4:4; 5, 23). Leaders of rival sects were there Hymenaeus, Philetus, Alexander—to oppose and thwart him (^{<5403>}1 Timothy 1:20; ^{<5427>}2 Timothy 2:17; 4:14, 15). The name of his beloved teacher was no longer honored as it had been; the strong affection of former days had vanished and "Paul the aged" had become unpopular, the object of suspicion and dislike (comp. ^{<5485>}Acts 20:37; ^{<5415>}2 Timothy 1:15). Only in the narrowed circle of the faithful few—Aquila, Priscilla, Mark, and others—who were still with him was he likely to find sympathy or support (^{<5406>}1 Timothy 4:19). We cannot wonder that the apostle, knowing these trials, and, with his marvelous power of bearing another's burdens, making them his own, should be full of anxiety and fear for his disciple's steadfastness; that admonitions, appeals, warnings, should follow each other in rapid and vehement succession (^{<5418>}1 Timothy 1:18; 3:15; 4:14;

5:21; 6:11). In the second epistle to him this deep personal feeling utters itself yet more fully. The friendship of twenty years was drawing to a close, and all memories connected with it throng upon the mind of the old man, now ready to be offered: the blameless youth (^{<500>}2 Timothy 3:15), the holy household (^{<500>}2 Timothy 1:5), the solemn ordination (ver. 6), the tears at parting (ver. 4). The last recorded words of the apostle express the earnest hope, repeated yet more earnestly, that he might see him once again (^{<500>}1 Timothy 4:9,21). Timothy is to come before winter, to bring with him the cloak for which in that winter there would be need (ver. 13). We may hazard the conjecture that he reached him in time, and that the last hours of the teacher were soothed by the presence of the disciple whom he loved so truly. Some writers have even seen in ^{<500>}Hebrews 13:23 an indication that he shared Paul's imprisonment, and was released from it by the death of Nero (Conybeare and Howson, 2, 502; Neander, *Pfanz. und Leit.* 1, 552). Beyond this all is apocryphal and uncertain.

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

A somewhat startling theory as to the intervening period of his life has found favor with Calmet (s.v. "Timothee"), Tillemont (2, 147), and others. If he continued, according to the received tradition, to be bishop of Ephesus, then he, and no other, must have been the "angel" of that Church to whom the message of ^{<500>}Revelation 2:1-7 was addressed. It may be urged, as in some degree confirming this view, that both the praise and the blame of that message are such as harmonize with the impressions as to the character of Timothy derived from the Acts and the Epistles. The refusal to acknowledge the self-styled apostles, the abhorrence of the deeds of the Nicolaitans, the unwearied labor, all this belongs to "the man of God" of the Pastoral Epistles. Nor is the fault less characteristic. The strong language of Paul's entreaty would lead us to expect that the temptation of

such a man would be to fall away from the glow of his “first love,” the zeal of his first faith. The promise of the Lord of the churches is in substance the same as that implied in the language of the apostle (2 Timothy 2, 4-6). This conjecture, it should be added, has been passed over unnoticed by most of the recent commentators on the Apocalypse (comp. Alford and Wordsworth, *ad loc.*). Trench (*Seven Churches of Asia*, p. 64) contrasts the “angel” of Rev. 2 with Timothy as an “earlier angel” who, with the generation to which he be longed, had passed away when the Apocalypse was written. It must be remembered, however, that, at the time of Paul’s death, Timothy was still “young,” probably not more than thirty-five; that he might, therefore, well be living, even on the assumption of the later date of the Apocalypse, and that the traditions (*valeant quantum*) place his death after that date. Bengel admits this, but urges the ‘objection that he was not the bishop of any single diocese, but the superintendent of many churches. This, however, may in its turn be traversed by the answer that the death of Paul may have made a great difference in the work of one who had hitherto been employed in traveling as his representative. The special charge committed to him in the Pastoral Epistles might not unnaturally give fixity to a life which had previously been wandering.

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

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

Timothy, First Epistle To.

This is the first of the so-called *Pastoral Epistles* of Paul, and therefore in treating it we shall adduce many points, especially those relating to its

authenticity, etc., which are applicable to two, and indeed to all three, of them. *SEE PAUL.*

I. Authorship. —The question whether these epistles were written by Paul was one to which, till within the last half-century, hardly any answer but an affirmative one was thought possible. They are found ascribed to Paul in the Peshito version (2nd century), in the Muratorian fragment, and in the catalogue of Eusebius, who places them among the *ὁμολογούμενα*. The catalogues of Athanasius, of the Laodicean Council (364), of Cyril, of Epiphanius, and of Jerome contain them, and ascribe them to the apostle. Reminiscences of 1 Timothy occur in Clem. *Romans* (*Epist.* 1 *Corinthians* 29): “Let us draw nigh to him; lifting up pure and undefiled hands” (comp. ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 2:8); in Polycarp (*Ad Philippen.* c. 4) “The root of all evils is covetousness. *Knowing* that we brought nothing into this world, and can carry nothing out let us put on the armor of righteousness” (comp. ^{<540E>}1 Timothy 6:7, 10); and in the letter: of the Church at Vienna and Lyons: “But the fury of the enemy chiefly fell on Attalus, a pillar and ground of our Church” (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 1; comp. 1 Timothy 3, 15). To 2 Timothy Ignatius seems to allude when he writes to Polycarp (c. 6), “Please him whose soldiers ye are, and from whom *you* receive pay” (comp. ^{<540D>}2 Timothy 2:4); and Polycarp (*Ad Philippen.* c. 5) “He has promised us that if we walk worthily of him, we shall reign with him” (comp. ^{<540E>}2 Timothy 2:11,12). To the epistle to Titus Ignatius-alludes (*Ad Trall.* c. 3): “Whose behavior is itself a great lesson of instruction.” (The word for “behavior,” *κατάστημα*, occurs in the New Test. only in Titus 2, 3). Likewise Clem. *Romans* (*Ep.* 1, 2): “Ye were ready for every good work” (comp. ^{<540E>}Titus 3:1). To, 1 Timothy we have direct testimony in Irenaeus (*Adv. Hier.* 1, 1, 1): “They introduce vain genealogies, which, as the apostle says, ‘minister’ questions, rather than godly edifying, which is ill faith” (comp. ^{<540D>}1 Timothy 1:4); in Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* 2, 383): “Concerning which the apostle writing says, ‘O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thee’ (comp. ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 6:20, 21); and in Tertull. (*De Prescrip. ficeret.* c. 25): “And this word Paul has used to Timothy, O Timothy, keep the deposit” (comp. *ibid.*). To 2 Timothy in Irenaeus (*Adv. Hcer.* 3, 3,3): “The apostles delivered the episcopate to Linus; of which Linus Paul makes mention in those epistles which he wrote to Timothy” (comp. ^{<540E>}2 Timothy 4:21); and in Tertull. (*Scop.* c. 13): “*Exulting* (i.e. Paul) in the prospect of it, he writes to Timothy, ‘I am poured out as a drinkoffering; and the time of my departure is at hand’” (comp. ^{<548B>}2

Timothy 4:6). To the epistle to Titus in Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3, 3, 4): “The apostles would not even in word communicate with those who adulterated the truth, as Paul says, ‘A heretic after the first admonition reject, knowing that such a one is perverse’” etc. (comp. ^{<500>}Titus 3:10, 11); in Clem. Alex. (*Admon. ad Gent.* p. 6) “For as that divine apostle of the Lord says, ‘The saving grace of God hath appeared unto all men,’” etc. (comp. Titus 2, 11-13); and in Tertull. (*De Prces.* c. 6): “Paul, who suggests that a heretic after the first admonition is to be rejected as perverse” (comp. Titus 3, 10). See also Tertull. (*Ad Uxorem*, 1, 7), Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 4:16, 3; 2, 14, 8). Parallelisms, implying quotation, in some cases with close verbal agreement, are found likewise in Ignatius, *Ad Mgtm.* c. 8 (^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:4); Polycarp, c. 4 (comp. ^{<500>}1 Timothy 6:7, 8); Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autol.* 3, 126 (comp. ^{<500>}1 Timothy 2:1, 2). Later testimony is so abundant that it is needless to adduce it. Thus the external testimony, indirect and direct, to the three epistles is, so far as the Church is concerned; as strong as to any portion of Scripture. It must not be concealed that they were rejected by some of the Gnostic heretics, as Marcion and Basilides (see Tertull. *Adv. Mar.* 5, 21; Jerome, *Prolog. ad Titus*). Tatian accepted the Epistle to Titus, but rejected those to Timothy. The contents of the epistles sufficiently account for the repugnance of the Gnostic teachers to admit their genuineness. Origen mentions (*Comment. in Matthew* p. 117) some who rejected 2 Timothy on account of the allusion to the apocryphal story of Jannes and Jambres (3, 8), which they considered unworthy of an apostle.

The Pastoral Epistles have, however, been subjected to a more elaborate scrutiny by the criticism of Germany. The first doubts were uttered by J. C. Schmidt. These were followed by the *Sendschreiben* of Schleiermacher, who, assuming the genuineness of 2 Timothy and *Titus*, undertook, on that hypothesis, to prove the spuriousness of 1 Timothy. Bolder critics saw that the position thus taken was untenable, that the three epistles must stand or fall together. Eichhorn (*Eileitf.* 3) and De Wette (*Einleit.*) denied the Pauline authorship of all three. There: was still, however, an attempt to maintain their authority as embodying the substance of the apostle’s teaching, or of letters written by him, on the hypothesis that they had been sent forth after his death by some over-zealous disciple, *who* wished, under the shadow of his name, to attack the prevailing errors of the time (Eichhorn, *ibid.*). One writer (Schott, *isagoge Hist. —crit.* p. 324) ventures on the hypothesis that Luke was the writer. Baur (*Die sogenannten*

Pastoral-Books), here as elsewhere more daring than others, assigns them to no earlier period than the latter half of the 2nd century, after the death of Polycarp in A.D. 167 (p. 138). On this hypothesis 2 Timothy was the earliest, 1 Timothy the latest of the three, each probably by a different writer (p. 72-76). They grew out of the state of parties in the Church of Rome, and, like the Gospel of Luke and the Acts were intended to mediate between the extreme Pauline and the extreme Petrine sections of the Church (p. 58). Starting from the data supplied by the Epistle to the Philippians, the writers, first of 2 Timothy, then of Titus, and lastly of 1 Timothy, aimed, by the insertion of personal incidents, messages, and the like, at giving to their compilations an air of verisimilitude (p. 70). It will be seen from the above statement that the question of authorship is here more than usually important. There can be no solution as regards these epistles like that of an obviously dramatic and therefore legitimate personation of character, such as is possible in relation to the authorship of Ecclesiastes. If the Pastoral Epistles are not Pauline, the writer clearly meant them to pass as such, and the *animus decipiendi* would be there in its most flagrant form. They would have to take their place with the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, or the Pseudo-Ignatian Epistles. Where we now see the traces, full of life and interest, of the character of "Paul the aged," firm, tender, zealous, loving, we should have to recognize only the tricks, sometimes skilful, sometimes clumsy, of some unknown and dishonest controversialist. Consequences such as these ought not, it is true, to lead us to suppress or distort one iota of evidence. They may well make us cautious, however, in examining the evidence, not to admit conclusions that are wider than the premises, nor to take the premises themselves for granted. The task of examining is rendered in some measure easier by the fact that, in the judgment of most critics, hostile as well as friendly, the three Pastoral Epistles stand on the same ground. The intermediate hypotheses of Schleiermacher (*supra*) and Credser (*Einleit. ins N.T.*), who looks on Titus as genuine, 2 Timothy as made up out of two genuine letters, and 1 Timothy as altogether spurious, may be dismissed as individual eccentricities, hardly requiring a separate notice. In dealing with objections which take a wider range we are meeting those also which are confined to one or two out of the three epistles.

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

1. Language. —The style, it is urged, is different from that of the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. There is less logical continuity, a want of order and plan, subjects brought up, one after the other, abruptly (Schleiermacher). Not less than fifty words, most of them striking and characteristic, are found in these epistles which are not found in Paul's writings (see the list in Conybeare and Howson, App. I, and Huther, *Einleit.*). The formula of salutation (χάρις ἔλεος, εἰρήνη), half-technical words and phrases like εὐσέβεια and its cognates (1 Timothy 2, 2; 3, 16; 6:6 *et al.*), παρακαταθήκη (^{<5018>}1 Timothy 1:18; 6:20; ^{<5012>}2 Timothy 1:12, 14; 2:2), the frequently recurring πιστὸς ὁ λόγος (^{<5015>}1 Timothy 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; ^{<5011>}2 Timothy 2:11), the use of ὑγιαίνουσα as the distinctive epithet of a true teaching—these and others like them appear here for the first time (Schleiermacher and Baur). Some of these words, it is urged, φανεροῦν, ἐπιφάνεια, σωτήρ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον, belong to the Gnostic terminology of the 2nd century.

On the other side it may be said

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

speech as well as in action. Each group of his epistles has, in like manner, its characteristic words and phrases.

(2.) If this is true generally, it is so yet more emphatically when the circumstances of authorship are different. The language of a bishop's charge is not that of his letters to his private friends. The epistles which Paul wrote to the churches as societies might well differ from those which he wrote, in the full freedom of open speech, to a familiar friend, to his own "true son." It is not strange that we should find in the latter a Luther-like vehemence of expression (e.g. **κεκαυστηριασμένων**, ^{<501>}1 Timothy 4:2; **διαπαρατριβὰ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν**, 6:5; **σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίας**, ^{<506>}2 Timothy 3:6), mixed sometimes with words that imply that which few great men have been without, a keen sense of humor, and the capacity, at least, for satire (e.g. **γραῶδεις μύθους**, ^{<507>}1 Timothy 4:7; **φλύαροι καὶ περίεργοι**, 5:13; **τετύφωται**, 6:4; **γαστέρες ἀργαί**, Titus 1, 12).

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

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

(5.) Lastly, there is the positive argument that there is a large common element, both of thoughts and words, shared by these epistles and the others. The grounds of faith, the law of life, the tendency to digress and go off at a word, the personal, individualizing affection, the free reference to his own sufferings for the truth, all these are in both, and by them we recognize the identity of the writer. The evidence can hardly be given within the limits of this article, but its weight will be felt by any careful

student. The coincidences are precisely those in most instances, which the forger of a document would have been unlikely to think of, and give but scanty support to the perverse ingenuity which sees in these resemblances a proof of compilation, and therefore of spuriousness.

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

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

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

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

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

(1.) The rule that the bishop is to be “the husband of one wife” (^{<54RD>}1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1, 6) indicates the strong Opposition to second marriages which characterized the 2nd century (Baur, p. 113-120).

(2.) The “younger widows” of ^{<5451B>}1 Timothy 5:11 cannot possibly be literally widows. If they were, Paul, in advising them to marry, would be excluding them, according to the rule of ^{<54RD>}1 Timothy 5:9, from all chance of sharing in the Church's bounty. It follows, therefore, that the word $\chi\eta\rho\alpha\iota$ is used, as it was in the 2nd century, in a wider sense, as denoting a consecrated life (Baur, p. 42-49).

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

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

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

(6.) On ^{<3006>}2 Timothy 1:6; 2:2, see below.

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

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

(2.) There is not a shadow of proof that the younger widows" were not literally such. The **χῆραι** of the Pastoral Epistles are, like those of ^{<400>}Acts 6:1; 9:39, women dependent on the alms of the Church, not necessarily deaconesses, or engaged in active labors. The rule fixing the age of sixty for admission is all but conclusive against Baur's hypothesis.

(3.) The use of **ἐπίσκοποι** and **πρεσβύτεροι** in the Pastoral Epistles as equivalent (^{<5005>}Titus 1:5, 7), and the absence of any intermediate order between the bishops and deacons (^{<5400>}1 Timothy 3:1-8), are quite unlike what we find in the Ignatian Epistles and other writings of the 2nd century. They are in entire agreement with the language of Paul (^{<4007>}Acts 20:17, 28; Philippians 1, 1). Few features of these epistles are more striking than the absence of any high hierarchic system.

(4.) The word **αἱρετικός**; has its counterpart in the **αἱρέσεις** of ^{<6119>}1 Corinthians 11:19. The sentence upon Hymenaeus and Alexander (^{<5002>}1 Timothy 1:20) has a precedent in that of ^{<4075>}1 Corinthians 5:5.

(5.) The best interpreters 'do not see in 1 Timothy 3, 13 the transition from one office to another (comp. Ellicott, *adloc.*, and **SEE DEACON**). If it is

there, the assumption that such a change is foreign to the apostolic age is entirely an arbitrary one.

4. Heresiology. —Still greater stress is laid on the indications of a later date in the descriptions of the false teachers noticed in the Pastoral Epistles. These point, it is said, unmistakably to Marcion and his followers. In the **ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως** (^{<500>}1 Timothy 6:20) there is a direct reference to the treatise which he wrote under the title of **Ἀντιθέσεις** setting forth the contradiction between the Old and New Test. (Baur, p. 26). The “genealogies” of ^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:4; ^{<500>}Titus 3:9 in like manner point to the eons of the Valentinians and Ophites (*ibid.* p. 12). The “forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats,” fits in to Marcion’s system, not to that of the Judaizing teachers of Paul’s time (*ibid.* p. 24). The assertion that “the law is good” (^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:8) implies a denial, like that of Marcion, of its divine authority. The doctrine that the “resurrection was past already” (2 Timothy 2, 18) was thoroughly Gnostic in its character. In his eagerness to find tokens of a later date everywhere, Baur sees in the writer of these epistles not merely an opponent of Gnosticism, but one ill part infected with their teaching, and appeals to the doxologies of ^{<501>}1 Timothy 1:17; 6:15, and their Christology throughout, as having a Gnostic stamp on them (p. 28-33).

Carefully elaborated as this part of Baur’s attack has been, it is, perhaps, the weakest and most capricious of all. The false teachers of the Pastoral Epistles are predominantly Jewish, **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** (^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:7), belonging altogether to a different school from that of Marcion, giving heed to “Jewish fables” (^{<500>}Titus 1:4) and” disputes connected with the law” (^{<500>}Titus 3:9). Of all monstrosities of exegesis few are more willful and fantastic than that which finds in **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** Antinomian teachers, and in **μαχὰ νομικαί** Antinomian doctrine (Baur, p. 17). The natural suggestion that in ^{<400>}Acts 20:30, 31 Paul contemplates the rise and progress of a like perverse teaching; that in Colossians 2, 8-23 we have the same combination of Judaism and a self-styled **γνώσις** (^{<500>}1 Timothy 6:20) or **φιλοσοφία** (^{<500>}Colossians 2:8), leading to a like false asceticism, is set aside summarily by the rejection both of the speech and the epistle as spurious. Even the denial of the resurrection, we may remark, belongs as naturally to the mingling of a Sadducean element with an Eastern mysticism as to the teaching of Marcion. The self-contradictory hypothesis that the writer of 1 Timothy is at once the strongest opponent of the

Gnostics, and that he adopts their language, need hardly be refuted. The whole line of argument, indeed; first misrepresents the language of Paul in these epistles and elsewhere, and then assumes the entire absence from the 1st century of even the germs of the teaching which characterized the 2nd (comp. Neander, *P. flaz. und Leit.* 1, 401; Heydenreich, p. 64).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. It is alleged that the writer of this epistle has made such a mistake as Paul could not have made when he classes Alexander with Hymenueus (1 Timothy 1, 20) as a false Christian, whereas we know from ~~5044~~2 Timothy 4:14 that he was not a Christian at all. But where is the shadow of evidence that the Alexander mentioned in ~~5002~~1 Timothy 1:20 is the same person with the Alexander mentioned in ~~5044~~2 Timothy 4:14? Was this name so uncommon in Ephesus that we must needs suppose a blunder where a writer speaks of one so called as a heretic simply because, in other passages, mention is made of one so called who was not a heretic? Nothing can be more obvious than that there were two Alexanders, just as there might have been twenty, known to the apostle and Timothy; and that of these two one was a heretic and troubler of the Church at Ephesus, and the other probably a heathen and an enemy of the apostle.

5. In ~~5002~~1 Timothy 1:20 mention is made of Hymenaeus as a heretic whom the writer makes Paul say he had excommunicated; but this is a mistake, for in ~~5027~~2 Timothy 2:17 we find Hymenaeus still a member of the Church

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

6. In ^{<5013>}1 Timothy 6:13 the writer refers to our Lord's good confession before Pontius Pilate. Now of this we have a record in John's Gospel; but, as this was not written in Paul's time, it is urged that this epistle must be ascribed to a later writer. It is easy to obviate *any* force that may appear to be in this remark by the consideration that all the prominent facts of our Lord's life, and especially the circumstances of his death, were familiarly known by oral communication to all the Christians before the gospels were written. Though, then, John's gospel was not extant in Paul's time, the facts recorded by *John* were well known, and might therefore be very naturally referred to in an epistle from one Christian to another. Of our Lord's confession before Pilate we may readily suppose that Paul, the great advocate of the spirituality of the Messiah's kingdom, was especially fond of making use.

7. The writer of this epistle, it is affirmed, utters sentiments in favor of the law, which are not Pauline, and teaches the efficacy of good works in such a way as to be incompatible with Paul's doctrine of salvation by grace. This assertion we may safely meet with a pointed denial. The doctrine of this epistle concerning the law is that it is good if it be used **νομίμως**, as a law, for the purposes which a moral law is designed to serve; *and* what is this but the doctrine of the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, where the apostle maintains that in itself and for its own ends the divine law is holy, just, and good, and becomes evil only when put out of its proper place and used for purposes it was never designed to serve (^{<5100>}Romans 7:7-12; ^{<4821>}Galatians 3:21. etc.). What the writer here teaches concerning good works is also in full harmony with the apostle Paul's teaching in his acknowledged epistles (comp. Romans 12; Ephesians and 6 etc.); and if in this epistle there is no formal exposition of the Gospel scheme, but rather a dwelling upon practical duties, the reason may easily be found in the

peculiar character of this as a pastoral epistle an epistle of official councils and exhortations to a minister of Christianity.

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

9. The writer of this epistle quotes *as a part of Scripture* a passage which occurs only in ^{<200>}Luke 10:7; but as Luke had not written his gospel at the time Paul is supposed to have written this epistle, and as it is not the habit of the New-Test. writers to quote from each other in the way they quote from the Old Test., we are bound to suppose that this epistle is the production of a later writer. But *does* this writer quote ^{<200>}Luke 10:7 in the manner alleged? The passage referred to is in 5, 18, where we have first a citation from ^{<204>}Deuteronomy 25:4, introduced by the usual formula, "The Scripture saith;" and then the writer adds, as further confirmatory of his position, the saying of our Lord which is supposed to be quoted from Luke's gospel. Now we are not bound to conclude that this latter was adduced by the writer as a part of Scripture. It may be regarded as a, remark of his own, or as some proverbial expression, or as a well-known saying of Christ's, by which he confirms the doctrine he is establishing. We are under no necessity to extend the formula with which the verse is commenced so as to include in it *all* that the verse contains. The **καί** by itself will not justify this; indeed, we may go further, and affirm that the use of **καί** alone rather leads to an opposite conclusion, for had the writer intended the latter clause to be regarded as a quotation from Scripture *as* well as the former, he would probably have used some such formula as **καὶ πάλιν**. (comp. ^{<213>}Hebrews 2:13).

10. De Wette maintains that the injunction in 5:23 is so much beneath the dignity of an apostle that we cannot suppose it to have proceeded from

such a writer as Paul. But what is there in such an injunction less dignified than in many injunctions of an equally familiar nature scattered through Paul's epistles? And in what is it incompatible with the apostolic character that one sustaining it 'should enjoin upon a young, zealous, and active preacher, whom he esteemed as his own son, a careful regard to his health; the more especially when, by acting as is here enjoined, he would vindicate Christian liberty from those ascetic restraints by which the false teachers sought to bind it?

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

1. In ^{<50B1>}1 Timothy 3:11, the writer enumerates a series of persecutions and afflictions which befell him at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, of which he says Timothy knew. Would Paul, it is asked, in making such an enumeration, have committed the mistake of referring to persecutions which he had endured *before* his connection with Timothy, and have said nothing of those which he endured *subsequently*, and of which Timothy *must* have known, while of the former he *might* be ignorant? But there is no mistake in the matter. Paul has occasion to refer to the knowledge Timothy had of his sufferings for the Gospel. Of these some had occurred before Timothy's connection with him, while others had occurred while Timothy was his companion and fellow sufferer. Of the latter, therefore, Paul makes no specific mention, feeling that to be unnecessary; but of the former, of which Timothy could know only by hearsay, but of which he no doubt did know. for we cannot conceive that any interesting point in Paul's previous history would be unknown to his "dear son in the faith," he makes specific enumeration. This fully accounts for his stopping short at the point where Timothy's personal experience could amply supply the remainder.

2. The declaration in 4:7, etc., is incompatible with what Paul says of himself in ^{<50B2>}Philippians 3:12, etc. But respect must be had to the very different circumstances in which the apostle was when he wrote these two passages. In the one case he viewed himself as still engaged in active work,

and having the prospect of service before him; in the other he regards himself as very near to death, and shortly about to enter into the presence of his master. Surely the same individual might in the former of these cases speak of work yet to do, and in the latter of his work as done, without any contradiction.

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

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

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

(a.) ^{<500B>}1 Timothy 1:3 implies a journey of Paul from Ephesus to Macedonia, Timothy remaining behind.

(b.) The age of Timothy is described as **νεότης** (^{<504D>}1 Timothy 4:12).

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

1. *The journey in question has been looked-upon as an unrecorded episode in the two years work at Ephesus* (~~4190~~ Acts 19:10). This conjecture has the merit of bringing the epistle within the limit of the authentic records of Paul's life, but it has scarcely any other. Against it we may urge that a journey to Macedonia would hardly have been passed over in silence either by Luke in the Acts, or by Paul himself in writing to the Corinthians. Indeed, the theory of unrecorded travels of this kind is altogether gratuitous. There is no period after the formal appointment of Paul as a missionary during which it was possible, so fully have we the itinerary of the apostle; unless, indeed, it be the long residence in Ephesus, that favorite resort of theorists as to imaginary journeys; and so entirely was Paul occupied with local labors there that it is wholly excluded even at that time.

2. *This journey has been identified with the journey after the tumult at Ephesus* (~~4401~~ Acts 20:1). Against this conjecture is the palpable fact that Timothy, instead of remaining at Ephesus when the apostle left, had gone on into Macedonia before him (~~4192~~ Acts 19:22). The hypothesis of a possible return is traversed by the fact that he was with Paul in Macedonia at the time when 2 Corinthians was written and sent off. To obviate this objection, it has been suggested that Paul might have written this epistle immediately after leaving Ephesus, and the second to the Corinthians not before the concluding period of his stay in Macedonia; so that Timothy might have visited him in the interval. This appears to remove the difficulty, but it does so by suggesting a new one; for how, on this supposition, are we to account for the apostle's delaying so long to write to the Corinthians after the arrival of Titus, by whose intelligence, concerning the state of the Corinthian Church, Paul was led to address them? It may be asked, also, if it be likely that Timothy, after receiving such a charge as Paul gives him in this epistle, would so soon have left Ephesus and followed the apostle.

An attempt has been made by Otto (*Die geschichtl. Verh.* p. 23 sq.) to avoid the difficulty in 1 Timothy 1 by translating it thus, "As I in Ephesus exhorted thee to stand fast, so do thou, as thou goest to Macedonia, enjoin on some not to adhere to strange doctrines," etc. The passage is thus made to refer to Timothy's going to Macedonia, not to the apostle's, and the occasion of his going is referred to the journey mentioned (~~4191~~ Acts 19:21, 22), with which the visit to Corinth mentioned (~~4147~~ 1 Corinthians 4:17; 16:10), is made to synchronize. The date of 1 Timothy is thus placed *before* that of 1 Corinthians. All this, however, rests on a rendering of 1

Timothy 1, 3 which, in spite of much learned disquisition, its author has failed to vindicate.

3. *The journey in question has been placed in the interval between Paul's first and second imprisonments at Rome.* In favor of this conjecture as compared with the preceding is the internal evidence of the contents of the epistle. The errors against which Timothy is warned are present, dangerous, and portentous. At the time of Paul's visit to Miletus in ^{<400>}Acts 20:1.e., according to those hypotheses, subsequent to the epistle, they are still only looming in the distance (ver. 30). All the circumstances referred to, moreover, imply the prolonged absence of the apostle. Discipline had become lax, heresies rife, the economy of the Church disordered. It was necessary to check the chief offenders by the sharp sentence of excommunication (^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:20). Other churches called for his counsel and directions, or a sharp necessity took him away, and he hastens on, leaving behind him, with full delegated authority, the disciple in whom he most confided. The language of the epistle-also has a bearing on the date. According to the two preceding hypotheses, it belongs to the same periods as 1 and 2 Corinthians and the Epistle to the Romans, or, at the latest, to the same group as Philippians and Ephesians; and in this case the differences of style and language are somewhat difficult to explain. Assume a later date, and then there is room for the changes in thought and expression which, in a character like Paul's, were to be expected as the years went by.

The objections to the position thus assigned are the following:

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

(2.) As the evidence that the apostle took such a journey between his first and second imprisonment is purely hypothetical and inferential, it must be admitted that the hypothesis built upon it as to the date of this epistle rests at the best on somewhat precarious grounds. On the other hand, we know that the apostle did purpose extended tours on his contemplated release from the first imprisonment (^{<6153>}Romans 15:23, 24), and that these embraced Asia Minor (Phillipians 2:2), as well as Crete (^{<5005>}Titus 1:5).

(3.) This hypothesis is directly opposed to the solemn declaration of Paul to the elders of the Church at Ephesus when he met them at Miletum, "I

know that ye all shall see my face no more" (⁴⁰¹⁵Acts 20:25), for it assumes that he did see them again and preached to them. But Paul was not infallible in his anticipations, and we have positive evidence that he did revisit Ephesus (⁵⁰¹²2 Timothy 4:12 ; comp. 13:20).

(4.) It is opposed by what Paul says (ver. 12), from which we learn that at the time this epistle was written Timothy was in danger of being despised as a youth; but this could hardly be said of him *after* Paul's first imprisonment, when he must, on the lowest computation, have been thirty years of age. In reply to this, it is sufficient to say that this was young enough for one who was to exercise authority over a whole body of bishop-presbyters, many of them older than himself (⁵⁴⁰¹1 Timothy 5:1).

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

The precise date of the first epistle we have, nevertheless, no means of fixing. In ³⁷¹²Philippians 2:24 the apostle expresses a hope of visiting that Church shortly. Carrying out this intention, he would, after his liberation, proceed, to Macedonia, whence we -must suppose him passing into Asia, and visiting Ephesus (A.D. 60). Thence he may have taken his proposed journey to Spain (⁶¹⁵⁴Romans 15:24, 28), unless he took advantage of his proximity to the West to do so direct from Rome. After, this, and not long before his martyrdom (A.D. 64), this epistle seems to have been written.

III. Place. —In this respect, as in regard to time, 1 Timothy leaves much to conjecture. The absence of any local reference but that in 1:3 suggests Macedonia or some neighboring district. In A and other MSS. in the Peshito, Ethiopic, and other versions, Laodicea is named in the inscription as the place whence it was sent; but this appears to have grown out of a traditional belief resting on very insufficient grounds (and incompatible with the conclusion which has been adopted above) that this is the epistle referred to in ⁵¹⁰¹⁶Colossians 4:16 as that from Laodicea (Theophyl. *ad loc.*). The Coptic version, with as little likelihood, states that it was written from Athens (Huther, *Einleit.*).

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

It may be divided into *three* parts, exclusive of the introduction (^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:1, 2) and the conclusion (^{<500>}1 Timothy 6:20, 21). In the *first* of these parts (^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:3-20) the apostle reminds Timothy generally of his functions, and especially of the duties he had to discharge in reference to certain false teachers, who were anxious to bring the believers under the yoke of the law. In the *second* (2-4:2) he gives Timothy particular instructions concerning the orderly conducting of divine worship, the qualifications of bishops and deacons, and the proper mode of behaving himself in a church. In the *third* (^{<500>}1 Timothy 6:3-19) the apostle discourses against some vices to which the Christians at Ephesus seem to have been prone.

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

- 1.** The ever-deepening sense in Paul's heart of the Divine Mercy, of which he was the object, as shown in the insertion of ἔλεος in the salutations of both epistles, and in the ἠλεήθην of ^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:13.
- 2.** The greater abruptness of the second epistle. From first to last there is no plan, no treatment of subjects carefully thought out. All speaks of strong overflowing emotion, memories of the past, anxieties about the future.
- 3.** The absence, as compared with Paul's other epistles, of Old-Test. references. This may connect itself with the fact just noticed, that these epistles are not argumentative, possibly also with the request for the "books and parchments" which had been left behind (^{<500>}2 Timothy 4:13). He may have been separated for a time from the ἱερὰ γράμματα, which were 'commonly his companions.
- 4.** The conspicuous position of the "faithful sayings" as taking the place occupied in other epistles by the Old-Test. Scriptures. The way in which

these are cited as authoritative, the variety of subjects which they cover, suggest the thought that in them we have specimens of the prophecies of the Apostolic Church which had most impressed themselves on the mind of the apostle, and of the disciples generally. 1 Corinthians 14 shows how deep a reverence he was likely to feel for such spiritual utterances. In ^{<500>}1 Timothy 4:1 we have a distinct reference to them.

5. The tendency of the apostle's mind to dwell more on the universality of the redemptive work of Christ (^{<548>}1 Timothy 2:3-6; 4:10); his strong desire that all the teaching of his disciples should be "sound" (*ὑγιαίνουσα*), commending itself to minds in a healthy state; his feat of the corruption of that teaching by morbid subtleties.

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

7. The recurrence of doxologies (^{<5017>}1 Timothy 1:17; 6:15, 16; ^{<548>}2 Timothy 4:18), as from one living perpetually in the presence of God, to whom the language of adoration was as his natural speech.

VI. Commentaries. —The following are the exegetical helps on *both* epistles to Timothy exclusively; to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Megander, *Expositio* [includ. Titus] (Basil. 1536, 8vo); Wittich, *Expositio* (Argent. 1542, 8vo); Artopoeus, *Scholia* (Stuttg. 1545; Basil. 1546, 8vo); Calvin, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1548, 4to; in French, *ibid.* 1563, fol.; in English by Tomson, Lond. 1579, 4to; by Pringle, Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Alesius, *Disputatio* (Lips. 1550-51, 2 vols. 8vo); D'Espence [Romans *Cath.*], *Commentarii* (1st Ep. Lutet. 1561, fol.; 1568, 8vo; 2nd Ep. Par. 1564, fol.); Major, *Enarrationes* (Vitemb. 1563-64, 2 vols. 8vo); Hyper, *Commentarius* [includ. Titus and Philem.] (Tigur. 1582, fol.); Magalian [R. C.], *Commentarii* [includ. Titus] (Lugd. 1609, 4to); Sotto [R. C.], *Commentarius* (includ. Titus] (Par. 1610, fol.); Stewart [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Ingolst. 1610-11, 2 vols. 4to); Weinrich, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1618, 4to); Scultetus, *Observationes* [includ. Titus and Philem.] (Francof. 1624; Vitemb. 1630, 4to); Gerhard, *Adnotationes* (Jen. 1643, 1666; Lips. 1712, 4to); Nethen, *Disputatio* (Ultraj. 1655, 4to); Habert ER. C.], *Expositio* [includ. Titus and Philem.] (Par. 1656, 8vo); Daille, *Expositiona* [French] (Genev. 1659-61, 3 vols. 8vo); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1667, 4to); Gargon, *Oopeninge* (Leyd. 1706, 1719,

4to); Hulse, *Oopeninge* (Rotterd. 1727, 4to); *Mosheim, *Erklärung* (Hamb. 1755, 4to); Zacharili, *Erklr.* (Leips. 1755, 8vo); Hesse, *Ellu.f.* (Gott. 1796, 8vo); *Heydenreich, *Erläut.* [includ. Titus] (Hadam. 1826-28, 2 vols. 8vo); Flatt, *Vorles.* [includ. Titus] (Tub. 1831, 8vo); Baumgarten, *Aechtheit*, etc. (Berl. 1837, 8vo); Leo, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1837-49, 2 vols. 8vo); Matthies, *Erklar.* [includ. Titus] (Greifsw. 1840, 8vo); Mack [R. C.], *Commentar* [includ. Titus] (Tüb. 1841, 8vo); *Scharling, *Untersuch.* etc. (from the Danish, Jen. 1846, 8vo); Paterson, *Commentary* [includ. Titus] (Lond. 1848, 18mo); Rudow, *De Origine*, etc. (Gotting. 1852, 8vo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* [includ. Titus] (Lond. 1856; Bost. 1866, 8vo); Mangold, *Die Irrlehrer*, etc. (Marb. 1856, 8vo); Vinke, *Aanmerkingen* (Utr. 1859, 8vo); *Otto, *Die Verhältnisse*, etc. (Leips. 1860, 8vo); Beck, *Erklar.* (Leips. 1879, 8vo).

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

Timothy, Second Epistle To.

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

I. Date. —It is certain that the second epistle was written while the author was a prisoner (⁵⁰¹⁸2 Timothy 1:8, 16, 17; 2:9; 4:21), at Rome, we may (for the present) assume; but the question arises, was it during his first or his second imprisonment that this took place?

1. In favor of the first, the most weighty consideration arises out of the fact that the apostle appears to have had the same individuals as his companions when he wrote this epistle as he had when he wrote the epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, and that to Philemon which we know were written during his first imprisonment at Rome. “At the beginning of the imprisonment,” says Hug, who has very forcibly stated this argument in favor of the earlier hypothesis, “when the Epistle to the Ephesians was written, Timothy, who was not one of Paul’s companions on the voyage to Italy (^{<427B>}Acts 27:2), was not with him at Rome; for-Paul does not add his name in the address with which the epistle commences, as he always did when Timothy was at his side. Timothy afterwards arrived; and, accordingly, at the outset of the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, his name appears with the apostle’s (^{<500E>}Colossians 1:1; ^{<500E>}Philemon 1:1); secondly, Luke was in Paul’s company (^{<5044>}Colossians 4:14; ^{<5024>}Philemon 1:24); thirdly, Mark was likewise with him (^{<5040>}Colossians 4:10; ^{<5024>}Philemon 1:24); fourthly, Tychicus was then Paul’s **διάκονος** and letter-bearer, and, in particular, was sent to Asia (^{<492E>}Ephesians 4:21 ; Colossians 1, 7, 8). All these circumstances are presented to view in the Second Epistle to Timothy.

(1) Timothy was not with Paul at first, but was summoned to his side (^{<5049>}2 Timothy 4:9, 21);

(2) Luke was with him (ser. 11);

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

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

2. On the other hand, the difficulties lying in the way of this seem insuperable. Hug’s reasoning assumes that the epistle must have been written in the *early* part of the apostle’s imprisonment, else Timothy could

not have been absent at the time of its composition. But that this is utterly inadmissible the following considerations show:

- (1.) When Paul wrote to the Colossians, the Philippians, and Philemon, Demas was with him; when he wrote this epistle to Timothy, Demas had forsaken him, having loved this present world and gone to Thessalonica (4:10).
- (2.) When Paul wrote to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, he was in good hopes of a speedy liberation, from his imprisonment; when he wrote this epistle to Timothy he had lost all these, hopes, and was anticipating death as near at hand (ver. 6-8).
- (3.) At the time this epistle was written Paul had been, if not oftener, at least once, before the bar of the emperor, when he had offered his apology (ver. 16).
- (4.) Tychicus, the bearer of the letters to the Colossians, had been dispatched from Rome *before* this epistle to Timothy was written (ver. 12).
- (5.) At the time the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon were written, Aristarchus was with Paul; by the time this was written, Aristarchus had left Paul (ver. 11). All these circumstances forbid our supposing that this Second Epistle to Timothy was written before the epistles above named; that is, in the early part of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome.

Shall we then, assign the epistle to a later period of that same imprisonment? Against this also lie difficulties. Before we can admit it, we must suppose that Timothy and Mark, who did not accompany Paul to Rome had shortly after followed him thither, and, after remaining awhile, left Paul, and were again requested by him in this epistle to return; that during the interval of their absence from Rome, Paul's first trial had occurred; and that, yet even before he had so much as appeared before his judges, he had written to his friends in terms intimating his full confidence of a speedy release (^{<30125>}Philippians 1:25; 2:24; ^{<50122>}Philemon 1:22). These circumstances may perhaps admit of explanation; but there are others which seem to present insuperable difficulties in the way of the supposition that this epistle was written at any period of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome.

- (1.) Paul's imprisonment, of which we have an account in the Acts, was of a much milder kind than that in which he was at the time he wrote this

epistle. In the former case, he was permitted to lodge in his own hired house, and to receive all who came to him, being guarded only by a single soldier; in the latter, he was in such close confinement that Onesiphorus had no small difficulty in finding him; he was chained, he suffered evil even unto bonds as a malefactor, his friends had mostly deserted him, and he had narrowly escaped destruction from the Roman tyrant (1:16-18; 2:9; 4:6, 7, 8, 18).

(2.) In ^{<504E>}2 Timothy 4:13 he requests Timothy to bring with him from Troas some books, parchments, etc. which he had left at that place. If we suppose the visit here referred to the same as that mentioned in ^{<401E>}Acts 20:5-7, we must conclude that these documents had been allowed by the apostle to lie at Troas for a space of at least years, as that length of time elapsed between the visit to Troas, mentioned by Luke, and Paul's first imprisonment at Rome. This is surely very unlikely, as the documents were plainly of value to the apostle; and if by **φαιλόνης**, in this passage, he meant a *cloak* or *mantle*, the leaving of it for so long a time unused then it might have been of service, and the sending so anxiously for it when it could be of little or none, as the apostle's time of departure was at hand, must be allowed to be not a little improbable.

(3.) In ^{<504D>}2 Timothy 4:20 Paul speaks of having left Trophimus sick at Miletus. Now this could not have been on the occasion referred to in ^{<401E>}Acts 20:15, for subsequent to that Trophimus was with Paul at Jerusalem (^{<402D>}Acts 21:29). It follows that Paul must have visited Miletus at a subsequent period; but he did not visit it on his way from Jerusalem to Rome on the occasion of his first imprisonment, and this, therefore, strongly favors the hypothesis of a journey subsequent to that event, and immediately antecedent to the writing of this epistle. The attempt to 'enfeeble the force of this by translating **ἀπέλιπον**, "they left," etc., and understanding it of messengers from Ephesus coming to visit Paul, is ingenious, but, can hardly be admitted, as no sound interpreter would forcibly supply a subject to a verb where the context itself naturally supplies one. (4.) In 4:20, the apostle says "Erastus abode in Corinth." Such language implies that shortly before writing this epistle the apostle had been at Corinth, where he left Erastus. But before his first imprisonment Paul had not been at Corinth for several years, and during the interval Timothy had been with him, so that he did not need to write to him at a later period about that visit (^{<401E>}Acts 20:4). Hug contends that **ἔμεινε** simply expresses the fact that Erastus was then residing at Corinth,

without necessarily implying that Paul had left him there; but would the apostle in this case have used the aorist?

3. It thus appears that the number of special names and incidents in the second epistle make the chronological data more numerous. We propose here, by way of summary, and in part recapitulation, to bring them, as far as possible, together, noticing briefly with what other facts each connects itself, and to what conclusion it leads as to the conflicting theories of an earlier and later date, (A) during the imprisonment of ^{<483>}Acts 28:30, and (B) during the second imprisonment already spoken of.

(1.) A parting apparently recent, under circumstances of special sorrow (^{<5004>}2 Timothy 1:4)-not decisive. The scene at Miletus (^{<4857>}Acts 20:37) suggests itself, if we assume A. The parting referred to in ^{<5003>}1 Timothy 1:3 might meet B.

(2.) A general desertion of the apostle even by the disciples of Asia (^{<5015>}2 Timothy 1:15). Nothing in the Acts indicates anything like this before the imprisonment of ^{<483>}Acts 28:30. Everything in Acts 19 and 20:and not less the language of the Epistle to the Ephesians, speaks of general and strong affection. This, therefore, so far as it goes, must be placed on the side of B.

(3.) The position of Paul as suffering (^{<5012>}2 Timothy 1:12), in bonds (^{<5009>}2 Timothy 2:9), expecting “the time of his departure” (^{<5006>}2 Timothy 4:6), forsaken by almost all (ver. 16)-not quite decisive, but tending to B rather than A. The language of the epistles belonging to the first imprisonment imply, it is true, bonds (^{<5013>}Philippians 1:13, 16; ^{<4901>}Ephesians 3:1; 6:20), and in all of them the apostle is surrounded by many friends, and is hopeful and confident of release (^{<5025>}Philippians 1:25; ^{<5022>}Philemon 1:22).

(4.) The mention of Onesiphorns, and of services rendered by him both at Rome and Ephesus (^{<5016>}2 Timothy 1:16-18) — not decisive again, but the tone is rather that of a man looking back on a past period of his life, and the order of the names suggests the thought of the ministrations at Ephesus being subsequent to those at Rome. Possibly, too, the mention of “the household,” instead of Onesiphorns himself, may imply his death in the interval. This, therefore, tends to B rather than A.

(5.) The abandonment of Paul by Demas (^{<5040>}2 Timothy 4:10)-strongly in favor of B. Demas was with the apostle when the epistles to the Colossians (^{<5004>}Colossians 4:14) and Philemon (24) were written. 2 Timothy must

therefore, in all probability, have been written after them; but if we place it anywhere in the first imprisonment, we are all but compelled, by the mention of Mark, for whose coming the apostle asks in ^{<S041>}2 Timothy 4:11, and who is with him in ^{<S040>}Colossians 4:10, to place it at an earlier age. The above qualifying words (“all but”) might have been omitted but for the fact that it has been suggested that Demas, having forsaken Paul, repented and returned (Lardner, 6:368).

(6.) The presence of Luke (^{<S041>}Luke 4:11) agrees well enough with A (^{<S044>}Colossians 4:14), but is perfectly compatible with B.

(7.) The request that Timothy would bring Mark (^{<S041>}Mark 4:11) seems at first, compared as above with ^{<S044>}Colossians 4:14, to support A, but, in connection with the mention of Demas, tends decidedly to B.

(8.) Mention of Tychicus as sent to Ephesus (4:12) appears, as connected with ^{<S042>}Ephesians 6:21, 22; ^{<S047>}Colossians 4:7, in favor of A, yet, as Tychicus was continually employed on special missions of this kind, may just as well fit in with B.

(9.) The request that Timothy would bring the cloak and books left at Troas (^{<S043>}2 Timothy 4:13). On the assumption of A, the last visit of Paul to Troas would have been at least four or five years before, during which there would probably have been opportunities enough for his regaining what he had left. In that case, too, the circumstances of the journey present no trace of the haste and suddenness which the request more than half implies. On the whole, then, this must be reckoned as in favor of B.

(10.) “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil,” “greatly withstood our words” (^{<S044>}2 Timothy 4:14, 15). The part taken by a Jew of this name in the uproar of Acts 19, and the natural connection of the *χαλκεύς* with the artisans represented by Demetrius, suggest a reference to that event as something recent, and so far support A., On the other hand, the name Alexander was too common to make us certain as to the identity and if it were the same, the hypothesis of a later date only requires us to assume what was probable enough, a renewed hostility.

(11.) The abandonment of the apostle in his first defense (*ἀπολογία*), and his deliverance “from the mouth of the lion” (^{<S046>}2 Timothy 4:16, 17) fits in as a possible contingency with either hypothesis, but, like the mention of

Demas in (5), must belong, at any rate, to a time much later than any of the other epistles written from Rome.

(12.) “Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick” (4, 20) language, as in (9), implying a comparatively recent visit to both places. If, however, the letter were written during the first imprisonment, then Trophimus had not been left; at Miletus, but had gone on with Paul to Jerusalem (~~4273~~Acts 21:29), and the mention of Erastus as remaining at Corinth would have been superfluous to one who had left that city at the same time as the apostle (~~4406~~Acts 20:4). The conjecture that the “leaving” referred to took place during the voyage of Acts 27 is purely arbitrary, and at variance with ver. 5 and 6 of that chapter.

(13.) “Hasten to come before winter” Assuming A, the presence of Timothy in ~~3006~~Philippians 1:1; ~~5006~~Colossians 1:1; Philemon 1 might be regarded as the consequence of this; but then, as shown in (5) and (6), there are almost insuperable difficulties in supposing this epistle to have been written before those three.

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

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

II. Place. —On this point the second epistle is free from the conflict of conjectures. With the solitary exception of Böttger, who suggests Caesarea, there is a *consensus* in favor of Rome, and everything in the circumstances and names of the epistle leads to the same conclusion. We may suppose that Paul was apprehended at Nicopolis (~~5412~~1 Timothy 3:12), and thence conveyed to Rome, where this epistle was written, shortly before his death. Where Timothy was at the time it is impossible to say; most probably at Ephesus.

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

It consists of an inscription (^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:1-5); of a series of exhortations to Timothy, to be faithful in his zeal for sound doctrine, patient under affliction: and persecution, careful to maintain a deportment becoming his office, and diligent in his endeavors to counteract the unhallowed efforts of the false teachers (^{<506>}1 Timothy 1:6; 4:8); and, a conclusion in which Paul requests Timothy to visit him, and sends the salutations of certain Christians at Rome to Timothy, and those of the apostle himself to some believers in Asia Minor.

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

Tin

(*l yd*𐤁𐤃 *bedil*, from *l d*𐤁; *to divide*; so called apparently from its separation as an *alloy* [Isaiah 1, 25]; Septl *κασσίτερος*; Vlg. *stannum*), Among the various metals found among the spoils of the Midianites, tin is enumerated (^{<0612>}Numbers 31:22); It. was known to the Hebrew metal-workers as an alloy of other metals (^{<2025>}Isaiah 1:25; ^{<3218>}Ezekiel 22:18, 20). The markets of Tyre were supplied with it by the ships of Tarshish (^{<3272>}Ezekiel 27:12). It was used for plummets (^{<3040>}Zechariah 4:10, marg. "stone of tin," as the Heb. is), and was so plentiful as to furnish the writer of Ecclesiasticus (47:18) with a figure by which to express the wealth of Solomon, whom he apostrophizes thus: "Thou didst gather gold as *tin*, and didst multiply silver as lead."

In the Homeric times the Greeks were familiar with it. Twenty lavers of tin were in Agamemnon's cuirass given him by Cinyres (Homer, *II.* 11:25), and twenty bosses of tin were upon his shield (*ibid.* 11:34). Copper, tin, and gold were used by Hephestus in welding the famous shield of Achilles (*ibid.* 18:474). The fence 'round the vineyard in the device upon it was of tin (*ibid.* 564), and the oxen were wrought of tin and gold (*ibid.* 574). -The

greaves of Achilles, made by Hephestus, were of tin beaten fine, close fitting to the limb (*ibid.* 612; 21:592). His shield had two folds, *or* layers, of tin between two outer layers of bronze and inner layer of gold (*ibid.* 20:271). Tin was used in ornamenting chariots (*ibid.* 23:503), and a cuirass of bronze overlaid with tin is mentioned (*ibid.* 561). No allusion to it is found in the *Odyssey*. The melting of tin in a smelting-pot is mentioned by Hesiod (*Theol.* 862).

Tin is not found in Palestine (Kitto, *Phys. Hist. of Palest.* ch. 3, p. 73). Whence, then, did the ancient Hebrews obtain their supply? "Only three countries are known to contain any considerable quantity of it: Spain and Portugal, Cornwall and the adjacent parts of Devonshire, and the islands of Junk, Ceylon, and Banca, in the Straits of Malacca" (Kenrick, *Phoenicia*, p. 212). According to Diodorus Siculus (5, 46), there were tin mines in the island of Panchaia, off the east coast of Arabia, but the metal was not exported. There can be little doubt that the mines of Britain were the chief source of supply to the ancient world. Mr. Cooley, indeed, writes very positively (*Maritime and Inland Discovery*, 1, 131), "There can be no difficulty in determining the country from which tin first arrived in Egypt. That metal has been in all ages a principal export of India; it is enumerated as such by Arrian, who found it abundant in the ports of Arabia at a time when the supplies of Rome flowed chiefly through that channel. The tin-mines of Banca are probably the richest in the world; but tin was unquestionably brought from the West at a later period." But it has been shown conclusively by Dr. George Smith (*The Cassiterides*, Lond. 1863) that, so far from such a statement being justified by the authority of Arrian, the facts are all the other way. After examining the commerce of the ports of Abyssinia, Arabia, and India, it is abundantly evident that, "instead of its coming, from the East to Egypt; it has invariably been exported from Egypt to the East" (p. 23). With regard to the tin obtained from Spain, although the metal was found there, it does not appear to have been produced in sufficient quantities to supply the Phoenician markets. Posidonius (in Strabo, 3, 147) relates that in the country of the Artabri, in the extreme north-west of the peninsula, the ground was bright with silver, tin, and white gold (mixed with silver), which were brought down by the rivers; but the quantity thus obtained could not have been adequate to the demand. At the present day the whole surface bored for mining in Spain is little more than a square mile (Smith, *Cassiterides*, p. 46). We are therefore driven to conclude that it was from the Cassiterides, or tin districts of Britain, that

the Phoenicians obtained the great bulk of this commodity (Lewis, *Hist. Survey of the Astr. of the Anc.* p. 451), and that this was done by the direct voyage from Gades. It is true that at a later period (Strabo, 3. 147) tin was conveyed overland to Marseilles by a thirty days journey (Diod. Sic. 5, 2); but Strabo (3, 175) tells us that the Phoenicians alone carried on this traffic in former times from Gades concealing the passage from every one; and that on one occasion, when the Romans followed one of their vessels in order to discover the source of supply, the master of the ship ran upon a shoal, leading those who followed him to destruction. In course of time, however, the Romans discovered the passage. In Ezekiel," the trade in tin is attributed to Tarshish, as 'the merchant' for the commodity, without any mention of the place whence it was procured" (*Cassiterides*, p. 74); and it is after the time of Julius Caesar that we first hear of the overland traffic by Marseilles.

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

Tinction

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

Tindal (I), Matthew

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

Tindal (I), Nicholas

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

Tindale, William

SEE TYNDALE, WILLIAM.

Tingstad, Johan Adolph

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

Tinker, Reuben

a missionary of the Presbyterian Church; was born at Chester, Mass., Aug. 6, 1799. He received a good preparatory education; graduated at Amherst College in 1827, and at the Auburn Theological Seminary in 1830; and in November of the same ear was ordained by the Mountain Association, with a view to his becoming a missionary of the American Board at the Sandwich Islands. He reached the islands at a somewhat critical period,

but, in spite of all existing difficulties, the cause of the Gospel was rapidly advancing. In 1834 it was resolved to publish; in the native language, a semi-monthly newspaper devoted to the interests of religion, and he was appointed to conduct it. In 1838 he dissolved his relations with the board, and established himself, with the approval of his brethren, at Koloa, on the island of Kani, where he labored until he departed for his own country in 1840. In September, 1845, he was installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Westfield, Chautauqua Co., N.Y., where he continued to labor till near the close of his life. He died Oct. 26, 1854. Mr. Tinker was an eloquent preacher, a self-sacrificing missionary, and a fast and firm friend. After his death appeared *Sermones by Rev. Reuben Tinker, Missionary at the Sandwich Islands*; with a Biographical Sketch by M. L. P. Thompson, D.D. (Buffalo, 1856, 12mo). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 4:770; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J.L.S.)

Tinne (or Chippewayan) Version

This language is quite different from that which is called Chippeway or Ojibbeway; it is spoken in the Hudson's Bay Territory, near Fort Simpson, and over a vast tract of country eastward of the Rocky Mountains. The Rev. W. W. Kirkby, of the Church Missionary Society, has translated the gospels according to Mark and John, which have been printed in the syllabic character, and circulated among those for whom they were designed since 1870. (B. P.)

Tinshemeth

SEE MOLE; SEE SWAN.

Tintoretto, II, Or Giacomo Robusti

a distinguished Italian painter, was born at Venice, according to Ridolfi, in 1512. After being instructed in the rudiments of design, he became a pupil of Titian, with whom he studied for a short time only; it being generally stated that Titian dismissed him, being jealous of his talents and progress. He was not discouraged, but resolved to become the head of a new school. Over his door he wrote, "Michael Angelo's design, and the coloring of Titian." He made a special study of light and shade, and of the human form both by living models and by anatomy. Though he possessed many excellences, his sovereign merit consisted in the animation of his figures.

He flourished for a long period, and retained his powers to a great age, dying at Venice in 1594. His three greatest pictures, according to his own estimate and that of others, are, *The Crucifixion*, in the College of San Rocco; *The Last Supper*, now in the Church of Santa Maria della Salute; and *11 Servo*, or the Venetian Slave, condemned to martyrdom by the Turks, invoking the protection of St. Mark. Some of his works are of enormous size, the *Crucifixion* being forty feet long, the *Israelites worshipping the Golden Calf* and the *Last Judgment* each about sixty feet high. One of his last productions was his *Paradiso*, in the hall of the great council chamber of San Marco. Tintoretto wrought so fast, and at so low a price, that few of the other painters in Venice could secure employment. The churches and halls of the different communities are overloaded with his productions. See Spooner, *Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

Tiph'sah

(Heb. *Tiphscch'*, **j spT** from **j sP**; *to ford*, this being the usual crossing-place of the Euphrates [Strabo, 16:1, 21]; Sept. **θαψά** v.r. **θερσά**; Vulg. *Thaphsa*, *Thapsa*) is mentioned in ^{<1102>}1 Kings 4:24 as the limit of Solomon's empire towards the Euphrates, and in ^{<2151>}2 Kings 15:16 it is said to have been attacked by Menahem, king of Israel, who "smote Tiphshah and all that were therein, and all the coasts thereof." It is generally admitted that the town intended, at any rate in the former passage, is that which the Greeks and Romans knew under the name of *Thapsacus* (**θάψακος**), situated in Northern Syria, on the western bank of the Euphrates, not far above Carchemish. Thapsacus was a town of considerable importance in the ancient world. Xenophon, who saw it in the time of Cyrus the younger, calls it "great and prosperous" (**μεγάλη καὶ εὐδαίμων**, *Anab.* 1; 4, 11). It must have been a place of considerable trade, the land traffic between East and West passing through it, first on account of its ford-way (which was the lowest upon the Euphrates), and then on account of its bridge (Strabo, 16:1, 23); while it was likewise the point where goods were both embarked for transport down the stream (Q. Curt. 10:1), and also disembarked from boats which had come up it, to be conveyed on to their final destination by land (Strabo, 16:3, 4). It is a fair conjecture that Solomon's occupation of the place was connected with his efforts to establish a line of trade with Central Asia directly across the continent, and that Tadmor was intended as a resting-place on the journey to Thapsacus. Thapsacus was the place at which armies marching east or

west usually crossed the "Great River." It was there that the Ten Thousand first learned the real intentions of Cyrus, and, consenting to aid him in his enterprise, passed the stream (Xenoph. *Anab.* 1, 4, 11). 'There, too, Darius Codomannus crossed on his flight from Issus (Arrian, *Exp. A l.* 2, 13); and Alexander, following at his leisure, made his passage at the same point (*ibid.* 3 7). A bridge of boats was usually maintained at the place by the Persian kings, which of course was broken up when danger threatened. Even then, however, the stream could in general be forded, unless in the flood season. This is clear from the very name of the place, and is confirmed by modern researches. When the natives told Cyrus that the stream had acknowledged him as its king, having never been forded until his army waded through it, they calculated on his ignorance, or thought he would not examine too strictly into the groundwork of a compliment (see Xenoph. *Anab.* 1, 4, 11). When Greek ascendancy and enterprise succeeded to Persian rule, Thapsacus rose into still greater importance, and embraced both sides of the river-whence it received the name of *Amhipolis* (Pliny, 5, 21).

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

Tipelskirch, Friedrich

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

Tippet

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

Tipstaff

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

Tira

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

Ti'ras

(Heb. *Tiras'*, *sryṯas* Sept. *θείρας*; Vulg. *Thisras*), the youngest son of Japheth (Genesis 10, 2). B.C. 2514. As the name occurs only in the ethnological table, we have no clue, so far as the Bible is concerned, to guide us as to the identification of it with any particular people. Ancient authorities generally fixed on the *Thracians*, as presenting the closest verbal approximation to the name (Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 6, 1; Jerome, *in* ~~Gen.~~ *Genesis 10:2*; Targums Pseudo-Jon. and Jerus. *on Genesis* loc. cit.; Targ. on ~~1 Chr.~~ *1 Chronicles 1:5*); the occasional rendering *Persia* probably originated in a corruption of the original text. The correspondence between *Thrace* and *Tiras* is not so complete as to be convincing; the gentile form *θρᾶξ*, however, brings them nearer together. No objection arises on ethnological grounds to placing the Thracians among the Japhetic races (Bochart, *Phaleg*, 3, 2; Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1, 55 sq.). Their precise ethnic position is, indeed, involved in great uncertainty; but all authorities agree in their general Indo-European character. The evidence of this is circumstantial rather than direct. The language has disappeared, with the exception of the ancient names and the single word *bria*, which forms the termination of *Mesembria*, *Selymbria*, etc., and is said to signify "town" (Strabo, 7:319). The Thracian stock was represented in later times by the *Getae*, and these, again, still later, by the *Daci*, each of whom inherited the old Thracian tongue (*ibid.* 303). But this circumstance throws little light on the subject; for the Dacian language has also disappeared, though fragments of its vocabulary may possibly exist either in Wallachian dialects or perhaps in the Albanian language (Diefenbach, *Or. Eur.* p. 68). If Grimm's identification of the *Getae* with the *Goths* were established, the Teutonic affinities of the Thracians would be placed beyond question (*Gesch. d. deutsch. Spr.* 1, 178); but this view does not meet with general acceptance. The Thracians are associated in ancient history with the *Pelasgians* (Strabo, 9:401), and the *Trojans*, with whom they had many names in common (*ibid.* 13:590); in *Asia Minor* they were represented by the *Bithnians* (Herod. 1, 28; 7:75). These circumstances lead to the conclusion that they belonged to the Indo-European family, but do not warrant us in assigning them to any particular branch of it. Other explanations have been offered of the name *Tiras*, of which we may notice the *Agathyrsi*, the first part of the name (*Aga*) being treated as a prefix (Knobel, *Völkertafel*, p. 129); *Taurus* and the various tribes occupying that range (Kalisch, *Comm.* p. 246); the river. *Tyras* (Dniester), with its

cogominous inhabitants the Tyritf (Havernick, *Einleit.* 2, 231; Schulthess, *Prad.* p. 194); and, lastly, the maritime *Tyrrheni* (Tuch, *in Genesis* loc. cit.). *SEE ETHNOGRAPHY.*

Ti'rathite

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

Tire

Picture for Tire

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

Tirha'kah

Picture for Tirhakah

[many *Tirshakah*] (Heb. *Tirha'kah*, **הַחֲרָה**), of Ethiopic derivation; Sept. **θαρακά** v.r. **θαραθά** and **θαρά** ; *Vulg. Tharaca*), a king of Cush (Sept. **βασιλεὺς Αἰθιοπῶν**, A.V. “king of Ethiopia”), the opponent of Sennacherib (⁻⁷²⁰2 Kings 19:9; ⁻⁷³⁰Isaiah 37:9). While the king of Assyria was “warring against Libnah,” in the south of Palestine, he heard of Tirhakah’s advance to fight him, and sent a second time to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. This was near the close of B.C. 713, unless we suppose that the expedition took place in the twenty-fourth instead of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, which would bring it to B.C. 703. If it were an expedition later than that of which the date is mentioned, it must have been before B.C. 697, Hezekiah’s last year. But, if the reign of Manasseh is reduced to thirty-five years, these dates would be respectively B.C. cir. 693, 683, and 678, and these numbers might have to be slightly modified if the fixed date of the capture of Samaria, B.C. 720, be abandoned. **SEE HEZEKIAH**. Wilkinson supposes (1, 138) that Tirh’kah occupied the throne of Egypt from B.C. 710 to 689. Rawlinson gives the date B.C. 690 (*Hersod.* 1, 392). Dr. Hincks, in an elaborate article, argues for this latter date, and: supposes Tirh’kah, after a reign over Egypt of twenty-six years, to have retired to Ethiopia B.C. 664 (*Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1864). **SEE CIHRONOLOGY**. According to Manetho’s epitomists, *Tarakos* (**Ταρακός**), or *Tarkos* (**Ταρκός**), was the third and last king of the XXVth dynasty, which was of Ethiopians, and reigned eighteen (Afr.) or twenty (Eus.) years. From one of the Apis-Tablets we learn that a bull Apis was born in his twenty-sixth year and died at the end of the twentieth of Psammetichus I of the XXVIth dynasty. Its life exceeded twenty years, and no Apis is stated to have lived longer than twenty-six. Taking that sum as the most probable, we should date Tirh’kah’s accession B.C. cir. 695, and assign him a reign of twenty-six years. In this case we should be obliged to take the later reckoning of the Biblical events, were it not for the possibility that Tirh’kah ruled over Ethiopia before becoming king of Egypt. In connection with this theory it must be observed that an earlier Ethiopian of the same dynasty is called in the Bible “So, king of Egypt,” while this ruler is called Tirh’kah, king of Ethiopia,” and that a Pharaoh is spoken of in Scripture at the period of the latter, and also that Herodotus (3, 141) represents the Egyptian opponent of Sennacherib as Sethos, a native king,

who may, however, have been a vassal under the Ethiopian. See So. It is deserving of remark, and strongly favors the view of those writers who maintain that during considerable periods Ethiopian dynasties ruled in Egypt, that from the time of Shishak to that of Tirh'kah it is of Ethiopians that we read in Scripture as having mainly furnished the hosts which marched to battle out of Egypt. While Shishak is called king of Egypt, his army is declared to have been composed, not of Egyptians, but of Lubims and Sukkims and Ethiopians (~~417B~~ 2 Chronicles 12:3). We subsequently read of Zerah the Ethiopian leading an army of Ethiopians and Lubims against Asa (16, 8). We now find that while Pharaoh of Egypt may have made great promises, it is the Ethiopian king Tirh'kah who alone brings an army into the field. In the reign of Pharaoh-necho, the Egyptian army seems to have been mainly composed of Ethiopians and Libyans (~~241D~~ Jeremiah 46:9). The natural inference is that, during this long period, the military power of Egypt was at a low ebb. At the time we are now speaking of, Rawlinson supposes Egypt to have been subject to Ethiopia (*Hierod. 1*, 391). In this he is not quite correct, however. Egypt may have been inferior to it in strength and spirit, but it was, at least, nominally independent at this time, though it may have fallen soon after under the power of the Ethiopian king. That Tirh'kah was actually king of Egypt at some time is strongly maintained. There is nothing in Scripture to prevent our supposing that he became so subsequent to the period when it speaks of him. Indeed, in the position in which it places him, at the head of a large army in Egypt, with no Assyrian enemy to dread, it pictures a situation which would tempt an ambitious soldier to extend his power by dethroning an effeminate or irresolute monarch, such as the Pharaoh of his time would seem to have been. Wilkinson (1, 138-142) supposes that he at first ruled over Upper Egypt, while Sethos held the sovereignty of the lower country; that he came to the Egyptian throne rather by legal succession than by usurpation; and that he did actually fight against the army of Sennacherib, and overthrow it in battle. Scripture, however, expressly ascribes the overthrow of the Assyrian to the supernatural interposition of God (~~1268S~~ 2 Kings 19:35). Herodotus (2, 141) does not mention Tirh'kah at all, but only speaks of the king of Egypt, and mentions the overthrow of the Assyrian army very much in the way that crafty, priests might pervert the actual occurrence as recorded in Scripture. It is quite possible that Tirh'kah may have led his army in pursuit of the Assyrians after their mysterious midnight overthrow; may have captured prisoners and treasure; and this would be quite sufficient ground for any successes ascribed to him on the

Theban sculptures. If, as is probable, he became king of all Egypt, there seems strong reason for agreeing with much, at least; of Strabo's account of him (lib. 15) as having extended his conquests into Europe. The Assyrian power was effectually checked by the ruin of its army and the divisions of its reigning family. At the head of a great army which had come forth to fight the Assyrians, and now found itself without a foe, there is every reason why Tirh'kah may have extended the Egyptian power as far as any Egyptian king before him. If Tirh'kah did come into actual collision with the Assyrians at or near Pelusium in Egypt, as many writers maintain, it must have been upon another occasion than that mentioned in Scripture (see Josephus, *Ant. 10:1, 4*). It is, however, more probable that Scripture has sketched in a few words the entire matter, and that the variations from it are the effect of ignorance or design. The invasion of Assyria had probably Egypt and Ethiopia as its ultimate object, but in the account of Scripture the Assyrian host plainly was only on its way to the accomplishment of its purpose. *SEE SENNACHERIB.*

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

Tirha'nah

[many *Tir'hanah*] (Heb. *Tirchanah'*, **תִּרְחָנָה** *Tirchanah'*; Sept. **θαρχανά** v.r. **θαράμ**; Vulg. *Tharina*), second named of the four sons of Caleb the Hezronite by his concubine Maachah (^{<12B>}1 Chronicles 2:48). B.C. apparently cir. 1618.

Tir'ia

(Heb. *Tireya*. אַרְיָאֵף *Ar'ia* *fear*; Sept. Τῖριά v.r. Τῖριό ; Vulg. *Thiria*), third named of the four sons of Jehaleleel of the tribe of Judah (~~1~~1 Chronicles 4:16). BC. apparently cir. 1618.

Tirinus, Jacob

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

Tirones

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

Tironesians, or Congregation of Tiron

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

At the time of its greatest prosperity there were under its control eleven abbeys, forty-four priories, and twenty-nine parishes, scattered over France, England, and Scotland. In 1629 the Abbey of Tiron was added to the possessions of the Congregation of St. Maur, and from that time the Tironesians ceased to exist as a separate organization. See Helyot, *Ordres Religieix*, 3, 674.

Tirosh

SEE WINE.

Tirsch, Leopold

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

Tirsha'tha

[most *Tir'shatha*] (Heb. always with the article, *hat-Tirshatha'*, **atvrāḥi**) hence the Sept. gives the word **Ἀθηρσασθά** [4.r. **Ἀθηρσαθά**]. ^{<1503>}Ezra 2:63; ^{<1075>}Nehemiah 7:65, and ' **Ἀρταρσασθά**, ^{<1601>}Nehemiah 10:1; Vulg. *Athersatha*), the title of the governor of Judaea under the Persians, derived by Gesenius from the Persian root *torsh*, signifying "stern," "severe." He compares the title *Gestrenger Herr*, formerly given to the magistrates of the free and imperial cities of Germany (comp. also our expression, "most dread sovereign"). It is added as a title after the name of Nehemiah (8:9; 10:1 [Heb. 2]); and occurs also. in three other places (^{<1503>}Ezra 2:63, and the repetition of that account in ^{<1075>}Nehemiah 7:65-70), where probably it is intended to denote Zerubbabel, who had held the, office before Nehemiah. In the margin of the A. V. (^{<1503>}Ezra 2:63; ^{<1075>}Nehemiah 7:65; 10:1) it is rendered "governor;" an explanation justified by ^{<1625>}Nehemiah 12:26, where "Nehemiah the governor **hj Phi**(*Pechah*, probably from the

same root as the word we write *pacha*, or pasha), occurs instead of the more usual expression "Nehemiah the Tirshatha." This word, **hhP**, is twice applied by Nehemiah to himself (^{<1654>}Nehemiah 5:14,18), and by the prophet Haggai (^{<3000>}Haggai 1:1; 2:2, 21) to Zerubbabel. According to Gesenius, it denotes the prefect or governor of a province of less extent than a satrapy. The word is used of officers and governors under the Assyrian (^{<1894>}2 Kings 18:24; ^{<2369>}Isaiah 36:9), Babylonian (^{<2517>}Jeremiah 51:57; ^{<3236>}Ezekiel 23:6, 23; see also ^{<1588>}Ezra 5:3, 14; 6:7; ^{<2782>}Daniel 3:2, 3, 27; 6:7 [Hebrews 8]), Median (^{<2512>}Jeremiah 51:28), and Persian (^{<1789>}Esther 8:9; 9:3) monarchies. Under this last we find it applied to the rulers of the provinces bordered by the Euphrates (^{<1586>}Ezra 8:36; ^{<1617>}Nehemiah 2:7, 9; 3:7), and to the governors of Judaea, Zerubbabel and Nehemiah (comp. ^{<3008>}Malachi 1:8). It is found also at an earlier period in the times of Solomon (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:15; ^{<1494>}2 Chronicles 9:14) and Benhadad king of Syria (^{<1124>}1 Kings 20:24), from which last place, compared with others (^{<1894>}2 Kings 18:24; ^{<2369>}Isaiah 36:9), we find that military commands were often held by these governors; the word, indeed, is often rendered by the A. V., either in the text or the margin, "captain." By thus briefly examining the sense of *Pechdh*, which (though of course a much more general and less distinctive word) 'is given as an equivalent to *Tirshath*'. we have no difficulty in forming an opinion as to the general notion implied in it. We have, however, no sufficient information to enable us to explain in detail in what consisted the special peculiarities in honor or functions that distinguished the Tirshatha from others of the same class, governors, captains, princes, rulers of provinces. **SEE GOVERNOR.**

Tir'zah

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

1. The last named of the five daughters of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh, whose case originated the law that in the event of a man dying without male issue his property should pass to his daughters (^{<0253>}Numbers 26:33; 27:1; 36:11 [where she is named second]; ^{<1573>}Joshua 17:3). **SEE ZELOPHEHAI**).

2. An ancient Canaanitish city, whose king is enumerated among the twenty-one overthrown in the conquest of the country (^{<1524>}Joshua 12:24).

From that time nothing is heard of it till after the disruption of Israel and Judah. It then reappears as a royal city, the residence of Jeroboam (^{<1147>}1 Kings 14:17; Sept. **Σαριφά**, i.e.? *Zaieda*), and of his successors, Baasha (^{<1152>}1 Kings 15:21, 33), Elah (^{<1168>}1 Kings 16:8, 9), and Zimri (ver. 15). It contained the royal sepulchres of one (ver. 6), and probably all the first four kings of the northern kingdom. Zimri was besieged there by Omri, and perished in the flames of his palace (ver. 18). The new king continued to reside there at first, but after six years he left it to his son Ahab (q.v.), at that time raised to the viceroyship; and removed to a new city which he built and named Shomrón (Samaria), and which 'continued to be the capital of the northern kingdom till its fall. Once, and once only, does Tirzah reappear, as the seat of the conspiracy of Menahem ben-Gaddi against the wretched Shallum (^{<1254>}2 Kings 15:14, 16); but as soon as his revolt had proved successful, Menahem removed the seat of his government to Samaria, and Tirzah was again left in obscurity. Its reputation for beauty throughout the country must have been wide-spread. It is in this sense that it is mentioned in the Song of Solomon, where the juxtaposition of Jerusalem is sufficient proof of the estimation in which it was held — "Beautiful as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem" (^{<2104>}Song of Solomon 6:4). The Sept. (**εὐδοκία**) and. Vulg. (*suavis*) do not, however, take *tirtsah* as a proper name in this passage. Its occurrence here on a level with Jerusalem has been held to indicate that the Song of Songs was the work of a writer belonging to the northern kingdom. But surely a poet, and so ardent a poet as the author of the, Song of Songs, may have been sufficiently independent of political considerations to go out of his own country if Tirzah can be said to be out of the country of a native of Judah- for a metaphor. *SEE CANTICLES*.

Eusebius (*Onomiasf.* sv. **θαρσιλά**) mentions it in connection with Menahem, and identifies it with a "village of Samaritans in Batansea." There is, however, nothing in the Bible to lead to the inference that the Tirzah of the Israelitish monarchs was on the east of Jordan. Josephus merely mentions it (**θαρσή**, *Ant.* 8:12, 5). It is nowhere stated to what tribe this town belonged; but Adrichomius (*Theaf. T. S.* p. 74) and others place it in Manasseh. Lightfoot (*Choreograph. Cent.* c. 88) seems to suspect that Tirzah and Shechem were the same; for he says that "if Shechem and Tirzah were not one and the same town," it would appear that Jeroboam had removed when his son died from where he was when he first erected his idols (comp. ^{<1125>}1 Kings 12:25; 14:17). It does not appear

to be mentioned by the Jewish topographers, or any of the Christian travelers of the Middle Ages, except Brocardus, who places “Thersa on a high mountain, three leagues (*leucæ*) from Samaria to the east” (*Descriptio Terræ Sanctæ*. 7:13). This is exactly the direction, and very nearly the distance, of *Tellizah*, a place in the mountains north of Nablus, which was visited by Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 3, 302) and Van de Velde in 1852 (*Syr. and Pal.* 3, 334). The town is on an eminence, which towards the east is exceedingly lofty, though, being at the edge of the central highlands, it is more approachable from the west. “The place is large and thriving, but without any obvious marks of antiquity (Robinson, *Later Res.* p. 302). Lieut. Coider, however, suggests the identity of Tirzah with a “mud hamlet” called *Teidsir*, twelve miles east of Jeba, which he found to have been once a place of importance, judging from the numerous rock-cut sepulchers burrowing under the houses, the fertile lands and fine olives around, and the monument of good masonry, apparently a Roman tomb. The position is beautiful, and the old main road leads to the place from Shechem (*Tent Work in Palest.* 1, 108).

Tischendorf, Lobegott Friedrich Constantin

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

Fidem Antiquorum Testium Recens. Brevenm Appaaturz Crit. una cuan Variis Lectionibus Elzev., Knappii, Scholzii, Lachmanni subjunctis, etc. (ibid.). In 1840 Tischendorf went to Paris. The library there contained a celebrated palimpsest. A manuscript of the Bible from early in the 5th century had been cleaned off in the 12th century, and used for writings of Ephraem Syrus. What no mortal had been able to do before, Tischendorf did, and with the aid of chemical reagents he completely restored the original text. The University of Breslau acknowledged his merit by bestowing on him the title of doctor of theology. Meanwhile he also collated the Paris manuscripts of Philo for Prof. Grossmann at Leipsic, and the only remaining manuscript of the 60th book of the Basilicas for Dr. Heimbach at Jena. F. Didot, the publisher, bargained with Tischendorf for a reissue of his Leipsic edition, which appeared at Paris in 1842; and then abbé Jager, a professor in the Sorbonne, begged him to edit a Greek text that should conform as nearly as possible to the Vulgate, which was also published in the same year. In 1841 and 1842 he visited the libraries in Holland, London, Cambridge, and Oxford. Early in 1843 he left Paris for Rome, on the way working four weeks on the Codex E of the gospels at Basle. In Italy he staved more than a year, and used his time in the best possible manner. When his Italian researches were completed, he prepared to start for his first Eastern journey in 1844, which he repeated again in 1853 and 1859. On his third journey, in 1859, he discovered the famous *Codex Sinaiticus*. After his return he was made ordinary professor of the Leipsic University, and a special chair of sacred paleography was made for him. From this time on, he spent the remainder of his life in publishing the results of his amassed materials, collected on his different journeys, of which we shall speak further on. On May 5, 1873, he was seized with apoplexy; he recovered somewhat from the attack, but in November, 1874, the malady grew worse, and on Dec. 7, 1874, he passed away. His funeral took place on the 10th, at which Drs. Ahifeld, Kahnis, Luthardt, and others made addresses.

Probably no theologian ever received so varied and so many signs of distinction, academic and civil. He was made a Russian noble, a Saxon privy-councilor, knight of any orders, doctor of all academic degrees, and member of an indefinite number of societies. When, in 1855, king Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia (brother of the present emperor of Germany) said to him, "You are predestined to discoveries; wherever they are possible, there you are to make them," he only proved himself a true

prophet; and only a man of such uncommon quickness, keenness, energy, and ambition as Tischendorf could achieve what he brought about. "What Wettstein and Bengel began," said his colleague Luthardt, "what Hug and Lachmann carried on he brought nearly to completion in a way which leaves the labors of his predecessors far behind." And "whoever," said Kahnis, "in the future outstrips him will do it only on the road which Tischendorf marked out; whoever overcomes him will do so only by the weapons which he himself has furnished." Complaint has been made of his changes of opinion, a reading not infrequently being confidently adopted in one issue and as confidently rejected in the next, or *vice versa*. But how could it be otherwise, when the evidences in the case were constantly increasing in number and clearness? As the illustrious scholar said in his last will, "I have sought no other aim than truth; to her I have always unconditionally bowed the knee." No pride of opinion, no zeal for consistency, was allowed to stand in the way. He was, doubtless, unconsciously biased in favor of the authorities he himself had brought to light; but his purpose was to set forth the exact text of the original without regard to dogmatic, or personal considerations.

As to his publications, they are very numerous. We must here pass over his essays, reviews, etc., and shall confine ourselves to his most important works. Besides those already mentioned, they are, in chronological order, *Codex Ephraemici Syri Rescriptus* (Lips. 1843-45, 2 vols.): *Monumenta Sacra Inedita sive Reliquiae Antiquissimae Textus Novi Testam. Graeci*, etc. (ibid. 1846): —*De Israelitarum per Mare Rubrum Transitu* (ibid. 1847): —*Evangelium Palatinum Ineditum sive Reliquiae Textus Evangeliorum Latini ante Hieron. versi ex Cod. Palatino Purpureo 4 vel. v p. Chr. Saeculi* (ibid. 1847): —*Novum Test. Grac.* (ibid. 1850; 2nd ed. 1862, and often): —*Vetus Test. Graece a juxta LXX Interpretes: Textum Vat. Romanum emendatius edidit*, etc. (ibid. 1850, 2 vols.; 2nd ed. 1856; 3rd ed. 1860; 4th ed. 1869; 6th ed. 1880): —*Codex Amzianus sive N.T. Latine Interprete Hiesronymo* (ibid. 1850; 2nd ed. 1954): —*De Evangeliorum Aipocryphorum Originie et Usa*, etc. (Hagae, 1851): —*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Lips. 1851): —*Synopsis Evangelica* (ibid. 1851; 2nd ed. 1854; ed. 2 emend. 1864; ed. 3 emend. 1871; transl. into Tamul by H. Schanz, Tranquebar, 1868): —*Codex Claromontanus sive Epistulae Pauli Omnes Gr. et Lat. ex Cod. Paris. Celeberaimo*, etc. (ibid. 1852): —*Evangelia Apocrypha* (ibid. 1853): —*N.T. Tsriglottum, Gr. Lat. Germanice*, etc. (ibid. 1854; 2nd ed. 1865): —*N.T. Greece: Editio Academica* (ibid. 1855,

and often): —*Monumenta Sacra Inedita : Nova Collectio* (1855-70, 7 vols.): —*Pilati circa Christum Judicio quid Lucis Afeiraturu ex Actis Pilati* (ibid. 1855): —*Anecdota Sacra et Profana ex Oriente et Occidente Allata*, etc. (ibid. 1855; 2nd ed. 1861): —*Hermae Pastor Graeca*. (ibid. 1856): —*N.T. Gr. et Lat., ex Triglottis* (ibid. 1858): —*N.T. Graec.: Editio Septima Critica Major* (ibid..1859), and *Editio Septina Critica Minor* (ibid.): —*Notitia Etditionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaistici Auspiclis Imperatoris. Alexandri II Susceptae* (ibid. 1860): —*Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petopolitanus*, etc. (Petropoli, 1862, 4 vols. fol.): — *N.T. Sinaiticum sire N.T. cum Epistula Barnabae et Fragmentis Pastoris* (Lips. 1863): — *N.T. Greece et Germaniae, ex Triglottis* (ibid. 1864): — *N.T. Latine: Textum Hieronymi Notata Clementina Lectione*, etc. (ibid. 1864) —*N.T. Gr., ex Sinaítico Codiae Omnium Antiquissimo Vaticana itengue Elzeviriaena Lectione. Notata* (ibid. 1865): —*Wann curden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* (ibid. 1865, and often). Of this little book there are three French, English, and American translations, two Swedish, and one each of Danish, Dutch. Italian, Russian, and *Turkish*: —*Apocalypses Apocryphce Mosis, Esdrce, Pauli, Johannis*, etc. (ibid. 1866): —*N.T. Vaticanum, post Angli Mai aliorumque Impefectos Labores ex ipso Codice edidit* (ibid. 1867): —*Appendix Codicum Celeberrimorum Sinaistici Vaticani Alexandrini* (ibid. 1867): —*Philonea Inedita Altera*, etc. (ibid. 1868): —*N.T. Gr., ad Antiquiss. Testes denuo Rec. Apparatum Criticumn Owreni Studio Perfectum* (ibid. 1869-72, 2 vols.); the third vol., containing *Prolegomena*, is now in preparation by Dr. Oscar Gebhardt; *The New Testament: the Authorized English Version, with Introductions and Various Readings from the three most Celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text* (ibid. 1869); 45,000 copies were sold in the first year: *Appendix Novi Testam. Vaticani*, etc. (ibid. 1869): — *Conlatio Critic Cod. Sin. cum Textu Elzeviriano Vatic.* etc. (ibid. 1869): —*Responsa ad Calumnias Romanus* (ibid. 1870): —*Die Sinaibibel*, etc. (ibid. 1871): — *N.T. Greece, ad Antiquissimos Testes deunuo recensuit: Editio Critica Minor ed. 8 Majore Desumpta* (1872), vol. 1: *Clementis Romnaai Epistulce* (ibid. 1873) . — *Biblia Sacra Latina Veteris Testam. Hieroyymo Interpretei* etc. Editionem instituit suasore Chr. Car. Jos. de Bunsen, Th. Heyse, ad finem perduxit C. de T. (ibid. 1873) --*N.T. Gr., ad Editionem suam 8 Crit. Majorem conformavit, Lectionibusque Sinaiticis et Vaticanis item Elzevirianis instruxit* (ibid. 1873): —*Liber Psalmorsunz Hebr. atque Let. ab Hieronymo e Hebraeo Conversus*. Consociata Opera edd. C. de T., S. Bar, Fr. Delitzsch (ibid. 1874). From the rich material left behind, we

may expect still other works. Besides these works, we must mention his *Reise in den Orient* (Leips. 1846, 2 vols.; Engl. transl. by W. L. Shuckard, *Travels in the East* [Lond. 1847]): —*Aus dem heiligen Lande* (ibid. 1862; transl. into French and Swedish): —*Recheonschafft über meine handschrülichen Studien Studien afeine wissenschaftlichen Reise*, published in the *Jahrbiicher der. Literatur*; and papers in the *Anzeige-Blatt*. The *Leipziger Repertorium der deutschen und ausldndischen Literatur*, the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Serapeurm*, and *Studien und Kritiken* also contain a vast amount of information from his pen, as maybe seen from the list of Tischendorf's writings furnished by Mr. Gregory for the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1876, p. 183 sq.

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

Tischer, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm

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

Bibi. Theolog. 2, 1343; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 262; 2, 161, 197, 228, 314, 321, 334. (B.P)

Tish'bite

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

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

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

been purposely so described, in order to distinguish it from the town of the same name in Galilee.

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

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

Tisio (or Tisi), Benvenuto

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

Tisri, or rather Tismori

(**yrc̄t** from **r̄c̄t**, to begin), was the Rabbinical name of the first month of the civil and the seventh month of the ecclesiastical year, in which fell the festival of Atonement and that of Tabernacles. In ^{<100>}1 Kings 8:2' it is termed the month of *Ethanim*, that is, the month of streaming rivers, which are filled during this month by the autumnal rains. It corresponds with our

September-October. Tisri is one of the six names of months found in Palmyrene inscriptions, which, with other evidence, renders it very probable that the Jewish names of months form a member in a great series, which were extensively in use in the eastern parts of the world (see Benfey and Stern, *Ueber die Monatsnamen einiger alten Völker* [Berlin, 1836]).

SEE MONTI.

Ti'tan

(**Τιτάν**, usually in the plur. **Τιτᾶνες**, of uncertain derivation).. These children of Uranus (Heaven) and Gaia (Earth) were, *SEE TITANES*, according to the earliest Greek legends, the vanquished predecessors of the Olympian gods, condemned by Zeus to dwell in Tartarus, yet not without retaining many relics of their ancient dignity (Aesch. *Prom. Vinc.* passim). By later (Latin) poets they were confounded with the kindred *Gigantes* (Horace, *Odes*, 3, 4, 42, etc.), as the traditions of the primitive Greek faith died away; and both terms were transferred by the Sept. to the Rephaim of ancient Palestine. *SEE GIANT*. The usual Greek rendering of *Rephaim* is indeed **Γίγαντες** (^{<1145>}Genesis 14:5; ^{<1124>}Joshua 12:4, etc.), or, with a yet clearer reference to Greek mythology, **γηγενεῖς** (Proverbs 2, 18; 9:18) and **θεομάχοι** (Symmach.; ^{<1198>}Proverbs 9:18; 21:16; ^{<1205>}Job 26:5). But in 2 Samuel 5, 18, 22 “the valley of Rephaim” is represented by **ἡ κοιλάς τῶν τιτάνων** instead of **ἡ κοιλάς τῶν γιγάντων** (^{<1115>}1 Chronicles 11:15; 14:9, 13); and the same rendering occurs in a Hexapl. text in ^{<1023>}2 Samuel 23:13. Thus Ambrose defends his use of a classical allusion by a reference to the old Latin version of 2 Samuel 5, which preserved the Sept. rendering (*De Fide*, 3, 1, 4, “Nam et gigantes et vallem Titanum prophetici sermonis series non refugit. Et Esaias Sirenas... dixit”). It can therefore occasion no surprise that in the Greek version of the triumphal hymn of Judith (16, 7) “the sons of the Titans” (**υἱοὶ Τιτάνων**; Vulg. *fili Titan*; old Lat. *fili Dathan*; *f. Tela*; *f. bellatorum*) stands parallel with “high giants,” **ὕψηλὸν Γίγαντες**, where the original text probably had **μγαρ** and **μγρωβγα**. The word has yet another interesting point of connection with the Bible; for it may have been from some vague sense of the struggle of the infernal and celestial powers, dimly shadowed forth in the classical myth of the Titans, that several Christian-fathers inclined to the belief that **Τειτάν** was the mystic name of “the beast” indicated in Rev. 13:18 (Ireneus, 5 30, 3, “Divinum putatur apud multos esse hoc nomen et ostentationem quandam continentulionis ... et alias autem et antiquum, et fide dignum, et

regale, magis autem et tyrannicum nomen ... ut ex multis colligamus ne forte *Titan* vocetur qui veniet”).

Titanes

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

Tithe

(**רְעִי**) *maaser*; Sept. and New Test. **δεκάτη**, occasionally **δέκατον** or **ἐπιδέκατον**; *Vulg. decimae*; plur. **תְּשׁוּבָה אֵי דְעָכָא**; *decimae*; from **רְעִי** “ten;” Targum **אַרְבָּעָה אֲרָבָה** (**ars[^m dt]**), the tenth part both of the produce of the land and of the increase of the flock, enjoined in the Mosaic law to be devoted by every Israelite to the servants of the sanctuary, and to the hospitable meals provided on the festivals for the poor and needy (**רְעִי** Leviticus 27:30-33; **רְעִי** Numbers 18:21-32; **רְעִי** Deuteronomy 12:5-18; 14:22-29; 26:12-14). (The following treatment of the subject relates to Jewish tithes from Biblical and Rabbinical sources.

I. The Mosaic Law respecting Tithes. —The first enactment respecting tithes ordains that the tenth of all produce and of all animals is to be

devoted to the Lord; that the predial or vegetable tithe may be redeemed if one fifth is added to its value; and that the mixed or animal tithe, which is unredeemable, is to be taken as it comes, without any selection, and without attempting to effect any change, else the original animal and the one substituted for it are both forfeited to the sanctuary (⁽⁴³⁷³⁾Leviticus 27:30-33). In the second mention of the tithe it is enacted that it is to be given to the Levites of the respective districts as a remuneration for their services in the sanctuary, since they were excluded from sharing in the division of the land of Canaan; that they are allowed to consume the tithe wherever they please ($\mu\omega\eta\mu\text{Al } \text{KB}$), and that from the tithe thus received they are to give a tenth to the Aaronites or priests (⁽⁴³⁸²⁾Numbers 18:21-32). In the third legislation on this point it is further commanded that the Israelites are to tithe the produce of the soil every year; that this vegetable tithe, together with the firstlings of the flock and herd, is to constitute the social and festive repast in the place of the sanctuary; that in case the sanctuary is too far off, the tithal produce is to be converted into money, which is to be taken to the metropolis, and there laid out in food for this entertainment, and that the Levite is to share with the family in this social meal. It is, moreover, ordained that at the end of every third year this vegetable tithe ($\text{ha}\text{W}\text{bT}\text{æc}\text{[j]ni}$) is not to be taken to the metropolis, but is to constitute hospitable and charitable meals at home, to which the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow are to be invited (⁽⁴³¹⁵⁾Deuteronomy 12:5-7, 17; 14:22-29). The triennial conversion of the second or vegetable tithe into entertainments for the poor is again enjoined in 26:12-15, where it is also ordered that every Israelite shall make an exculpatory declaration that he has conscientiously performed the tithal command.

It will be seen that the book, of Deuteronomy only mentions the second or vegetable tithe as well as its triennial conversion into the poor tithe, omitting altogether the first or Levitical tithe; while the books of Leviticus and Numbers, which discuss the Levitical tithe, pass over in silence the second or feast tithe. This has given rise to various theories among modern critics. Thus Ewald will have it that the Deuteronomist, writing during the period of the Jewish monarchy, when the Levitical tithe, as enacted in Leviticus and Numbers, could no longer be continued as a regular rate in consequence of the new taxes imposed by the sovereigns, endeavored to bring the tithe back to its original form of a voluntary offering. (*Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel*, p. 346). Knobel (*Comment. on Leviticus* p.

419, 590) regards ⁽⁵¹²⁶⁾Deuteronomy 12:6, 11; 14:22-29; 26:12, as proceeding from the later Jehovistic legislator who lived towards the end of the kingdom of Judah, and who substituted for the older Elohist annual vegetable and animal tithe, which was no longer practicable, the triennial vegetable tithe which was to be devoted to the hospitable meals, whereunto the Levites, together with the stranger, widow, orphans, and poor, were to be invited. Bishop Colenso (*The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined*, 3, 476), who also regards the enactments in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy as referring to one and the same tithe, finds “the most complete contradiction between the two sets of laws.” Against these theories, however, is to be urged that

- a.** The tithal enactment in Deuteronomy has nothing whatever to do with the one in Leviticus and Numbers, and is therefore neither intended to contravene nor supersede it.
- b.** The Deuteronomist presupposes the existence and force of the Levitical tithe as the fixed income of the ministers of the sanctuary, and designs the second tithe to be in force by its side. This is evident from the fact that the book of Deuteronomy (⁽⁵¹⁰⁰⁾Deuteronomy 10:9; 12:19; 14:27, 29), like the books of Leviticus and Numbers, legislates upon the basis of Levitical poverty, and frequently refers to the care to be taken of the Levites. Now if, according to the above-named hypothesis, we are to regard the triennial tithe as substituted in the place of the original Levitical tithe, we are shut up to the preposterous conclusion that the only provision made by the Deuteronomist for the Levites is an ample meal once in three years.
- c.** The mention of the second tithe by the Deuteronomist alone is owing to the fact that it is connected with the fixing of the central sanctuary, the rites and regulations of which he alone discusses.
- d.** The post-exilian practice of the Jews shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the nation for whom these tithal laws were passed understood the enactment in Deuteronomy to mean *a second* tithe as in force side by side with the first or Levitical tithe enjoined in Leviticus and Numbers (Tobit 1, 7; Josephus, *An.* 4:8, 8, 22; Mishna, *Maaser Sheni*). This also sets aside the objection urged by some that a double tithe would be too heavy and unbearable a tax. For if the Jews did not find it so in later times, when under the rule of foreign sovereigns, and paying heavy rates to them, surely they could not have found the double tithe too grinding an

oppression during the independence of the State, especially when it is remembered that the second tithe was devoted to festive repasts of the respective families at which the Levites, the strangers, the widows, orphans, etc., were simply guests.

From all this we gather:

1. That one tenth of the whole produce of the soil was to be assigned for the maintenance of the Levites.
2. That out of this the Levites were to dedicate a tenth to God for the use of the high-priest.
3. That a tithe, in all probability a *second* tithe, was to be applied to festival purposes.
4. That in every third year either this festival tithe or a *third* tenth was to be eaten in company with the poor and the Levites.

The question thus arises, were there *three* tithes taken in this third year, or is the third tithe only the second under a different description? That there were two yearly tithes seems clear, both from the general tenor of the directions and from the Sept. rendering of ^{<5142>}Deuteronomy 26:12. But it must be allowed that the *third* tithe is not without support.

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

b. Tobit says he gave one tenth to the priests, one tenth he sold and spent at Jerusalem, i.e. commuted according to ^{<5142>}Deuteronomy 14:24, 25, and another tenth he gave away (Tobit 1, 7, 8).

c. Jerome says one tenth was given to the Levites, out of which they gave one tenth to the priests (δευτεροδεκάτη); a second tithe was applied to festival purposes, and a third was given to the poor (πρωχοδεκάτη) (*Corm. on* ^{<3651>}Ezekiel 45:1, 565). Spencer thinks there were three tithes. Jennings, with Mede, thinks there were only two complete tithes, but that in the third year an addition of some sort was made (Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* p. 727; Jennings, *Jewish Ant.* p. 183).

On the other hand, Maimonides says the third and sixth years second tithe was shared between the poor and the Levites, i.e. that there was no third tithe (*De Jur. Paup.* 6:4). Selden and Michaelis remark that the burden of three tithes, besides the first-fruits, would be excessive. Selden thinks that the third year's tithe denotes only a different application of the second, or festival, tithe, and Michaelis that it meant a surplus after the consumption of the festival tithe (Selden, *On Tithes*, 2, 13; *Michaelis, Lawus of Moses*, § 192, 3, 143, ed. Smith). Against a third tithe may be added Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* p. 359i Jahn, *Ant.* § 389; Godwyn, *Moses and Aaron*, p. 136, and Carpzov, p. 621,622; Keil, *Bibl. Arch.* § 71, 1, 337; Saalschütz, *Hebr. Arch.* 1, 70; Winer, *Realwörterb. s.v.* "Zehnte."

Of these opinions, that which maintains three separate and complete tithings seems improbable as imposing an excessive burden on the land, and not easily reconcilable with the other directions; yet there seems no reason for rejecting the notion of two yearly tithes when we recollect the especial promise of fertility to the soil conditional on observance of the commands of the law (Deuteronomy 28). There would thus be, (1) a yearly tithe for the Levites; (2) a second tithe for the festivals, which last would, every third year, be shared by the Levites with the poor. It is this poor man's tithe which Michaelis thinks is spoken of as likely to be converted to the king's use under the regal dynasty (^{<0815>}1 Samuel 8:15, 17; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, 1, 299). Ewald thinks that under the kings the ecclesiastical tithe system reverted to what he supposes to have been its original free-will character.

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

1. The Levitical, or first, tithe (^{<0000>}ווארארæcēḡm). This tithe was paid after both the first-fruit (^{<0000>}פּוּרָה־בָּבָא) and the priestly heave-offering (^{<0000>}חֲמִיל־רֵט) had been separated, the amount of which, though not fixed in the Mosaic law, was generally one fiftieth of the produce (comp. ^{<02319>}Exodus 23:19; ^{<05101>}Deuteronomy 26:1, etc., with Mishna, *Bikkurim*; ^{<04885>}Numbers 18:8; ^{<05104>}Deuteronomy 18:4, with Mishna, *Terumoth*, 3, 7; 4:3; Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Alathanuth Anjim*, 6:2). As the Mosaic law does

not define what things are subject to this tithe, but simply says that it is to consist of both vegetables and animals (^{<1873>}Leviticus 27:30 sq.), the Jewish canons enacted that as to the produce of the land “whatsoever is esculent, though still kept in the field, and derives its growth from the soil, is tithable; or whatsoever may be eaten from the commencement to the completion of its growth, though left in the field: to increase in size, is tithable, whether small or great; and whatsoever cannot be eaten at the beginning, but can only be eaten at the end of its growth, is not tithable till it is ripe for food” (Mishna, *Maaseroth*, 1, 1). It will be seen that this definition embraces even the smallest kitchen herbs and aromatic plants; and that it explains the remark of our Savior that tithe was paid of mint, dill, and cummin, which he, however, did not condemn, but, on the contrary, said, “These ought ye to have done” (^{<433>}Matthew 23:23; ^{<214>}Luke 11:42; comp. Mishna, *Maaseroth*, 1, 2-8).. The animals subject to this ‘Levitical tithe are still more indefinitely described in the Pentateuchal statute, which simply says, “As to all the tithe of herds and flocks, whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord” (^{<1873>}Leviticus 27:32). It will be seen; that this law does not say whether the tenth is to be paid of the newly born animals, whether it includes those newly purchased or exchanged, whether it is payable if a man has less than ten cattle, or at what age of the animals the tithe becomes due. The spiritual heads of the people had therefore most minutely to define these points so as to make the tithal law practicable. Hence the following canons obtained: All animals are tithable except those which are born of heterogeneous copulation (comp. ^{<1873>}Deuteronomy 22:9), which are damaged, which have come into the world irregularly, or which are bereaved of their mother; which have been purchased or received as presents. They are only tithable when there are ten newly born of the same kind, so that the offspring of oxen and small cattle must not be put together to make up the requisite number, nor are even those to be put together which are born in different years, though they belong to the same kind. Sheep and goats may be tithed together, provided they have all been born in the same season (Mishna, *Bekoroth*, 9:3, 4). The tithing is to take place three times in the year, about fifteen days before each of the three great festivals-viz. (a) on the first of Nisan, being fifteen days before Passover; (b) on the first of Sivan, being only five days before Pentecost, because the small number of animals born between these two festivals could not suffice for the celebration of Pentecost if the second tithe term were to be fifteen days before this festival; and (c) on the twenty-ninth of Elul instead of the

part of the Temple, under the superintendence of priests and Levites, in which the tithe was kept (^{<4811>}2 Chronicles 31:11-14; ^{<1608>}Nehemiah 10:38, 39; 12:44; 13:12; Josephus, *Ant.* 20:8,8). *The triennial, or poor, tithe* (ϣνϣε ρϣεϣι πτωχοδεκάται), also called *the third tithe* (ϣνϣε ρϣεϣι ἡ τρίτη δεκάτη, Tobit 1, 7; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8,22), and *the second tithe* (δεύτερον ἐπιδέκατον, Sept., ^{<1612>}Deuteronomy 26:12), because it was properly the second tithe converted into the poor tithe, to be given to and consumed by the poor at home, instead of conveying it to the metropolis to be eaten by the owner. As every seventh year was a fallow year not yielding a regular harvest, it was enacted that the second tithe should be eaten in Jerusalem by the owner thereof and his guests in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the septennial cycle, and be given to the poor in the third and seventh years. It will thus be seen that the whole series of taxes reached its completion at the end of every third and seventh year, or on the eve of Passover of the fourth and seventh years. Hence it is that the third year is denominated *the year of tithe* (ρϣεϣι ϣιτνῖ) i.e. when all the tithes had taken their rounds (^{<1612>}Deuteronomy 26:12), and not because, as some critics will have it, the annual tithe of the earlier legislator, was afterwards changed by the Deuteronomist into a triennial tithe. Hence, too, the spiritual heads of the Jewish people in and before the time of Christ constituted and denominated the Preparation Day of Passover of the fourth and seventh years a day of searching and removal (ρϣϣ[b]) in accordance with ^{<1612>}Deuteronomy 26:12 (Mishna, *Maaser Shenī*, 5, 6), when every Israelite had to separate all the tithes which he ought to have paid in the course of the three years, but which, either through negligence or through some untoward circumstances, he had failed to do. At the evening sacrifice on the last day of Passover, every pilgrim, before preparing to return home, had to offer a prayer of confession, in accordance with ver. 13. As this confession (ϣνϣϣ) is an expansion and traditional exposition of ver. 13-15, which accounts for the Chaldee and other versions of the passage in question, we give it entire: “I have removed the hallowed things from the house” (i.e. the second tithe and the quadrennial fruit [^{<1612>}Leviticus 19:23, etc.]);” have given it to the Levite” (i.e. the Levitical tithe); “and-also given it” (i.e. the priestly offering and the priestly tithe) “to the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow” (i.e. the poor tithe)... “from the house” (i.e. from the dough [comp. ^{<1617>}Numbers 15:17, etc.]) “according to all thy commandments which thou hast commanded me” (i.e. not given the second tithe before the first). “I have not transgressed thy commandments” (i.e.

not paid one kind for the other, the cut for the standing, the standing for the cut, the new for the old, nor the old for the new). "I have not forgotten" (i.e. to thank thee and to remember *thy* name thereby). I have not eaten thereof in my mourning; I have not given thereof to the dead" (i.e. for coffins, shrouds, or..mourners). "I have hearkened to the voice of the Lord my God" (i.e. have taken it to the chosen sanctuary). "I have done all that thou hast commanded me" (i.e. have rejoiced and caused others to rejoice therewith), etc. (Mishna, *Maaser Sheni*, 5, 10-13). In the two years of the septennial cycle, when the second tithe was converted into the poor tithe, there was no additional second tithe, inasmuch as the poor tithe took its place (Maimonides, *Iad ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Mathanuth Anjin*, 6:4). The poor could go into a field where the poor tithe was lying and demand of the owner to satisfy their *wants*. The minimum quantity to be given to them was defined as follows : If the tithe be of wheat, 1 cab; barley, 1 cab; spelt; 1 cab; lenten-figs, 1 cab; cake-figs, the, weight of 25 sicli; wine, 1 log; oil, log; rice, cab; olives, 1 pound; pulse, 3 cabs; nuts, 10 nuts; peaches, 5 peaches; pomegranates, 2; citrons, 1; and if. of any other fruit, it shall not be less than may be sold for such a sum as will buy food sufficient for two meals. If the owner's means are slender and the poor so numerous that he is unable to give to each the specified measure, he is to produce the whole tithe and place it before them so that they may divide it among themselves. The owner may only give one half of the tithe to his own poor relatives, and the other he must distribute among the poor generally. If a man and woman apply together, the woman is to be satisfied first. No debts are allowed to be paid out of the poor tithe, nor a recompense to be made for benefits, nor captives redeemed, nor is it to be devoted to nuptial feasts or alms, nor is it to be taken out of Palestine into a foreign land (*Maimonides, ibid. 6:7-17*). Though no tithes were paid in Palestine in the sabbatical year, when all was in common, *SEE SABBATICAL YEAR*, yet the land of Egypt, Ammon, and Moab had to pay them for the support of the poor of Israel, because, the Sabbath of the soil was not observed in these countries, while the Babylonians had to pay the second tithe (Mishna, *Yadaim*, 4:3; *Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Mathanuth Anjim*, 6:5).

III. Oriyin and Observance of the Tithal Law. — Without inquiring into the reason for which the number ten (q.v.) has so frequently been preferred as a number of selection in the cases of tribute-offerings (Philo derives *δέκα* from *δέχεσθαι* [*De X. Orac.* 2, 184]), both sacred and secular,

voluntary and compulsory, we *must* remark that the practice of paying tithes obtained among different nations from the remotest antiquity. Thus the ancient Phoenicians and the Carthaginians sent tithes annually to the Tyrian Hercules (Diod. Sic. 20:14; Justin, 18:7); the southern Arabians could not dispose of their incense before paying a tenth thereof to the priests at Sabota *in* honor of their god Sabis (Pliny, *Hist. iat.* 12:32); the ancient Pelasgians paid a tithe of the produce of the soil and the increase of their herds to their deities (Dionys. Halic. 1, 19, 23, etc.); and the Hellenes consecrated to their deities a tenth of their annual produce of the soil (Xenoph. *Hellen.* 1, 7, 10), of their business profits (Herod. 4:152), of confiscated estates (Xenoph. *Hellen.* 1, 7, 10), of their spoils (Herod. 5, 77; 9:81; Xenoph. *A nab.* 5, 3, 4; *Hellen.* 1.5 3, 21; Diod. Sic. 11:33; Pausan. 3, 18, 5; 5, 10, 4; 10:10, 1; τὰς δεκάτας τῶν περιγινομένων τοῖς θεοῖς καθιεροῦν; Harpocration, s.v. Δεκατεύειν ; and Knobel, *Comment. on* ^{<0273>}*Leviticus* 27:30). Among other passages the following may be cited: 1 Macc. 11, 35; Herod. 1, 89; 7:132; Diod. Sic. 5, 421; Pausan. 5, 10, 2; Justin, 20:3; Arist. (*Econ.* 2, 2; Livy, 5, 21; Polyb. 9:39; Cicero, *Veirr.* 2, 3, 6, and 7 (here tithes of wine, oil, and “minutse fruges” are mentioned); *Pro Leg. Manil.* 6; *Plnt. Ages.* ch. 19:p. 389; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 12:14; Macrob. *Sat.* 3, 6; Rose, *Inscr. Gr.* p. 215; Gibbon, 3, 301, ed. Smith; and a remarkable instance of fruits tithed and offered to a deity, and a feast made, of which the people of the district partook, in Xenoph. *A nab.* 5, 3; 9, answering thus to the Hebrew poor man’s tithe feast mentioned above.

In Biblical history the two prominent instances of early occurrence are: 1. Abram presenting the tenth of all his property, according to the Syriac and Arabic versions of Heb; 7:and Bashi in his. *Commentary*, but, as the passages themselves appear to show, of the spoils of his victory, to Melchizedek (^{<0140>}Genesis 14:20; ^{<0302>}Hebrews 7:2, 6; Josephus, *Ant 1*, 10, 2; Selden, *On Tithes*, ch. 1). 2. Jacob, after his vision at Luz, devoting a tenth of all his property to God in case he should return home in safety (^{<0282>}Genesis 28:22). These instances bear witness to the antiquity of tithes in some shape or other previous to the Mosaic tithe system. There can therefore be no doubt that, like many other Pentateuchal ordinances, the inspired legislator adopted the tithal law into the divine code because he found that, with some modifications, this primarily voluntary tax was a proper stipend for the servants of the sanctuary, and that it would, at the

same time, be a means of promoting pilgrimage to the national sanctuary on the great festivals, and social intercourse between the rich and the poor.

During the monarchy, the payment of tithes was neglected, and it seems that the kings claimed them for themselves (^{<4984>}1 Samuel 8:14, 15, 17; with 1 Macc. 2, 35). It was, however, re-established at the restoration of religion by the pious Hezekiah (^{<4916>}2 Chronicles 31:5, 6, 12), until after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity (^{<4608>}Nehemiah 10:38; 12:44; 13:5, 12), when material alterations and modifications were made in the tithal law owing to the altered state of the commonwealth and to the disproportion of the Levites and laymen. Only 341 or 360 Levites returned at first from the Babylonian captivity, with about 37,319 laymen; while with Ezra only 38 Levites came back, with 1496 laymen; and there can be but little doubt that the same disproportion continued among those who returned afterwards, as well as in the gradual and natural increase of the nation. There were thus 97 laymen to 1 Levite, while the tithe of 9 laymen amounted to as much as was left for each private family; and if we take 10 laymen to 1 Levite, as the latter had to pay a tenth to the priest, the tithe when duly paid by all the people yielded ten times as much as the Levites required. On the other hand, there were in Judaea, after the return from Babylon, a disproportionately large number of priests, since, exclusive of those who had no register (^{<4912>}Ezra 2:62), 4289 of them came with Zerubbabel-i.e. twelve or thirteen times more than Levites-and two whole families, besides separate individuals, came with Ezra. These could not possibly have subsisted upon *the legal dues* (^{<4606>}Nehemiah 10:36-39). In addition to the miserably provided priests, there were the 612 Nethinim who came back with Zerubbabel and Ezra (^{<4928>}Ezra 2:58; 8:20; ^{<4610>}Nehemiah 7:60), for whom no provision whatever existed. Ezra had therefore to take the superabundant tithe from the Levites for the support of the priests and the Nethinim. Hence Josephus distinctly tells us that the priests received tithes in later times (*Life*, 15; *Ant.* 11:5, 8; 20:8, 8; 9, 2; *Apion*, 1, 22). It is this distribution of the Levitical tithe between the priests and the Levites which is evidently alluded to when the Talmud says that Ezra transferred the tithes from the Levites to the priests as a punishment for their tardiness in returning from exile (*Kethuboth*, 26 a; *Cholin*, 131 b; *Yebammoth*, 86 b; *Sotah*, 47 b), for it could not possibly mean that he took *the whole* tithe away from the Levites, since that would be at variance with other records (comp. ^{<4508>}Ezra 10:38, 39; ^{<4630>}Nehemiah 13:10, 13; Tobit 1, 7,-with *Tossephoth oi Kethuboth*, 26 a), and would leave the Levites

wholly unprovided for, and visit the good Levites who did return with the punishment deserved by those who remained behind. It is, moreover, owing to this distribution of the Levitical tithe effected by Ezra that the tithe was afterwards divided into three portions, one of which was given by the owner to his friends the priests and Levites, the other was taken to the Temple storehouse, and the third portion was distributed in Jerusalem among the poor and the needy *chaberim* (μyrbj) =doctors of the law (Jerusalem *Sotah*, 9:11; Jerusalem *Maaser Shemni*, 5, 15; Babylon *Yebamoth*, 86 b).

The board appointed to watch over the tithes, as well as the storehouses, which already existed in the time of Hezekiah for the reception of the tithes (⁴⁸¹¹¹2 Chronicles 31:11-14), were now better organized than ever. To achieve the purpose intended by Ezra in the new division of the tithe, it was absolutely necessary that the collection and the distribution thereof should take place under the careful superintendence of a body consisting of both priests and Levites. Such a board was therefore duly appointed, and it was ordained that at least one portion of the tithes should be taken to Jerusalem for the support of the ministering Levites.

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

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

Tithes

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

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

Another and a more arbitrary distinction is into *great* and *small* — the first being tithes of grain, hay, wood, etc.; the second being the other kind of predial, as well as all personal and mixed tithes. The great tithes of a parish

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

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

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

law, yet in force there. In the United States, tithes are exacted by the Mormon hierarchy. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 5, ch. 5, § 1 sq.

Titian, or Tiziano Vecellio

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

Martyrdom of San Lorenzo. The Academy of Venice contains his *Assumption* and *Presentation of the Virgin*, and the Manfrini Palace in the same city *The Entombment of Christ*. In the Escorial is a *Last Supper*, upon which he labored seven years; in the Uffizi Gallery, *A Virgin and Child with Saints*; and in the Vatican, *Christ Crowned with Thorns*. See Northcote, *Life of Titian* (Lond. 1830, 2 vols.); Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *Life of Titian* (1875); Spooner, *Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

Title

is the rendering in the A.V. of ^WYX *tsiyun*, a pillar or cippus set up as a sepulchral sign, ^{<12317>}2 Kings 23:17, or as a “waymark,” ^{<26121>}Jeremiah 31:21; “sign,” ^{<35915>}Ezekiel 39:15; and of ^TITLOS , Lat. *titulus*, a tablet with a *superscription* (^{<31019>}John 19:19, 20), set up by Pilate over Christ’s cross (q.v.).

Title

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

Title

to orders in Episcopal churches. This is best explained by quoting the 33rd canon of the Established Church of England:

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

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

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

Title

(diminutive of *tit*), an old English word signifying the merest trifle (see Plumptre, *Bible Educator*, 4:211), is used in the A. V. (Matthew 5, 18; ^{<2167>}Luke 16:17) as a rendering for *κεράϊα*, *a little horn*, hence *a point* (e.g. of a sail yard, Lucan, *Navig.* 4; Polyb. 14:10, 11; of an island, Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 1, 21, 2); in the New Test. the apex of a Heb. letter, such as distinguishes *d* from *d*, *b* from *k*, i.e. the slightest distinction (so Philo, in *Flacc.* p. 984 b). *SEE JOT*.

Tittmann, Johann August Heinrich

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

Tittmann, Karl Christian

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

character. Perhaps his best work is his *Tractatus de Vestigiis Gnosticorum in N.T. frustra Quaesitis* (Lips. 1773).

Titular Bishops

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

Titulus

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

Ti'tus

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

1. Sources of Information. —Our materials for the biography of this companion of Paul must be drawn entirely from the notices of him in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the: Galatians, and to Titus himself,

combined with the Second Epistle to Timothy. He is not mentioned in the Acts at all. The reading **Τίτου Ιούστου** in ~~<4180>~~ Acts 18:7 is too precarious for any inference to be drawn from it. Wieseler, indeed, lays some slight stress upon it (*Chronol. des apost. Zeit.* [Gött. 1848], p. 204), but this is in connection with a theory which needs every help. As to a recent hypothesis that Titus and Timothy were the same person (King, *Who was St. Titus?* [Dublin, 1853]), it is certainly ingenious, but quite untenable (see ~~<5040>~~ 2 Timothy 4:10). The same may be said of the suggestion of Mircker (Meining. 1861), that Titus of the epistles is the same person with Silvanus, or Silas, of the Acts, although there is nothing that absolutely forbids such an identification.

2. His, Known Journeys. —Taking the passages in the epistles in the chronological order of the events referred to, we turn first to Galatians 2, 1, 3. We conceive the journey mentioned here to be identical with that (recorded in Acts 15) in which Paul and Barnabas, went from Antioch to Jerusalem to the conference which was to decide the question of the necessity of circumcision to the Gentiles (A.D. 47). Here we see Titus in close association with Paul and Barnabas at Antioch. He goes with them to Jerusalem. He is, in fact, one of the **τινὲς ἄλλοι** of ~~<4180>~~ Acts 15:2, who were deputed to accompany them from Antioch. His circumcision was either not insisted on at Jerusalem, or, if demanded, was firmly resisted (**οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι**). He is very emphatically spoken of as a Gentile (**Ἕλληνας**), by which is most probably meant that both his parents were Gentiles. Here is a double contrast from Timothy, who was circumcised by Paul's own directions, and one of whose parents was Jewish (~~<4180>~~ Acts 16:1, 3; ~~<5005>~~ 2 Timothy 1:5; 3:15). Titus would seem, on the occasion of the council, to have been specially a representative of the church of the uncircumcision.

It is to our purpose to remark that, in the passage cited above, Titus is so mentioned as apparently to imply that he had become personally known to the Galatian Christians. This, again, we combine with two other circumstances, viz. that the Epistle to the Galatians and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians were probably written within a few months of each other **SEE GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO**, and both during the same journey. From the latter of these two epistles we obtain fuller notices of Titus in connection with Paul.

After leaving Galatia (^{<44823>}Acts 18:23), and spending a long time at Ephesus (^{<44901>}Acts 19:1-20, 1), the apostle proceeded to Macedonia by way of Troas. Here he expected to meet Titus (^{<44123>}2 Corinthians 2:13), who had been sent on a mission to Corinth. In this hope he was disappointed [see TROAS], but in Macedonia Titus joined him (^{<44116>}2 Corinthians 7:6, 7, 13-15). Here we begin to see not only the above-mentioned fact of the mission of this disciple to Corinth, and the strong personal affection which subsisted between him and Paul (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ver. 7), but also some part of the purport of the mission itself. It had reference to the immoralities at Corinth rebuked in the first epistle, and to the effect of that first epistle on the offending Church. We learn, further, that the mission was so far successful and satisfactory: ἀναγγέλλων τὴν ὑμῶν ἐπιπόθησιν (ver. 7), ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν (ver. 9), τὴν πάντων ὑμῶν ὑπακοήν: (ver. 15); and we are enabled also to draw from the chapter a strong conclusion regarding the warm zeal and sympathy of Titus, his grief for what was evil, his rejoicing over what was good: τῇ παρακλήσει ἢ παρεκλήθη ἐφ' ὑμῖν (ver. 7); ἀναπεπαιται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πάντων ὑμῶν (ver. 13); τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς ἔστιν (ver. 15). But if we proceed further we discern another part of the mission with which he was entrusted. This had reference to the collection, at that time in progress, for the poor Christians of Judaea — καθὼς προενήρχατο, 8:6, a phrase which shows that he had been active and zealous in the matter, while the Corinthians themselves seem to have been rather remiss. This connection of his mission with the gathering of these charitable funds is also proved by another passage, which contains, moreover, an implied assertion of his integrity in the business (μὴ τι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος, 12:18), and a statement that Paul himself had sent him on the errand (παρεκάλεσα Τίτον, *ibid.*). Thus we are prepared for what the apostle now proceeds to do after his encouraging conversations with Titus regarding the Corinthian Church. He sends him back from Macedonia to Corinth, in company with two other trustworthy Christians, *SEE TROPHIMUS*; *SEE TYCHICUS*, bearing the second epistle, and with an earnest request (παρακαλέσαι 8:6; τὴν παράκλησιν, ver. 17) that he would see, to the completion of the collection; which he had zealously promoted on his late visit (ἵνα καθὼς προενήρξατο, οὕτως καὶ ἐπιτελέσῃ, ver. 6), Titus himself being in nowise backward in undertaking the commission. On a review of all these passages, elucidating as they do the characteristics of the man, the duties

he discharged, and his close and faithful co-operation with Paul, we see how much meaning there is in the apostle's short and forcible description of him (Εἶτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου, κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός, ver. 23).

All that has preceded is drawn from direct statements in the epistles; but by indirect though fair inference we can arrive at something further, which gives coherence to the rest, with additional elucidations of the close connection of Titus with Paul and the Corinthian Church. It has generally been considered doubtful who the ἀδελφοί were (^{<461>}1 Corinthians 16:11,12) that took the first epistle to Corinth. Timothy, who had been recently sent thither from Ephesus (^{<449>}Acts 19:22), could not have been one of them (ἐὰν ἔλθῃ Τιμοθεῖον ^{<460>}1 Corinthians 16:10), and Apollos declined the commission (ver. 12). There can be little doubt that the messengers who took that first letter were Titus and his companion, whoever that might be, who is mentioned with him in the second letter (Παρεκάλεσα Τίτου, καὶ συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφόν, ^{<472>}2 Corinthians 12:18). This view was held by Macknight, and very clearly set forth by him (*Transl. of the Apostolical Epistles, with Comm.* [Edinb. 1829], 1, 451, 674; 2, 2, 7,124). It has been more recently given by Prof. Stanley (*Corinthians*, 2nd ed. p. 348, 492), but it has been, worked out by no one so elaborately as by Prof. Lightfoot (*Camb. Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, 2, 201, 202). There is some danger of confusing *Titus and the brother* (^{<472>}2 Corinthians 12:18), i.e. *the brethren* of ^{<461>}1 Corinthians 16:11,12, who (according to this view) took the first letter, with *Titus and the brethren* (^{<478>}2 Corinthians 8:16-24) who took the second letter. As to the connection between the two contemporaneous missions of Titus and Timotheus; this observation may be made here, that the difference of the two errands may have had some connection with a difference in the characters of the two agents. If Titus was the firmer and more energetic of the two men, it was natural to give him the task of enforcing the apostle's rebukes, and urging on the flagging business of the collection.

A considerable interval now elapses before we come upon the next notices of this disciple. Paul's first imprisonment is concluded, and his last trial is impending. In the interval between the two, he and Titus were together in Crete (ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, Titus, 5). We see Titus remaining in the island when Paul left it, and receiving there a letter written to him by the apostle. From this letter we gather the following biographical details: 'In

the first place, we learn that he, was originally converted through Paul's instrumentality; this must be the meaning of the phrase **γνήσιον τέκνον**, which occurs so emphatically in the opening of the epistle (ver. 4). Next we learn the various particulars of the responsible duties, which he had to discharge in Crete. He is to complete what Paul had been obliged to leave unfinished (**ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ**, ver. 5), and he is to organize the Church throughout the island by appointing presbyters in every city. *SEE GORTYNA; SEE LASEA*. Instructions are given as to the suitable character of such presbyters (ver. 6-9); and we learn, further, that we have here the repetition of instructions previously furnished by word of mouth (**ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διεταξάμην**, ver. 5). Next he is to control and bridle (**ἐπιστομίζειν**, ver. 11) the restless and mischievous Judaizers, and he is to be peremptory in so doing (**ἔλεγγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως**, ver. 13). Injunctions in the same spirit are reiterated (^{301B}Titus 2:1, 15; 3:8). He is to urge the duties of a decorous and Christian life upon the women (^{301B}Titus 2:3-5), some of whom (**πρεσβύτιδας**, ver. 3), possibly, had something of an official character (**καλοδιδασκάλους, ἵνα σωφρονίζωσι τὰς νέας**, ver. 3,4). He is to be watchful over his own conduct (ver. 7); he is to impress upon the slaves the peculiar duties of their position (ver. 9,10); he is to check all social and political turbulence (3:1), and also all wild theological 'speculations (ver. 9); and to exercise discipline on the heretical (ver. 10). When we consider all these particulars of his duties, we see not only the confidence reposed in him by the apostle, but the need there was of determination and strength of purpose, and therefore the probability that this was his character; and all this is enhanced if we bear in mind his isolated and unsupported position in Crete, and the lawless and immoral character of the Cretans themselves, as testified by their own writers (1, 12, 13). *SEE CRETE*.

The notices which remain are more strictly personal. Titus is to look for the arrival in Crete of Artemas and Tychicus (3, 12), and then he is to hasten (**σπουδάσον**) to join Paul at Nicopolis, where the apostle is proposing to pass the winter (ibid.). Zenas and Apollos are in Crete, or expected there; for Titus is to send them on their journey, and supply them with whatever they need for it (ver. 13). It is observable that Titus and Apollos are brought into juxtaposition here, as they were before in the discussion of the mission from Ephesus to Corinth.

The movements of Paul, with which these later instructions to Titus are connected, are considered elsewhere. *SEE PAUL*; *SEE TIMOTHY*. We need only observe here that there would be great difficulty in inserting the visits to Crete and Nicopolis in any of the journeys recorded in the Acts, to say nothing of the other objections to giving the epistle any date anterior to the voyage to Rome. *SEE TITUS, EPISTLE TO*. On the other hand, there is no difficulty in arranging these circumstances, if we suppose Paul to have traveled and written after being liberated from Rome, while thus we gain the further advantage of an explanation of what Paley has well called the affinity of this epistle and the first to Timothy. Whether Titus did join the apostle at Nicopolis we cannot tell. But we naturally connect the mention of this place with what Paul wrote at no great interval of time afterwards, in the last of the Pastoral Epistles (Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν, ^{<small>S.M.O.</small>} 2 Timothy 4:10); for Dalmatia lay to the north of Nicopolis, at no great distance from it. *SEE NICOPOLIS*. From the form of the whole sentence, it seems probable that this disciple had been with Paul in Rome during his final imprisonment: but this cannot be asserted confidently. The touching words of the apostle in this passage might seem to imply some reproach, and we might draw from them the conclusion that Titus became a second Demas: but, on the whole, this seems a harsh and unnecessary judgment.

3. Traditionary Close of his Career. — Whatever else remains is legendary, though it may contain elements of truth. Titus is connected by tradition with Dalmatia, and he is said to have been an object of much reverence in that region. This, however, may simply be a result of the passage quoted immediately above: and it is observable that of all the churches in modern Dalmatia (Neale, *Ecclesiological Notes on Dalm.* p. 175) not one is dedicated to him. The traditional connection of Titus with Crete is much more specific and constant, though here again we cannot be certain of the facts. . He is said to have been permanent bishop in the island, and to have died there at an advanced age (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 4, 2; Theodoret, *Ad 1 Timothy* 3, 1; *Const. Aost.* 7:46; Jerome, *Ad Titus* 2, 7; Isidore, *Vit. Sanct.* 87). The modern capital, Candia, appears to claim the honor, of being his burial-place (Cave, *Apostolici*, 1716, p. 42). In the fragment *De ita et Actis Titi*, by the lawyer Zenas (Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N.T.* 2, 831, 832), Titus is called bishop of Gortyna; and on the old site of Gortyna is a ruined church, of ancient and solid masonry, which bears the name of St. Titus, and where service is occasionally celebrated by priests from the neighboring hamlet of Metropolis (Falkener. *Remacins in Crete*, from a

MSS. History of Candia, by Onorio Belli, p. 23). The cathedral of Megalo Castron, in the north of the island, is also dedicated to this saint. Lastly, the name of Titus was the watchword of the Cretans when they were invaded by the Venetians; and the Venetians themselves; after their conquest of the island, adopted him to some of the honors of a patron saint; for as the response after the prayer for the Doge of Venice was “Sancte Marce, tu nos adjuva,” so the response after that for the duke of Candia was “Sancte Tite, tu nos adjuva” (Pashley, *Travels in Crete*, 1, 6. 175). The day on which Titus is commemorated is Jan. 4 in the Latin calendar, and Aug. 25 in the Greek.

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

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

Titus, Epistle To.

This is the third of the so-called Pastoral Epistles of Paul, following immediately after those to Timothy.

I. Authenticity. —In this respect there are no specialties in this epistle which require any very elaborate treatment distinct from the other Pastoral Letters of Paul. *SEE TIMOTHY, FIRST EPISTLE TO*. If those two were not genuine, it would be difficult confidently to maintain the genuineness

of this. On the other hand, if the Epistles to Timothy are received as Paul's, there is not the slightest reason for doubting the authorship of that to Titus. Amid the various combinations which are found among those who have been skeptical on the subject of the Pastoral Epistles, there is no instance of the rejection of that before us on the part of those who have accepted the other two. So far, indeed, as these doubts are worth considering at all, the argument is more in favor of this than of either of those. Tatian accepted the Epistle to Titus, and rejected the other, two. Origen mentions some who excluded 2 Timothy, but kept 1 Timothy with Titus. Schleiermacher and Neander invert this process of doubt in regard to the letters addressed to Timothy, but believe that Paul wrote the present letter to Titus. Credner, too, believes it to be genuine, though he pronounces 1 Timothy to be a forgery, and 2 Timothy a compound of two epistles.

To turn now from opinions to direct external evidence, this epistle stands on quite as firm a ground as the others of the pastoral group, if not a firmer ground. Nothing can well be more explicit than the quotations and references in *Irenaeus, C. Haeres.* 1, 16, 3 (see ^{<56B0>}Titus 3:10); Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 350 (comp. ^{<5012>}Titus 1:12), and 3, 3, 4; by Tertull. *De Praescr. Hler.* c. 6 (comp. ^{<56B0>}Titus 3:10, 11), and *Adv. Marc.* 5, 21; and by Origen, in many places (Lardner, *Works*, vol. 2, 8vo); to say nothing of earlier allusions in Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 47 (see ^{<56B4>}Titus 3:4), which can hardly be doubted; Theoph. *Ad Autol.* 2., 95 (see ^{<56B5>}Titus 3:5); 3, 126 (see ver. 1), which are probable; and Clem. Romans 2 *Corinthians* 1 (see *ibid.*), which is possible.

As to internal features, we may notice, in the first place, that the Epistle to Titus has all the characteristics of the other Pastoral Epistles. See, for instance, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος (^{<56B8>}Titus 3:8), ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία (^{<56B9>}Titus 1:9; 2, 1; comp. ^{<5013>}Titus 1:13; 2:8), σωφρονεῖν, σώφρων, σωφρόνων (^{<56B8>}Titus 1:8; 2, 5. 6,12), σωτήριος, σωτήρ, σώζω (^{<56B8>}Titus 1:3,4; 2:10,11, 13; 3:4, 5, 7), Ἰουδαϊκοὶ μῦθοι (^{<5014>}Titus 1:14; comp. ^{<56B9>}Titus 3:9), ἐπιφάνεια (^{<5013>}Titus 2:13), εὐσέβεια (^{<56B8>}Titus 1:1),) ἔλεος (^{<56B5>}Titus 3:5; in ^{<5014>}Titus 1:4 the word is doubtful). All this tends to show that this letter was written about the same time and under similar circumstances with the other two. But, on the other hand, this epistle has marks in its phraseology and style which assimilate it to the general body of the Epistles of Paul. Such may fairly be reckoned the following: κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγώ (^{<56B8>}Titus 1:3); the quotation from a

heathen poet (ver. 12); the use of ἀδόκιμος (ver. 16); the “going off at a word” (σωτήρος...ἐπεφάνη γὰρ...σωτήριος .. . ^{<5120>}Titus 2:10,11); and the modes in which the doctrines of the atonement (ver. 13) and of free justification (^{<5135>}Titus 3:5-7) come to the surface. As to any difficulty arising from supposed indications of advanced hierarchical arrangements, it is to be observed that in this epistle πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος are used as synonymous (ἵνα καταστήσης πρεσβυτέρους... δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ... 1, 5, 7), just as they are in the address at Miletus about the year A.D. 55 (^{<4017>}Acts 20:17, 28). At the same time, this epistle has features of its own, especially a certain tone of abruptness and severity, which probably arises partly out of the circumstances of the Cretan population, *SEE CRETE*, partly out of the character of Titus himself. If all these things are put together, the phenomena are seen to be very unlike what would be presented by a forgery, to say nothing of the general overwhelming difficulty of imagining who could have been the writer of the Pastoral Epistles, if it were not Paul himself.

To the objections of the German critics, founded upon the difficulty of ascertaining the proper date of this epistle, the best reply will be furnished by ascertaining, if possible, when and where the epistle was written (see below); but even should we fail in this, it would be strange were we to relinquish our conviction of the authenticity of an ancient writing simply because, possessing very imperfect information as to many parts of the alleged author’s history, we were unable to say with certainty when he was in circumstances to compose it.

I. Date. —The only circumstances stated in the epistle itself calculated to aid us in determining this question are, that at the time it was written Paul had recently visited Crete (^{<5105>}Titus 1:5); that he was about to spend the winter in Nicopolis (^{<5112>}Titus 3:12); and that Apollos was about to visit Crete, on his way to some other place (ver. 13). There are three hypotheses that have been formed in order to meet these facts, especially the first, namely Paul’s visit to Crete.

1. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles that Paul visited Crete on his voyage to Rome (^{<4207>}Acts 27:7); but the shortness of his visit at that time, the circumstances under which it was made, and the improbability of his expecting to spend the ensuing winter at Nicopolis, place it out of the question to suppose that it was to this visit he refers in this epistle. As this is, however, the only visit recorded by Luke, in rejecting it we are forced to

suppose another visit, and to find some period in the apostle's life when it was probable that such a visit was paid.

2. It has been thought by Hug that the period referred to in ~~Acts~~ Acts 18:18,19 admits of our placing this visit to Crete within it. Paul, at that time, was on his journey from Corinth to Palestine, but on some account or other landed at Ephesus. This leads to the suggestion that the apostle must either voluntarily have departed from the usual course in order to visit some place lying between Corinth and Ephesus; or that he must have been driven by stress of weather from the course he meant to pursue. In either case the probability of his visiting Crete at that time is strong. We find, from the above statement made by Paul in this epistle, that Apollos, if at this time on his way from Ephesus to Corinth (~~Acts~~ Acts 18:24, 27; 19:1), was to touch at Crete; which, it has been assumed, renders it not improbable that it 'was customary for ships sailing between these two ports to call at Crete by the way; and Paul may have availed himself of this practice in order to visit Crete before going to Palestine. Or he may have sailed in a ship bound directly from Corinth to Palestine, and have been driven out of his course, shipwrecked on Crete, and obliged to sail thence to Ephesus as his only remaining method of getting to his original destination — a supposition which will not appear very improbable when we remember that Paul must have suffered several shipwrecks of which Luke gives no account (~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 11:25, 26); and that his getting to Ephesus on his way from Corinth to Palestine is a fact for which, in some way or other, we are bound to account. (Paul evidently, however, took that route as the only one of general travel, there being no vessel sailing direct from Corinth to Caesarea or Antioch.) It was while staying on this occasion at Ephesus that Hug supposes Paul to have written this epistle.

As confirmatory of this have been adduced the two other facts above referred to as mentioned in the epistle itself, viz. the visit of Apollos to Crete, and Paul's intention to winter at Nicopolis. From ~~Acts~~ Acts 19:1 we learn that during the time Apollos was residing at Corinth, whence he had gone from Ephesus, Paul was engaged in a tour through the upper coasts (viz. Phrygia and Galatia; comp. ~~Acts~~ Acts 18:23), which ended in his return to Ephesus. This tour was commenced after the apostle had been at Jerusalem and Antioch (ver. 22). It appears, therefore, that Paul left Antioch much about the same time that Apollos reached Corinth. But Apollos went to Corinth from Ephesus, Paul went to Jerusalem from Ephesus. At this city, therefore, they may have met; and before leaving it

Paul perhaps wrote this epistle, and gave it to Apollos to deliver to Titus at Crete, on his way to Corinth.

Further. Paul went up to Jerusalem to keep the feast; after which he visited Antioch, and then traveled for some considerable time in Upper Asia. He, therefore, is supposed to have spent the winter somewhere in Asia Minor. (On the contrary, he seems to have rapidly passed through that region.). Now there was a town named Nicopolis, between Antioch and Tarsus, near to which, if not through which, Paul must pass on his way from Antioch to Galatia (Strabo, 14:465, ed. Casaubon, fol. 1587). May not this have been the very place referred to in ~~SOME~~ Titus 3:12? In such a locality it was quite natural for Paul to desire to spend the winter; and as Titus was a native of Asia, it would be well known to him, especially if he knew what route the apostle designed to pursue. All this, it is held, supports the hypothesis that Paul wrote this epistle before leaving Ephesus to go to Syria.

Another circumstance alleged in favor of this hypothesis is the close resemblance in sentiment and phraseology between this epistle and the first Epistle to Timothy. This resemblance is so close, and in some particulars so peculiar, that we are naturally led to conclude that both must have been written while the same leading ideas and forms of expression were occupying the apostle's mind. Now the First Epistle to Timothy is held by the maintainers of this theory to have *been* written after Paul had left Ephesus the second time to go into Macedonia, that is, about two years and a half after the period when Hug supposes the Epistle to Titus to have been written. To some this may appear too long a time to justify any stress being laid upon the similarity of the two epistles in this question of their respective dates; but when it is remembered that during the interval Paul had been dealing at Ephesus; with very much the same class of persons, to whom a great part of both epistles refer, and that both are addressed to persons holding the same peculiar office, the force of this objection will be weakened.

Against this date, on the contrary, may justly be adduced the many precarious, and (as above seen) some positively inaccurate, assumptions necessary to its support. The main objection, however, is the exceeding improbability that Paul, while on his way from Corinth to Palestine, which he was in haste to reach by a given day (~~THIS~~ Acts 18:18, 20, 21), could have found time to stop at Crete, found numerous churches there (~~SOME~~ Titus 1:5),

and leave Titus in charge of them. Nor have we any evidence that on the voyage in question Paul was accompanied by Titus; nor yet that the individuals mentioned in <sup>^{SC12>}Titus 3:12,13, were at that time so located with reference to Paul and Titus. For these and other reasons, this hypothesis must be discarded as too problematical throughout.

3. As to the time and place and other circumstances of the writing of this epistle, the following scheme of filling up Paul's movements after his first imprisonment will satisfy all the conditions of the case: We may suppose him possibly after accomplishing his long-projected visit to Spain) to have gone to Ephesus, and taken voyages from thence, first to Macedonia and then to Crete; during the former to have written the First Epistle to Timothy, and after returning from the latter to have written the Epistle to Titus, being at the time of dispatching it on the point of starting for Nicopolis, to which place he went, taking Miletus and Corinth on the way. At Nicopolis we may conceive him to have been finally apprehended and taken to Rome, whence he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy. 1 Other possible combinations may be seen in Birks (*Horae Apostolicae* 301 at the end of his edition of the *Horae Pauline*, p. 299301) and in Wordsworth (*Greek Testament*, 3, 418,421.'It is an undoubted mistake to endeavor to insert this epistle in any period of that part of Paul's life which is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. There is in this writing that unmistakable difference of style (as compared with. the earlier epistles) which associates the Pastoral Letters with one another, and with the latest period of Paul's life; and it seems strange that this should have been so slightly observed by good scholars and exact chronologists, e.g. Archdn. Evans (*Script. ioy.* 3. 327-333) and Wieseler (*Chronol. des capost. Zeitalt.* 329-355), who, approaching the subject in very different ways, agree in holding the foregoing theory (No. 2) that this letter was written at Ephesus (between 1 and 2 Corinthians), when the apostle was in the early part of his third missionary journey (Acts 19). *SEE PAUL; SEE TITUS.*

III. Design and Contents. —The task which Paul had committed to Titus, when he left him in Crete, was one of no small difficulty. The character of the people was unsteady, insincere, and quarrelsome; they were given to greediness, licentiousness, falsehood, and drunkenness, in no ordinary degree; and the Jews who had settled among them appear to have even gone beyond the natives in immorality. Among such a people it was no easy office which Titus had to sustain when commissioned to carry forward

the work which Paul had begun, and to set in order the affairs of the churches which had arisen there, especially as heretical teachers had already crept in among them. Hence Paul addressed to him this epistle, the main design of which is to direct him how to discharge with success the duties to which he had been appointed. For this reason the apostle dilates upon the personal qualifications of Church officers and members, and their functions, with such local allusions as rendered these directions, especially pertinent. After the introductory salutation, which has marked peculiarities (~~SCIO~~ Titus 1:1-4), Titus is enjoined to appoint suitable presbyters in the Cretan Church, and specially such as shall be sound in doctrine and able to refute error (ver. 5-9). The apostle then passes to a description of the coarse character of the Cretans, as testified by their own writers, and the mischief caused by Judaizing error among the Christians of the island (ver. 10-16). In opposition to this, Titus is to urge sound and practical Christianity on all classes (~~SCIO~~ Titus 2:1-0), on the older men (ver. 2), on the older women, and especially in regard to their-influence over the younger women (ver. 3-5), on the younger men (ver. 6-8), on slaves (ver. 9, 10), taking heed meanwhile that he himself is a pattern of good works (ver. 7). The grounds of all this are given in the free grace which trains the Christian to self-denying and active piety (ver. 11, 12), in the glorious hope of Christ's second advent (ver. 13), and in the atonement by which he has purchased us, to be his people (ver. 14). All these lessons Titus is to urge with fearless decision (ver. 15). Next, obedience to rulers is enjoined, with gentleness and forbearance towards all men (31, 2), these duties being again rested on our sense of past sin (ver. 3), and on the gift of new spiritual life and free justification (ver. 4-7). With these practical duties are contrasted those idle speculations which are to be carefully avoided (ver. 8, 9); and with regard to those men who are positively heretical, a peremptory charge is given (ver. 10, 11). Some personal allusions then follow: Artemas or Tychicus may be expected at Crete, and on the arrival: of either of them Titus is to hasten to join the apostle at Nicopolis, where he intends to winter; Zenas the lawyer, also, and Apollos, are to be provided with all that is necessary for a journey in prospect (ver. 12, 13). Finally, before the concluding messages of salutation, an admonition is given to the Cretan Christians, that they give heed to the duties of practical useful piety (ver. 14, 15).

IV. Commentaries. —The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole of this epistle exclusively: Megander, *Expositio* [includ. Timothy]

(Basil. 1536, 8vo); Willich, *Expositio* (Lips. 1540, 8vo); Hoffmann, *Commentarius* (Frcft. 1541, 8vo); Culmann, *Notae* (Norib. 1546, 8vo); Alesius, *Explicatio* (Lips. 1550, 8vo); Espencasus [Romans Cath.], *Commentarius* (Par. 1568, 8vo); Hunnius, *Expositio* (Marp. 1587, 1604; Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); Rhodomann, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1597, 8vo); Maglian [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1609, 4to); Sotto [R. C.], *Commentarius* [includ. Timothy] (Par. 1610, fol.); Taylor, *Commentary* (Camb. 1612, 4to; 1658, fol.); Scultetnus, *Observationes* [includ. Timothy and, Philem.] (Frcft. 1624; Vitemb. 1630, 4to); Goupil [R. C.], *Paraphrasis* (Par. 1644, 8vo); Daille, *Sermons* [Fr.] (ibid. 1655, 8vo); Hobert [R. C.], *Expositio* [includ. Timothy and Philem.] (ibid. 1656, 8vo); Wallis, *Expositio* (Oxon. 1657, 8vo); Fecht, *Expositio* (Rost. 1692, 1700, 4to); *Rappolt*, *Observationes*, (in his *Opp.* 1, 781); Breithaupt, *Exercitatio* (Hal. 1703, 4to); Outhof, *Verkltaarting* (Amst. 1704, 4to); Zentgrav, *Commentarius* (Arg. 1706, 4to); Gebhard, *Paraphrasis* (Gryph. 1714, 4to); Koehnen, *Verklaaring* (Utr. 1724, 4to); Vitringa, *Verklaaring* (Franek. 1728, 4to); Rambach, *Erklärung* [includ. Galatians] (Gies. 1739, 4to); Van Haven, *Commentatio* (Hal. 1742, 4to); Hurter, *Cozmmmentarius* (Schafh. 1744, 4to); Mosheim, *Erklärung* (ed. Von Einckm, Stend. 1779, 4to); Kiinol, *Explicatio* (Lips. 1788, 4to); Van den Ess, *Compositio* (L. B. 1825, 8vo); Paterson, *Commentary* [includ. Timothy] (Lond. 1848, 18mo); Graham, *Commentary* (ibid. 1860, 12mo). **SEE EPISTLE**. Titus, bishop OF BOSTRA, in Arabia, was driven from his see, under Julian, A.D. 362; returned under Valentinian; and died about A.D. 371. He wrote *Contra Manichoes Lib. III*, which is extant in a Latin translation in *Biblioth. Pair.* tom. 4. A discourse *On the Branches of Palm*, Greek and Latin, and a *Commentary on Luke*, in Latin, have been published under his name, but are questioned. —Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 1, 248. See *Herzog, Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Titus, Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus

Picture for Titus 1

Picture for Titus 2

emperor of Rome, was the eldest son of Vespasian and Flavia Domitilla, and was born at Rome, Dec. 30, A.D. 40. He was educated at the court of Nero with Britannicus, and hence acquired some false moral principles which afterwards led him into many excesses. He was in charge of a legion

of the Roman forces in the last war of the Jews, and on his father's elevation to the imperial throne, he prosecuted the war to a successful close, sharing the honors of a triumph jointly with Vespasian. On his own elevation to the throne, he reformed his habits, and became celebrated for his virtues and popularity. He died Sept. 13, A.D. 81, in the third year of his reign. His career is given by the ancient historians Suetonius and Tacitus, and his connection with the Jews by Josephus. Monographs on him have been written in Latin by Jung (1761), and in French by Rolland (1830).

Ti'zite

(Heb. *Titsi'*, **yxxyTi**, patrial, as if from some unknown place or person called *Tits*; Sept. **θωσαί** v.r. **Ἰεασαί**; Vulg. *Thosaites*), the designation of Joha (q.v.), the brother of Jediael and son of Shimri, one of the heroes of David's army named in the supplementary list of ^{<13145>}1 Chronicles 11:45. The word is possibly a corruption for **yxæTæ** *Tirzite*, i.e. inhabitant of Tirzah (q.v.).

To'ah

(Heb. *To'ach*, **j w̄ḏ**, *lowly*; Sept. **θουού** v.r. **θουουέ** and **θειέ**; Vulg. *Thohu*), son of Zuph and father of Eliel in the genealogy of Heman the Levitical musician (^{<1364>}1 Chronicles 6:34 Hebrews 19:1); elsewhere called by the similar name TOHU (^{<9006>}1 Samuel 1:1), or the different one (^{<1365>}1 Chronicles 6:26) NAHATH *SEE NAHATH* (q.v.). *SEE SAMUEL*.

Tob

(Heb. *Tob*, **bwḏ**, *good*, as everywhere; Sept. **Τώβ**; Vulg. *Tob*), the name of a region or district (**/ra**; Sept. **γη**; Vulg. *terra*; A. V. land'') into which Jephthah withdrew when expelled from home by his half-brethren (^{<9713>}Judges 11:3), and where he remained, at the head of a band of freebooters, till he was brought back by the sheiks (**μynæ**) of Gilead (ver. 5). The narrative implies that the land of Tob was not far distant from Gilead; at the same time, from the nature of the case, it must have lain out towards the eastern deserts. It is undoubtedly mentioned again in ^{<1006>}2 Samuel 10:6, 8 as one of the petty Aramitish kingdoms or states which supported the Ammonites in their great conflict with David; but in that passage the A.V. presents the name *literatim* as Ishtob (q.v.), i.e. *man of*

Tob, meaning, according to a common Hebrew idiom, the “men of Tob.” After an immense interval it appears again (Τώβιον or Τούβιον) in the Maccabean history (1 Macc. 5, 13), and was then the abode of a considerable colony of Jews, numbering at least a thousand males. *SEE TOBIE*. In 2 Macc. 12:17 its position under the name TUBIENI *SEE TUBIENI* (q.v.) is defined very exactly as at or near Charax, 750 stadia from the strong town Caspis, though, as the position of neither of these places is known, we are not thereby assisted in the recovery of Tob. The Targum and Abarbanel render it simply “good land,” while Kimchi and Ben-Gerson look upon *Tob* as the name of the lord or owner of the land. Eusebius and Jerome make it a country, but say nothing of its situation (*Onomast. s.v.*). Ptolemy (*Geogr. 5, 19*) mentions a place called θαῦβα as lying to the southwest of Zobah, and therefore possibly to the east or north-east of the country of Ammon proper. In Stephanus of Byzantium and in Eckhel (*Doctr. Nunmm. 3, 352*) the names *Tubai* and *Tabeni* occur. The name *Tell Dobbe* (Burckhardt, *Syria*, April 25), or, as it is given by the latest explorer of those regions, *Tell Dibbe* (Wetzstein, *Map*), attached to a ruined site at the south end of the Leja, a few miles north-west of Kenlawat, and also that of *Ed-Dub*, some twelve hours east of the mountain El-Kileib, are both suggestive of Tob. According to Schwarz (*Palest. p. 200*) the Talmud identifies it with a Gentile town called *Susitha* or *Chephon*, somewhere on the south-east shore of the lake of Tiberias; perhaps the *Bippos* (q.v.) so often mentioned by Josephus.

Tob-adoni'jah

(Heb. *Tôb Adoniyah*, ἡγαθὰ βρῦ, *good is Adonijah*; Sept. *Τωβαδονίας* v.r. *Τωβαδωβεία*; Vulg. *Thobadonias*), last named of the nine Levites sent by Jehoshaphat through the cities of Judah to teach the law to the people (^{ca. 478}2 Chronicles 17:8). B.C. 910.

Tobey, Zalmon

a Baptist minister, was born in Norfolk, Conn., July 27, 1791. His parents were Congregationalists. He pursued his collegiate studies for a time at Williams College, and then became a member of Brown University, where he graduated in the class of 1817. In the fall of this year, he was ordained to the work of the ministry in Canaan, Conn., and in the following spring became pastor of the Baptist Church at Fruit Hill, Providence, R. I., where he remained five years (1818-23). He became pastor of the Fourth Baptist

Church. Providence, Sept. 2, 1823, where he continued for about ten years (1823-33). During this period he fraternized chiefly with the Freewill Baptists, the Church of which he was pastor largely sympathizing with him. After being disconnected with the regular Baptists for several years, he returned to that body. His subsequent pastorates were in Bristol, R. I., for three years; Colebrook, Conn., for five years; and Pawtucket, R. I., for seven years. In the spring of 1851 he removed to Warren, R. I. He preached as occasion offered in and around Warren for several years. He died in Norfolk. Conn., where he was visiting his relatives, Sept. 17, 1858. See Rev. Dr. H. Jackson, *Funeral Sermon*. (J. C. S.)

Tobi'ah

(Heb. *Tobiyah'*, תוביאח [once תוביאח Nehemiah 2, 19], *goodness of Jehovah*; Sept. *Τοβίας* v.r. *Τοβεία*; Vulg. *Tobia, Tobis*), the name of two men. *SEE TOBIAS*; *SEE TOBIAIL*.

1. A person whose "children" were a family that returned with Zerubbabel, but were unable to prove their connection with Israel (^{<1070>}Ezra 2:60; ^{<1072>}Nehemiah 7:62). B.C. ante 536.
2. A base-born ally of the Samaritans who played a conspicuous part in the rancorous opposition made by Sanballat the Moabite and his adherents to the rebuilding of Jerusalem under Nehemiah, B.C. 446. With *an* affectation of scorn, after the manner of Remus in the Roman legend, they looked on the constructions of the now hopeful and thriving Jews, and contemptuously said, "Even if a fox go up, he will break down their stone wall" (^{<1073>}Nehemiah 4:3). The two races of Moab and Ammon found in these men fit representatives of that hereditary hatred to the Israelites which began before the entrance into Canaan, and was not extinct when the Hebrews had ceased to exist as a nation. The horrible story of the origin of the Moabites and Ammonites, as it was told by the Hebrews, is an index of the feeling of repulsion which must have existed between these hostile families of men. In the dignified rebuke of Nehemiah it received its highest expression: "Ye have no portion, nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem" (2, 20). But Tobiah, though-a slave (ver. 10, 19), unless this be a title of opprobrium, and an Ammonite, found means to ally himself with a priestly family, and his son Johanan, married the daughter of Meshullam the son of Berechiah (6, 18). He himself was the son-in-law of Shechaniah the son of Arah (ver. 17), and these family relations created for 'him a strong faction

among the Jews, and may have had something to do with the stern measures which Ezra found it necessary to take to repress the intermarriages with foreigners. Even a grandson of the high-priest Eliashib had married a daughter of Sanballat (13, 28). In 13:4 Eliashib is said to 'have been allied to Tobiah, which would imply a relationship of some kind between Tobiah and Sanballat, though its nature is not mentioned. The evil had spread so far that the leaders of the people were compelled to rouse their religious antipathies by reading from the law of Moses the strong prohibition that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God forever (ver. 1). Ewald (*Gesch.* 4:173) conjectures that Tobiah had been a page ("slave") at the Persian court, and, being in favor there, had been promoted to be satrap of the Ammonites. But it almost seems that against Tobiah there was a stronger feeling of animosity than against Sanballat, and that this animosity found expression in the epithet "the slave," which is attached to his name. It was Tobiah who gave venom to the pitying scorn of Sanballat (^{<404B>}Nehemiah 4:3), and provoked the bitter cry of Nehemiah (ver. 4, 5); it was Tobiah who kept up communications with the factious Jews, and who sent letters to put their leader in fear (6:17, 19); but his crowning act of insult was to take up his residence in the Temple in the chamber which Eliashib had prepared for him in defiance of the Mosaic statute. Nehemiah's patience could no longer contain itself, "therefore," he says, "'I cast forth all the household stuff of Tobiah out of the chamber,'" and with this summary act Tobiah disappears from history (13, 7, 8). *SEE NEHEMIAH.*

Tobiah, Ben Eliezer

a Jewish writer, who flourished at Mayence, A.D. 1107, is the author of a commentary on the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth, i.e. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. This commentary, the proper title of which is *Lekach Tob* (bwf j ql) in allusion to his name, as is evident from the quotations made by Aben-Ezra and Rashbam, but which is erroneously called *atqsp* or *atrfwz atqsp*, consists both of excerpts from the ancient expository works, such as *Siphra*, *Siphre*, *Tanchuma*, etc., and of an attempt at a grammatical explanation of the text. A portion of it, embracing the commentaries on Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, was first published at Venice in 1546. With a Latin translation it was republished in Ugolino's *Thesaurus Antiuita tum Sacrarum* (ibid. 1764-69), vol. 15:16. Excerpts of the commentaries on the

five Megilloth were published by A. Jellinek (Leips. 1855-58). The whole MS. is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (*Cod. Uri* 124). See First, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 427.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 6:159; Kitto, *Cycop.* s.v.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, p. 233, 406; De' Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (German transl.), p. 314; Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortrage*, p. 293-295. (B. P.)

Tobi'as

(**Τωβίας**), the Greek form of the name *Tobiah* or *Tobjiah*, as it occurs of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. The son of Tobit, and central character in the book of that name. **SEE TOBIT, BOOK OF.**
2. The father of Hyrcanus, apparently a man of great wealth and reputation, at Jerusalem in the time of Seleucus Philopator (2 Macc. 3, 11). B.C. cir. 187. In the high-priestly schism which happened afterwards, **SEE MENELAUS**, "the sons of Tobias" took a conspicuous part (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 5, 1). One of these, Joseph, who raised himself by intrigue to high favor with the Egyptian court, had a son named Hyrcanus (*ibid.* 4, 2). It has been supposed that this is the Hyrcanus referred to in 2 Macc. 3, 11; and it is not impossible that, for some unknown reason (as in the case of the Maccabees), the whole family were called after their grandfather, to, the exclusion of the father's name. On the other hand, the natural recurrence of names in successive generations makes it more probable that the Hyrcanus mentioned in Josephus was a nephew of the Hyrcanus in 2 Macc. (comp. Ewald, *Gesch. 'd. Volkes Israel*, 4., 309; Grimm, *Ad Macc.* loc. cit.).

To'bie

the name of a district (**τὰ Τωβίου** v.r. **Τουβίου**; Vulg. *loca Tubin*), where, in the time of the Maccabees, was an extensive colony of Jews (1 Macc. 5, 13); probably identical with the land of TOB **SEE TOB** (q.v.) mentioned in the history of Jephthah (^(TOB)Judges 11:3, *b*).

To'biel

(**Τωβήλ**, for He **ל טוב**, *goodness of God*; comp. *Tobael*), the father of Tobit and grandfather of Tobias (Tobit 1, 1).

Tobi'jah

(Heb. *Tobiyah*, **הַיְבוּס** [once (^{<3860>}Zechariah 6:10) in the prolonged form *Tobiya'hu*, **וְהַיְבוּס**, *goodness of Jehovah*), the name of two men. **SEE TOBIAH; SEE TOBIAS.**

1. (Sept. **Τωβίας**, but some MSS. omit; Vulg. *Thobias*.) The eighth named of the nine Levites sent by Jehoshaphat to teach the law in the cities of Judah (^{<4478>}2 Chronicles 17:8). . B.C. 910.

2. (Sept. **οἱ χρήσιμοι αὐτῆς** ; Vulg. *Tobias*.) Second named of the three or four representative men of the Jewish captives in the time of Zechariah, in whose presence the prophet was commanded to take crowns of silver and gold and put them on the head of Joshua the high-priest (^{<3860>}Zechariah 6:10,14). B.C. 519. Rosenmüller conjectures that he was one of a deputation who came up to Jerusalem from the Jews who still remained in Babylon with contributions of gold and silver for the Temple. But Maurer considers that the offerings were presented by Tobijah and his companions, because the crowns were commanded to be placed in the Temple as a memorial of their visit and generosity. **SEE ZECHARIAH.**

To'bit

(Sept. **Τωβείθ, Τωβείτ, Τωβίτ**; Vulg. *Tobias*; et. Lat. *Tobi, Thobi, Tobis*), the son of Tobiel and father of Tobias (Tobit 1, 1, etc.). The name appears to answer to **יבוּס**, *Tob*, which occurs frequently in later times (Fritzsche, *Ad Tob.* 1, 1), and not (as Welte, *Einleitung*, p. 65) to **הַיְבוּס**, *Tobiah*; yet in that case **Τωβίς**, according to the analogy of **Λείς** (**יִלְעָה**), would have been the more -natural form. The etymology of the word is obscure. Ilgen translates it simply "my goodness;" Fritzsche regards it as an abbreviation of **הַיְבוּס**, comparing **Μελί** (^{<4024>}Luke 3:24, 28), **יִקְזָה**, etc. (*Ad Tob.* loc. cit.). The form in the Vulg. is of no weight against the old Latin, except so far as it shows the reading of the Chaldaic text which Jerome used, in which the identity of the names of the father and son is directly affirmed (1, 9, Vulg.). **SEE TOBIT, BOOK OF.**

Tobit, Book of

one of the deutero-canonical books of the Old Test., standing in most editions of the original between the Epistle of Jeremiah and. the Book of

Judith, but in the A. V. between 2 Esdr. and Judith. It is chiefly interesting for the insight which it gives us into the superstitious notions of the Jews during the period of the Apocrypha.

I. Title. — In the Greek the book is called simply Tobit (Τωβίτ, Τωβείτ) in the old MSS. At a later time the opening words of the book, Βίβλος λόγων Τωβίτ, were taken as a title. In Latin MSS. it is styled *Tobis*, *Liber Thobis*, *Liber Tobic* (Sabatier, p. 706), *Tobit et Tobias*, *Liber utriusque Tobice* (Fritzsche, *Einleit.* § 1). In the A. V. it is superscribed “The book of the words of Tobit, etc., who, in the time of Eiemessar (Shalmaneser), king of the Assyrians, was led captive out of Thisbe, which is at the right hand of Kydios of Nephtholim in Galilee, above Aser.” The word Tobit is probably a Hebrew form **tybwṯ**, signifying *goodness*, a name very appropriate in a narrative of virtue suffering, yet rewarded.

II. Design and Contents. — The object of this book is to show that God, in his mysterious providence, permits sore calamities to befall the most pious and God-fearing in the very act of, and apparently for, obeying his commandments, but that he at the same time exercises a special care over them in the midst of their sufferings, vouchsafes them a happy issue out of all their trials, and holds them up to the world at large as patterns of patience under tribulations, as such who have been deemed worthy of being tried and purified, and who have demonstrated that the effectual and fervent prayer of a “righteous man availeth much.” The method adopted by the writer for working out this design will be seen from the following analysis of the book itself.

Tobit

a Jew of the tribe of Naphtali, who strictly observed the law and remained faithful to the Temple service at Jerusalem (1, 4-8), was carried captive to Assyria by Shalmaneser. While in captivity he exerted himself to relieve his countrymen, which his favorable position at court (**ἀγοραστής**, 1,13, “purveyor”) enabled him to do, and at this time he was rich enough to lend ten talents of silver to a countryman, Gabael of Rages, in Media. But when Sennacherib succeeded his father, Shalmaneser, the fortune of Tobit was changed. He was accused of burying the Jews whom the king had put to death, and was only able to save himself, his wife, Anna, and his son Tobias, by flight. On the accession of Esar-haddon, he was allowed to return to Nineveh, at the intercession of his nephew, Achiacharuts, who

occupied a high place in the king's household (1, 22); but his zeal for his countrymen brought him into a strange misfortune. As he lay one night in the court of his house, being unclean from having buried a Jew whom his son had found strangled in the market-place, sparrows "muted warm dung into his eyes," and he became blind. Being thus disabled, he was for a time supported by Achiacharus, and after his departure (read *ἔπορεύθη*, 2, 10) by the labor of his wife. On one occasion he falsely accused her of stealing a kid which had been added to her wages, and in return she reproached him with the miserable issue of all his righteous deeds. Grieved by her taunts, he prayed to God for help; and it happened that on the same day Sara, his kinswoman (6, 10, 11), the only daughter of Raguel, also sought help from God against the reproaches of her father's household. For seven young men wedded to her had perished on their marriage-night by the power of the evil spirit Asmodus (q.v.); and she thought that she should "bring her father's old age with sorrow unto the grave" (3, 10). So Raphael was sent to deliver both from their troubles. In the meantime Tobit called to mind the money which he had lent to Gabael, and dispatched Tobias, with many wise counsels, to reclaim it (ch. 4). On this Raphael (under the form of a kinsman, Azarias) offered himself as a guide to Tobias on his journey to Media, and they "went forth both, and *the young man's dog with them,*" and Anna was comforted for the absence of her son (ch. 5). When they reached the Tigris, Tobias was commanded by Raphael to take "the heart, and liver, and gall" of "a fish which leaped out of the river and would have devoured him," and instructed how to use the first two against Asmodaeus, for Sara, Raphael said, was appointed to be his wife (ch. 6). So when they reached Ecbatana, they were entertained by Raguel, and, in accordance with the words of the angel, Sara was given to Tobias in marriage that night, and Asmodaeus was "driven to the utmost parts of Egypt," where "the angel bound him" (ch. 7, 8). After this Raphael recovered the loan from Gabael (ch. 9), and Tobias then returned with Sara and half her father's goods to Nineveh (ch. 10). Tobit, informed by Anna of their son's approach, hastened to meet him. Tobias, by the command of the angel, applied the fish's gall to his father's eyes and restored his sight (ch. 11). After this Raphael, addressing to both words of good counsel, revealed himself, and "they saw him no more" (ch. 12). On this Tobit expressed his gratitude in a fine psalm (ch. 13); and he lived to see the long prosperity of his son (14, 1, 2). After his death Tobias, according to his instruction, returned to Ecbatana, and "before he died he heard of the destruction of Nineveh," of which "Jonas the prophet spake" (14. 15,4).

III. Historical and Religious Character of the Book.

1. There are three theories about the reality of this story.

(1.) The opinion that this book records proper history was universally held by the Christian Church up to the time of the Reformation, and has even since been maintained by bishop Gray (*A Key to the O. T.* p. 620, etc., ed. 1857), Welte (*Einleit.* p. 84 sq.), Scholz (*Einleit.* 2, 594 sq.), and most Roman Catholic writers. In support of this opinion may be urged,

a. The minute account which it gives of Tobit's tribe, his pedigree, place of birth, the time in which he lived, his family, his condition and employment, his captivity, poverty, blindness, recovery, age, death, and place of burial (1, 1, 13, 20, 21; 2, 10; 11:13; 14:11-13);

b. The exactness of the historical remarks about the Assyrian kings (1, 2, 13, 15, 21), without deriving the names **Ἐννεμέσσαρος** (=Shalmaneser) and **Σαχερδονός** from the Old Test., as well as the correctness of the geographical points (1, 14; 2, 21; 3, 7; 6:1, 11); c. The impossibility of tracing the main features of the narrative to any Old Test. prototype, and of explaining them on the hypothesis of fiction. The obscure place Thisbe is given as Tobit's place of birth (1, 2), and many minute particulars of his life are described which have in themselves nothing whatever to do with the plot, and which can only be accounted for on the reality of the events. On the other hand, Bertholdt (*Einleit.* § 579) has given a summary of alleged errors in detail (e.g. 1, 2, "Naphtali," comp. with ^{<12153>}2 Kings 15:29; 6:9, Rages, said to have been founded by Sel. Nicator), but the question turns rather upon the general complexion of the history than upon minute objections, which are often captious and rarely satisfactory (comp. Welte, *Einleit.* p. 84-94).

(2.) The opinion that it is a moral fiction was first thrown out by Luther (*Vorrede aufs Buch Tobia* [Bible, ed. 1534]), and has since been maintained by Rainold (*Censur.* 1, 726), J. A. Fabricius, Buddens (*Hist. Eccles.* 2, 489), Paul Faginus, Eichhorn (*Einleit.* p. 401 sq.), Bertholdt (*Einleit.* 5, 2477 sq.), De Wette (*Einleit.* § 309), Gutmann (*Die Apokryphen.* p. 143), Ewald (*Gesch. d. V. J.* 4:233 sq.), Fritzsche (*Kurgef. exeget. Handb. z. d. Apokryphen*, 2, 14 sq.), Davidson (*The Text of the O.T. Considered*, p. 1001), Vaihüger (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop. s.v.* "Tobias"), Gratz (*Gesch. der Juden*, 4:180 [2nd ed. 1866]), etc. In support of this opinion it is urged-a. The narrative is completely isolated; and

though the events pretend to have occurred before and shortly after the fall of Nineveh (B.C. 606), no other document written at a later period refers to them. It bears a strong likeness to the tales of the *Thousand and One Nights*, with the obvious exception that the writer has a considerable acquaintance and sympathy with the writings of the Old Test. He writes in a pleasing style, and with a good deal of power. But he is clearly at variance with the sacred books of the holy nation on important points both of fact and principle. Tobit's age, his wife's, who died after him, and that of his son are much beyond the ordinary limit of old age in his day, and bring us back to the times of the patriarchs. He was fifty-eight years of age when he lost his sight, in the reign of Esar-haddon, and lived one hundred years after that time. Now, if, according to Rawlinson, Esar-haddon began to reign B.C. 680, Tobit must have survived the fall of Nineveh (B.C. 625 or 606), of which, he is made to prophesy (14, 4). He also takes no account of Sargon, who comes-in between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. He removes to Ely-mais, and yet is found at Nineveh (11, 16), though he does not intimate his return, unless it be in 3, 17, where he speaks of coming home. b. The name Tobit does not occur in the Old Test., and belongs to a later age. c. The form, spirit, and tone of the narrative show that it belongs to a very late period. The doctrine of good and evil spirits (3, 8; 6:14; 8:3; 12:15), the ascription of human lusts to spiritual beings (vi, 14), the notion of the seven presence-angels bringing the prayers of the pious before the Divine throne (12, 12, 15), the marriage instrument (**hbwtk**), and the legal benediction pronounced over tie wedded pair (7, 13, 14), are of post-Babylonian origin... 1. The stories of the angel Raphael in a human form giving a false account of himself as being a kinsman of Tobit (5, 12), of Tobit becoming blind in both eyes by the falling of some dung of sparrows (2, 10), and of the marvelous fish (6, 2-5) are beyond all matter of fact. The modes of repelling evil spirits and curing blindness betray a superstitious or trifling mind. The angel is made to feign himself a man, a Jew of a family known to Tobit, and to be the voucher for the false charms which are introduced. Although the extraordinary character of the details, as such, is no objection against the reality of the occurrences, yet it may be fairly urged that the character of the alleged miraculous events, when taken together, is alien from the general character of such events in the historical books of Scripture; while there is nothing exceptional in the circumstances of the persons, as in the case of Daniel, which might serve to explain this difference.

(3.) The view that the narrative is based upon a real occurrence preserved by tradition, but poetically embellished to suit the spirit of the time in which it was written, is maintained by Arnald, Dereser, Ilgen, Keil, etc. The fact that there are different recensions and embellishments of the story, and that the *Midrash Tanchuma* (pericope [wnyzah](#)) gives an independent version of it, seems to show that it was traditionally handed down from the time when the occurrence took place. It is quite possible that some real occurrences, preserved by tradition, furnished the basis of the narrative, but it does not follow by any means that the elimination of the extraordinary details will leave behind pure history (so Ilgen). As the book stands it is a distinctly didactic narrative. Its point lies in the moral lesson which it conveys, and not in the incidents. The incidents furnish lively pictures of the truth which the author wished to inculcate, but the lessons themselves are independent of them. Nor can any weight be laid on the minute exactness with which apparently unimportant details are described (e.g. the genealogy and dwelling-place of Tobit, 1, 1, 2; the marriage festival, 8:20; 11:18, 19, quoted by Ilgen and Welte), as proving the reality of the events, for such particularity is characteristic of Eastern romance, and appears again in the Book of Judith. The writer in composing his-story necessarily observed the ordinary form of a historical narrative.

2. The religious character of the book is one of its most important and interesting features, inasmuch as it shows the phases of faith which obtained prior to the advent of Christ, and explains many points in the New Test. Few probably can read the book in the Sept. text without assenting to the favorable judgment of Luther on its merits. Nowhere else is there preserved so complete and beautiful a picture of the domestic life of the Jews after the Return. There may be symptoms of a tendency to formal, righteousness of works out; as yet the works are painted as springing from a living faith. The devotion due to Jerusalem is united with definite acts of charity (1, 6-8) and with the prospect of wider blessings (13, 11). The giving of alms is not a mere scattering of wealth, but a real service of love (1, 16, 17; 2, 1-7; 4, 7-11, 16), though at times the emphasis which is laid upon the duty is exaggerated (as it seems) from the special circumstances in which the writer was placed (12, 9; 14:10). Of the special precepts one (4, 15, [ὁ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσης](#)) contains the negative side of the golden rule of conduct ([ⓂMatthew 7:12](#)), which in this partial form is found among the maxims of Confucius.

But it is chiefly in the exquisite tenderness of the portraiture of domestic life that the book excels. The parting of Tobias and his mother, the consolation of Tobit (5, 17-22), the affection of Raguel (7, 4-8), the anxious waiting of the parents (10, 1-7), the son's return (9, 4; 11), and even the unjust suspiciousness of the sorrow of Tobit and Anna (2, 11-14) are painted with a simplicity worthy of the best times of the patriarchs. Almost every family relation is touched upon with natural grace and affection: husband and wife, parent and child, kinsmen, near or distant, master and servant, are presented in the most varied action, and always with life-like power (1, 22; 2, 10, 13, 14; 5, 14, 15, 17-22; 7,3-8, 16; 8:4-8; 10:1-7; 11:1-13; 12:1-5, etc.). Prayer hallows the whole conduct of life (4, 19; 6:17; 8:5-8, etc.); and even in distress there is confidence that in the end all will be well (4, 6, 14, 19), though there is no clear anticipation of a future personal existence (3, 6).

The most remarkable doctrinal feature in the book is the prominence given to the action of spirits, who, while they are conceived to be subject to the passions of men and material influences (Asmodaeus), are yet not affected by-bodily wants, and manifested only by their own will (Raphael, 12:19). Powers of evil (**δαίμόνιον, πνεῦμα πονηρόν**, 3, 8, 17; 6:7, 14, 17) are represented as gaining the means of injuring men by sin, while they are driven away and bound by the exercise of faith and prayer (8, 2,3). On the other hand, Raphael comes among men as "the healer" (comp. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, c. 20), and, by the mission of God (3, 17; 12:18), restores those whose good actions he has secretly watched (12, 12, 13), and "the remembrance of whose prayers he has brought before the Holy One" (12, 12). This ministry of intercession is elsewhere expressly recognized. Seven holy angels, of whom Raphael is one, are specially described as those "which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in aid out before the glory of God" (12, 15). It is characteristic of the same sense of the need of some being to interpose between God and man that singular prominence is given to the idea of "the glory of God," before which these archangels appear as priests in the holiest place (8, 15; 12:15); and in one passage "the angel of God" (5, 16, 21) occupies a position closely resembling that of the Word in the Targums and Philo (*De Muet Norn.* § 13, etc.). Elsewhere blessing is rendered to "all the holy angels" (11, 14, **εὐλογημένοι** as contrasted with **εὐλογητός**; comp. Luke 1, 42), who are themselves united with "the elect" in the duty of praising God forever (8, 15).

This mention of “the elect” points to a second doctrinal feature of the book, which it shares with Baruch alone of the Apocryphal writings, the firm belief in a glorious restoration of the Jewish people (14, 5; 103, 9-18). But the restoration contemplated is national, and not the work of a universal Savior. The Temple is described as “consecrated and built for all ages” (1:4), its feasts are “an everlasting decree” (ver. 6), and when it is restored the streets of Jerusalem shall say, “Blessed be God which hath extolled it forever” (13:18). In all there is not the slightest trace of the belief in a personal Messiah.

Comparisons have often been made between the Book of Tobit and Job, but from the outline which has been given it is obvious that the resemblance is only superficial, though Tobit 2:14 was probably suggested by ^{<1811>}Job 2:9, 10, while the differences are such as to mark distinct periods. In Tobit the sorrows of those who are afflicted are laid at once in prayer before God, in perfect reliance on his final judgment, and then immediately relieved by Divine interposition. In Job the real conflict is in the soul of the sufferer, and his relief comes at length with humiliation and repentance (^{<1816>}Job 42:6). The one book teaches by great thoughts; the other by clear maxims translated into touching incidents. The contrast of Tobit and Judith is still more instructive. These books present two pictures of Jewish life and feeling, broadly distinguished in all their details, and yet mutually illustrative. The one represents the exile prosperous and even powerful in a strange land, exposed to sudden dangers, cherishing his national ties, and looking with unshaken love to the Holy City, but still mainly occupied by the common duties of social life; the other portrays a time of reproach and peril, when national independence was threatened, and a righteous cause seemed to justify unscrupulous valor. The one gives the popular ideal of holiness of living, the other of courage in daring. The one reflects the current feeling at the close of the Persian rule, the other during the struggles for freedom.

IV. *Original Language, Versions, Condition of the Text, etc. —*

1. The whole complexion of the book shows that it is of Palestinian origin, and hence many have assumed that the languages in which the traditional story was first written down were Hebrew and Aramaic. Indeed, Jerome tells us that he made his Latin version from the Aramaic in one day, with the assistance of a Jew, who, being skilled in both Hebrew and Chaldee, dictated to him the import thereof in Hebrew (“Exigitis, ut-librum

Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad Latinum stylum traham, librum utique Tobiae quem Hebraei de catalogo divinarum Scripturarum secantes his quae Hagiographa [Apocrypha] memorant, manciparunt. Feci satis desiderio vestro, non tamen meo studio. Et quia vicina est Chaldseorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae pertissimum loquacem reperiens unius diei laborem arripui, et quidquid; ille mihi, Hebraicis verbis expressit,-hoc ego accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui” [*Præf. in Tob.*]). This has been thought to be corroborated by the fact that some of the difficulties in the Greek text can be removed on the supposition of a Hebrew original. Thus ἔκχεον τοὺς ἄρτους σου ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον τῶν δικαίων (4:17), which has no sense, seems to be a mistranslation of **j l ç yqyrxh brqb hñ l** ; the translator, by a transposition of the last two letters, having read **rbqb** instead of **brqb** and **ḫç** instead of **j l ç**, as is evident from the antithetical clause, “Land give it not to the wicked,” in harmony with the traditional injunction **rwsa hr̄b[yrbw[ydy qyzj hl** , *it is not lawful to strengthen the hands of the transgressor*. So also καὶ εὐλόγησε Τωβίας τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (9, 6) may be accounted for only the supposition that it is a mistranslation of the Hebrew **wtça ta hybwf ḫbyw**. The correct rendering of it requires that either Gabael should be taken as the subject — i.e. “and he (i.e. Gabael) saluted Tobias with his wife” — or that both Tobias and his wife should be the subject — i.e. “and Tobias and his wife saluted them,” i.e. the two comers, Azarias and the servant. See also. 5, 11, 12, 18; 6:9; arid for the Hebraizing style, 1, 1; 13; 3, 5; 5, 14; 14:19; De Wette, *Einleit.* § 310; Gratz, *Geschichte*,: 4:466 (2nd ed.). On the other hand, superior clearness, simplicity, and accuracy of the Sept. text prove conclusively that this is nearer the original than any other text which is known, if it be not, as some have supposed (Jahn and Fritzsche doubtfully), the original itself. Indeed, the arguments, which have been brought forward to show that it is a translation are far from conclusive. The supposed contradictions between different parts of the book, especially the change from the first (1-3, 6) to the third person (3:7-14), from which Ilgen endeavored to prove that the narrative was made up of distinct Hebrew documents, carelessly put together, and afterwards rendered by one Greek translator, are explicable on other grounds; and the alleged mistranslations (3:6; 4:19, etc.) depend rather on errors in interpreting the Greek text than on errors in the text itself. The style, again, though harsh in parts, and far from the classical standard, is not more so than some books which were undoubtedly written

in Greek (e.g. the Apocalypse); and there is little, if anything, in it which points certainly to the immediate influence of an Aramaic text. (1, 4, εἰς πάσας τὰς γενέας τοῦ αἰῶνος; comp. ~~ⲉⲩⲠⲉ~~ Ephesians 3:21; 1, 22, ἐκ δευτέρας; 3:15, ἵνα τί μοι ζῆν; 5:15, τίνα σοι ἔσομαι μισθὸν διδόναι; 14:3, προσέθετε φοβεῖσθαι, etc.) To this it may be added that Origen was not acquainted with any Hebrew original (*Ep. ad Afric.* 13); and the Chaldee copy which Jerome used, as far as its character can be ascertained, was evidently a later version of the story. On the other hand, there is no internal evidence against the supposition that the Greek text is a translation. The Greek offers some peculiarities-in vocabulary: 1, 6, πρωτοκουρία, i. e. ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κουρῶν, ~~ⲉⲩⲠⲉ~~ Deuteronomy 18:4; 1, 7, ἀποπρατίζομαι; 1, 21, ἐκλοιστία; 2, 3, στραγγαλόω, etc.: and in construction, 13:7, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι τὴν μεγαλωσύνην; 12:4, δικαιοῦσθαί τινι; 6:19, προσάγειν τινί (intrans.); ver. 6, ἐγγίξειν ἐν, etc. But these furnish no argument on either side.

2. There are extant different Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Hebrew texts of this book, differing more or less from one another in the details of the narrative; but yet, on the whole, so far alike that it is reasonable to suppose that all were derived from one written original, which was modified in the course of translation or transcription.

Besides the Greek text of the Sept. which was adopted into this version because it was that-of the Greek Church, there is a recension, one fragment of which (1:1-2, 2) is contained in the *Cod. Sinaiticus* (or *Cod. Frid. Augustanus*, ed. Tischendorf [Leips. 1846]), and another (6:9-13) in the last three MSS. (44, 106, 107) of Holmes and Parsons.

Of Latin translations we have the ante-Hieronymian version, which was first published by Sabatier (*Bibliorum Sacrosanctarum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*, 1743) from two MSS. of the 8th century, and which, according to the investigations of Fritzsche (p. 1 sq.), is mostly made from the recension of the Greek text, but partly (vi, 15-17; 7:15-18; 8:14-17; 12:6-9, 11-22; 13:6-18) also from the common text, while 10:1-11, 19 is from a mixture of both texts. In this edition of the *Vetus Latina*, Sabatier also published, in the form of notes and as various readings, two other codd., one being of the same age as the MSS. of the ante-Hieronymian version, belonging to the library of St. Germanus (No. 15), and concluding (13, 12) with *Explicit Tobijustus*; and the other belonging to the Vatican (No. 7). The text of the latter differs so materially from the other MSS. that it is

regarded as an independent version, though emanating from the same Greek source. It is less barbarous and more fluent in style, as well as more explicit its renderings, and it is to be regretted that it has survived as a fragment, containing only 1, 1-6; 12 (*Bibl. Lat.* 2, 706). There also, existed another Latin version, as is evident from the quotations of this book contained in the *Speculum* of Augustine, which Angelo Mai has published (*Spicilegium Romanorum*, 9:21-23). As to the Vulgate Latin version, Jerome tells us, as we have seen, that he made it in one day from the Syro-Chaldaic. It differs very materially from the Greek, and is evidently derived from a different form which this traditional story assumed in a different part of the country. The treatment of the text in this recension is very arbitrary, as might be expected from the above account, which Jerome gives of the mode in which it was made; and it is of very little critical value, for, it is impossible to distinguish accurately the different elements which *are* incorporated in it. It is evident that in this process Jerome made some use of the Old Latin version, which he follows almost verbally in a few places: 3, 3-6; 4:6,7, 11. 23, etc.; but the greater part of the version seems to be an independent work. On the whole, it is more concise than the Old Latin; but it contains interpolations and changes, many of which mark the asceticism of a late age: 2, 12-14 (parallel with Job); 3, 17-23 (expansion of 3, 14); 6:17 sq. (expansion of 6:18); 9:11, 12; 12:13 (“et quia acceptus eras Deo, necesse fuit ut tentatio probaret te”).

The Syriac version is made from the two different recensions of the Greek; 1, 1-7, 9 being a translation of the common Greek text of the Sept.; while 7:10, etc., is from a text represented by the above-named three MSS. (44, 106,107) of Holmes and Parsons, according to the marginal annotations in Usher’s MS.

Neubauer has lately discovered a Chaldee version among the MSS. of the Bodleian Library, which may prove to be a copy of that to which Jerome refers as the basis of his version.

There are four Hebrew versions of this book, the one first published in Constantinople, 1517; then with a Latin translation by Paul Fagius, and adopted in Walton’s *Polyglot* (Lond. 1657), vol. 4. It is a free translation of the common Greek text, made by a learned Jew in the 12th century. The second is that first published with a Latin translation by Sebastian Minister (Basle, 1542; then again in 1549, 1556, 1563), and has also been inserted in Walton’s *Polyglot*. This Hebrew version is more in harmony with the

Vetus Latina; and the author of it, who was a Jew, is supposed to have flourished in the 5th century. The: third Hebrew version was made from the common Greek text by J. S. Frinkel (Leips. 1830); and the fourth is by J. Siebenberger — it was published in Warsaw, 1840, with a Judaeo-German translation, a Hebrew commentary, and an elaborate Hebrew introduction.

As to the versions of the Reformation, Luther made his translation from the Vulgate; the Swiss-Zurich Bible (1531) is also from the Vulgate.: Coverdale (1535), as usual, followed the Zurich version, *SEE COVERDALE*; and he again was followed by Matthew's Bible (1537), Lord Cromwell's Bible (1539), — Cranmer's Bible (1540), and the Bishops Bible (1568). The Genevan version (1560) is the first made from the Greek, and our present A.V. (1611), as in most cases, followed the Genevan version, though this was interdicted by James I.

3. The first complete edition of the book was by Ilgen (*Die Gesch. Tobi's ...mit...einer Einleit. verssehen* [Jen. 1800]), which, in spite of serious defects due to the period at which it was published, contains the most full discussion of the contents. The edition of Fritzsche (*Exeget. Handb.* [Leips. 1853], vol. 2) is concise and scholar like, but leaves some points without-illustration, In England the book, like the rest of the Apocrypha, seems to have fallen into neglect.

V. Author, Date, and Place of Composition. —As 12:20 tells us that Raphael, before his *disappearance*, commanded Tobit and his son Tobias to record the events; of their lives; and, moreover, since Tobit, in the first three chapters, speaks in the first person, while (ch. 13) his prayer is introduced by the statement *Καὶ Τωβὶτ ἔγραψε προσευχὴν εἰς ἀγαλλίασιν καὶ εἶπεν*; the Church universal, up to the time of the Reformation, believed that Tobit himself wrote this book (B.C. cir. 600) as far as ch. 14; that 14:1-11 was written by his son Tobias; and that 12:12-15 was added by -the editor of this document immediately after the death of Tobias. This opinion is shared by bishop Gray, Prideaux, and others, who modify it by submitting that it was compiled from the memoirs of Tobit and Tobias; while Ilgen maintains that 1, 1-3, 7; 13:1-8, were written by Tobit in Assyria, B.C. 689; 3, 8-12, 2-22; 14:1-15, were written in Palestine, B.C. cir. 280; and that from these two Hebrew documents the Chaldee version was made B.C. cir. 120, which Jerome translated into Latin. Modern critics, however, conclude, from the whole complexion of the

book, its angelology, theology, etc., that it is a post-Babylonian production, and that it was -written by a Palestinian Jew. But these critics differ very materially about the precise date when the book was compiled, as will be seen from the following table:

The Catholic Church—Bishop Gray, Ilgen	B.C.	689-600
Ewald		350
Herzfeld		300
Bertholdt		250-200
Eichhorn	A.D.	10
Fabricius		100
Grätz		130

But though internal evidence leaves it beyond the shadow of a doubt that the book was compiled after the Babylonian captivity, yet the arguments adduced by Gratz (*Geschichte*, 3, 466, 2nd ed.) to prove that it was written after the destruction of the Temple, and during, the persecutions of Hadrian, are inconclusive. The reference to the destruction of the Temple (13, 10, 16; 14:4) is designed to refer to what took place in the reign of Zedekiah, when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem and burned the sanctuary (2 Kings 25). The other remark of this learned historian-viz. that the bread of heathens (ἄρτος τῶν ἑθνῶν=μῦρκν τρ), of which Tobit speaks (ver. 1, 10), was first interdicted shortly before the destruction of the Temple by Titus is based upon restricting the term ἄρτος to *actual bread*, whereas it signifies *food* generally, and this was prohibited long before the Christian era (comp. Daniel 1, 5). Indeed, the book is singularly devoid of the stringent Halachic expansions of the Mosaic enactments which obtained in later times: it contains no allusion whatever to the rewards in a future life, and has no reference to the party-strifes which were so rampant at the time of Christ, traces of which might naturally be expected in it if it had been written in or after the time of Christ. It is therefore most probable that the book was written *B.C.* cir. 250-200.

VI. Canoncity and Authority. —Like the other deutero-canonical books, Tobit was, never included in the canon by the synagogue. This is established beyond the shadow of doubt, not only from the list of the Hebrew Scriptures given by the Jews themselves in the Talmud

(*BabaBathra*, 14), but from the oldest catalogues of the canon furnished by Christian fathers, such as Melito, Origen, etc. Indeed, Origen distinctly states that neither Tobit nor Judith was ever received by the Jews as Sacred Scripture- Ἐβραῖοι τῷ Τωβίτῃ οὐ χρῶνται (*Ep. ad Affric.* § 13; comp. *De Orat.* 1, 14).

It was, however, different in the Greek Church, where the text of the Sept. was received as canonical. There appears to be a clear reference to it in the Latin version of the Epistle of Polycarp (c. 10, *elemosyna de morte liberat*; Tobit 4:10; 12:9). In a scheme of the Ophites, if there be no corruption in the text, Tobias appears among the prophets (Iren. 1, 30,11).. Forming part of the contents of this version, Clement of Alexandria quotes Tobit 4:15; 12:8,-as taken from - ἡ γραφή, *Scripture* (Strom. 2, 23,139). But though Origen himself also quoted it as *Scripture*, yet it is ranked by Christians among such as were read to the catechumens, and contains a plainer and less elevated doctrine (*In Numbers Homil.* 20). Even Athanasius, when writing without any critical regard to the canon, quotes Tobit as Scripture (*Apol. c. Arian.* § 11, ὡς γέγραπται, Tobit 12:7); but when he gives a formal list of the sacred books, he definitely excludes it from the canon, and places it with other Apocryphal books among the writings which were to be read by those who were but just entering on Christian teaching, and desirous to be instructed in the rules of piety” (*Ep. Fest.* p. 1177, ed. Migne). This distinction, however, between *canonical* and *apocryphal* afterwards disappeared, to a great extent, in the Greek Church, as is seen from the fact that Bar-Hebraeus places Tobit among the sacred books in his Nomocanon of the Antiochenian Church (Mai, *Script. Vett. Nova Collectio*, 53; comp. Fritzsche, p. 18).

In the Latin Church Tobit was regarded with greater sacredness. Cyprian often quotes it as *Holy Writ* (*De Opere et Eleemosynis Liber*). Hilary cites it to prove the intercession of angels (*In ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 129:7*), and tells us that some Christians added both Tobit and Judith to the other two-and-twenty canonical books to make up their canon of four-and-twenty books (*Prol. in Psalm 15*). Lucifer quotes it as authoritative (*Pro Athan.* 1, 871). Augustine includes it with the other Apocrypha of, the Sept. among “the books which the Christian Church received” (*De Doctr. Christ.* 2, 8). This is expressed still more distinctly in the *Speculum* (p. 1127, C., ed. Par. 1836): “Non sunt omittendi et hi [libri] quos quidem ante Salvatoris adventum constat esse conscriptos, sed eos non receptos a Judaeis recipit tamen ejusdem Salvatoris ecclesia.” The preface from which these words

are taken is followed by quotations from Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Tobit. In this Augustine was followed by the mass of the later Latin fathers. Ambrose, in especial, wrote an essay on Tobias, treating of the evils of usury, in which he speaks of the book as “prophetic” in the strongest terms (*De Tobia*, l, 1; *comp. Hexcem.* 6:4). Jerome, however, followed by Rufinus, maintained the purity of the Hebrew canon of the Old Test., and, as has been seen, treated it very summarily.

The third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), Innocent I (405), and the councils of Florence (1439) and Trent (1546), declared it canonical. Indeed, in the old Roman Missal and in the Missal of Sarum there is a proper mass of Raphael, the archangel, and it is ordered in the prefatory rubric that the office be celebrated for pilgrims, travelers, sick persons, and demoniacs. This is followed by two short prayers, one addressed to God and the other to Raphael (*comp. Arnald, Dissertation on Asodcus*).

As to the Reformed Church, though Luther was the first who separated the deuterocanonical from the canonical books, yet he entertained the highest opinion of the book of Tobit. “If it is history,” says the great Reformer, “it is fine holy history; but if fiction, it is indeed right beautiful, wholesome, profitable fiction, and play of an ingenious poet.... It is, therefore, profitable and good for us Christians to read this book as the production of an excellent Hebrew poet, who treats not on frivolous, but solid, matters” (*Vorrede zum Buche-Tobia*, in his translation of the Bible, ed. 1534). In the Anglican Church the book of Tobit is looked upon with still greater favor—4, 7-16 is quoted in: the *Homilies* as the counsel of the holy father Toby (*On A In2s-deeds*, pt. 1); 4:10 is cited as a lesson taught by “the Holy Ghost in Scripture” (*ibid.* pt. 2)-; and 12:8 is adduced to show that the angel Raphael, told Tobias that “fasting used with prayer is of great efficacy” (*Of Fasting*, pt. 2). Passages of Tobit are also incorporated in the liturgy; 4:7-9 is among the passages used at the offertory; 3, 3, according to the Latin Vulgate, is introduced into the litany; 6:17, according to the Vulgate, is alluded to in the preface to the Marriage Service; while in the prayer following immediately after the versicles and responses in the same service in the First Book of Prayer of Edward VI, the following sentence is used: “And as thou didst send the angel Raphael to Thobie and Sara, the daughter of Raquel, to their great comfort, so vouchsafe to send thy blessing upon these thy servants” (Parker Society’s ed. p. 131)..

VII. Commentaries. —The following are the special exegetical helps on this Apocryphal book: Fagius, *Tobice Liber* (Isny, 1542, 4to; also in the Lond. *Polyglot*, 1657, fol.); Miinster, *ybⲟⲩ rpⲥⲉ* (Basle, 1542, i549, 1556, 1563, 4to; also in Walton's *Polyglot*); Drusius, *Tobias Graece* (Franck. 1591, 8vo; also in his *Criticae Sacrae*); Senarius, *In Libros Tobie, Judith*, etc. (Mainz, 1610, fol.); Drexel, *Tobias Illustratus* (Mun. 1611, 1.2mo); Sanctius, *In Libros Ruth, Tobias*, etc. (Lugd. 1628, fol.); Justinian, *Tobias Illustratus* (Colossians 1629, fol.); Van Mauden, *Tobias Delineatus* (Antw. 1631, fol.); Βίβλος Λόγων Τωβίτ, etc. (in the eds. of the Apocrypha, F. ad M. 1634, 1757, 8vo; by Augusti [Leips. 1804, 8vo]; Apel [ib." 1836, 8vo]); Celada, *Commenztarius in Tob. fist.* (Lugd. 1644, fol.); Anon. *Tobie, Judith, et Esther, avec Explication* (Paris, 1688, 8vo); Van der Hardt, *Emnigma Tobice*, etc. (Helmnst. 1728, 4to); Aden, *hϣⲟⲩ rpⲥⲉ* (Amst. 1736, 8vo); Sabatier, *Liber Tobit* (in the *Vetus Latina* [Par. 1751, fol.], vol. 1); Seller, *Pred. üb. d. B. Tobias* (Munich, 1780, 8vo); Le Clerc, *Liber Tobice* (Par. 1785, 8vo); Bauer, *Das B. Tobias Erklar* (Bramb. — Wiirtzb. 1787, 1793. 12mo); Eichhorn, *Ueb. d. B. Tobias* (in his *Bibliothek*, 2, 410-440 [Leips. 1787-1800]); Ilgen, *Die Gesch. Tobi's* (Jen. 1800, 8vo); Hbpfner, *Historia Tobice Graec* (Viterbn. 1802, 4to); Dereser, *Tobias, Judith u. Esther erklar* (Frankfort-on-the Main, 1803, 1833, 8vo); Paur, *Das B. Tobias bearbeitet* (Leips. 1817, 8vo); Van Ess, *Liber Tobice* (Tub. 1822, 8vo); Frainkel, *Das B. Thobi* (in his *μϣⲟⲩ ϣⲓ ⲓⲓⲙⲟⲩⲥ K*) [Leips. 1830, 8vo]; Siebenberger, *hϣⲟⲩ ϣⲓⲉⲓ* (Heb. translation and commentary [Warsaw, 1839, 8vo]); Guttman, *Die Apokr. des A. T.* (Altona, 1841, 8vo); Cittadini and Bottari, *Libri di Tobia, Giuditta, e Ester* (Ven. 1844, 8vo); Fritzsche, *Die Bücher Tobi und Judith* (vol. 2 of the *KurzgeJf exeg. Handb.* [Leips. 1853, 8vo]); Reusch, *Das B. Tobias erklart* (Freib. 1857, 8vo); Sengelmann, *Das B. Tobit erklart* (Hamb. 1857, 8vo).
SEE APOCRYPHA.

Tobler, Titus

a German writer known for his researches in Palestine, was born June 25, 1806, at Stein, in the canton of Appenzell, Switzerland. He studied at Zurich and Vienna, was promoted as doctor of medicine in Würzburg, and, after spending a time in Paris, returned in 1827 to his native place and settled there as a physician. In 1835-36 he traveled in Palestine for mere medical purposes (comp. *Lustreise in Morgenland* [Zurich, 1839, 2 vols.]), but he soon became so interested in the topographico-geographical

exploration of the Holy Land that he undertook a second journey in .1845. See his *Bethlehem* (St. Gall.'1849): —*Plan von Jerusalem* (1850): —*Golgatha* (1851) . —*Die Siloahquelle und der Oelberg* (1852):. —*Denkblätter aus Jerusalem* (1853, 2nd ed. 1856): —and especially *Topographie, von Jerusalem u. seinen Umgebungen* (Berlin, 1853-54, 2 vols.): —*Beitrag zur medicin. Topographie von Jerusalem* (ibid. 1855). He undertook a third journey, and published as the results, *Planographie von Jerusalem* (Gotha, 1858): —*Dritte Waniderung nach Palestina* (ibid.'1859). In 1865 he went for the fourthtime, but on account of the cholera he soon returned and published *Nazareth in Paldstina, nebst Anhang der vierten Waniderung* (Berlin, 1868). Besides these works, he published, *De Locis Sanctis, quaeperambulavit Antonius Martyr c. an. 570* (St. Gall. 1863): —*Teodoricus de Locis Sanctis* (ibid. 1865): *Bibliographia Geographica Palestina* (Leips. 1867): —*Dergrosse Streit der Lateiner mit den Griechen in Palestina*, etc. (St. Gall. 1870): —*Palestinae Descriptiones ex Sceculo IV, V, et VI* (ibid. 1869): —*Descriptiones Terrce Sanctae ex Sceculo VIII, IX, XII, et XV* (Leips. 1874): — *Bibliographia Geogr. Palestinae ab. Anno CCCXXXIII usque ad Annum M*(Dresden, 1875). Tobler died Jan. 21, 1871, at Munich. The interesting life of this man will be found in Heim's *Dr. Titus Tobler, der Palestina fahrer; Ein appenzellisches Lebensbild: Nach handschriftlichen Quellen bearbeitet* (Zurich, 1879). (B. P.)

To'chen

(Heb. *To'ken*, תֹּכֶן *task or measure* [as in ^{<210>}Ezekiel 5:18; 45:11]; Sept. *θοκάν* v.r. *θογγάν*; Vulg. *Thochen*), one of the towns in the tribe of Simeon (^{<133>}1 Chronicles 4:32); probably the same elsewhere (^{<1652>}Joshua 15:24) called TELEM *SEE TELEM* (q.v.) or TELAIM (^{<1504>}1 Samuel 15:4).

Todd, David

a Congregational minister, was born at West Hanover, Pa., Nov. 5, 1821. He left home at the age of fifteen to attend the preparatory school of Oberlin College. After finishing his collegiate studies there, he entered the theological department, and passed through the prescribed course. He commenced his labors in Illinois, supplying the churches of Knox and Ontario; ten miles distant from each other. In these places he gathered permanent congregations and organized churches. 'He was ordained at

Victoria, Aug. 18, 1847. In 1849 he went to Bureau County, and took charge of a Congregational Church, where he labored with success until 1863, when he accepted a call to Pine Bluffs, Ark. He remained there until 1865, when, his health failing, he found it necessary to return to his Northern home. On his return he resumed his work as pastor, and finished his course—a faithful pastor and an excellent preacher, held in high esteem by the Church and community. He died at Granville, Ill., Aug. 10, 1874. (W. P. S.)

Todd, Henry John

an English clergyman, was born in 1763, and educated at Hertford College, Oxford, whence he proceeded as A.M. in 1786. He became a minor canon of Canterbury Cathedral soon after. In 1792 he was presented to the vicarage of Milton, near Canterbury, and some years later to the rectory of All-hallows, Lombard Street, London. He was appointed by the archbishop keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth; and in 1820 he was presented, by the earl of Bridgewater, to the rectory of Settrington, in Yorkshire. In 1830 he was collated by the archbishop of York to the prebend of Hushwaite in that cathedral church; and, finally, in 1832, he was appointed archdeacon of Cleveland. He died at Settrington, Yorkshire, Dec. 24, 1845. He wrote, *Some Account of the Deans of Canterbury* (Song of Solomon 1793, 8vso): — *Catalogue of Books in the Library of Christ Church* (ibid. 1802, 8vo): — *Catalogue of the Archiepiscopal Manuscripts in the Library at Lambeth Palace* (Lond, 1812, fol.): — *Original Sin, Free-will, Regeneration, Faith, etc., as Maintained in Certain Declarations of our Reformers* (ibid. 1818, 8vo): — *Vindication of our Authorized Translation and Translators of the Bible* (ibid. 1819, 8vo): — *Observations on the Metrical Versions of the Psalms made by Sternhold, Hopkins, and others* (ibid. 1819, 8vo; 1822, 8vo): — *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Rev. Brian Walton, Bishop of Chester* (ibid. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Account of Greek MSS., Chiefly Biblical, etc.* (ibid. 1823, 8vo): — *Archbishop Cranmer's Defense of the Doctrine of the Sacrament, with a Vindication of the Author against Lingard, Milner, and Butler* (ibid. 1825, 8vo): — *Of Confession and Absolution, and the Secrecy of Confession* (ibid. 1828, 8vo): *Life of Archbishop Cranmer* (ibid. 1831, 2 vols. 8vo): *Authentic Account of our Authorized Translation of the Bible and of the Translators, etc.* (2nd ed. Malton, 1834, 12mo; Lond. 1835, 8vo). See *English Cyclop. Biog. s.v.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.*

Todd, Hugh

a learned English divine, was born at Blencow, Cumberland, in 1658. He became a charity scholar of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1672; fellow of University College, Dec. 23, 1678; A.M. and chaplain to bishop of Carlisle, July 2, 1679. In 1685 he was appointed one of the four canon residentiaries of Carlisle, and the same year obtained the vicarage of Stanwix, which he resigned in 1688. He resigned his residentiaryship in 1720, and died in 1728, being vicar of Penrith and rector of Arthuret. He published, *Description of Sweden* (1680, fol.): — *Life of Phocion* (1684): — *Sermon* (1707, 4to): — *Sermon*, etc. (1711, 4to).

Todd, James Henthorne, D.D.

an Irish clergyman, was born in Dublin, April 23, 1805; graduated at Trinity College, and became a fellow there in 1831. He was also regius professor in, and librarian of, the University of Dublin; treasurer and precentor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and president for five years (the usual term) of the Royal Irish Academy. He was one of the founders of the Irish Archaeological Society. His death took place June 28, 1869. He published, *Histoical Tablets and Medallions*, etc. (1828, r. 4to): — *Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the Writings of Daniel and St. Paul; Donellen Lecture* (Dubl. 1840, 8vo; 1842, 8vo): — *Six Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the Apocalypse of St. John; Donellen Lecture* (ibid. 1846, 8vo): — *Remarks on the Roman Dogma of Infallibility* (ibid. 1848, 8vo): — *Historical Memoirs of the Successors of St. Patrick and Archbishops of Armagh* (ibid. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo): — *The Waldensian MSS. preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, etc. (Lond. and Camb.' 1865, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. Of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Todd, John (1)

a Presbyterian minister, was a graduate of Nassau Hall in 1749, and was taken on trial by the New Brunswick Presbytery, May 7, 1750. He was licensed Nov. 13, and went to Virginia. A call was laid before the Presbytery May 22, 1751, and he was ordained on its acceptance. He was installed, by Hanover Presbytery, pastor of Providence Church in Louisa County, Va. Davies delighted in him, and speaks of him as his favorite friend, relying on his judgment in cases of importance. Todd wrote to

Whitefield in 1755, giving an account of the wonderful work of God in his congregation. Colossians Gordon said, after hearing him, that he “never heard a sermon, but one from Mr. Davies with more attention and delight.” He obtained from the Rev. Dr. Gordon, of Stepney, near London, scientific apparatus and valuable books, which he gave to aid Transylvania University in founding a school. He was a man of great piety. and eminently useful in edifying the Church. He died July 27, 1793. (W. P.S.)

Todd, John (2), D.D.

an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Rutland, Vt., Oct. 9, 1800; graduated at Yale College in 1822, spent four years at the Andover Theological Seminary, and was ordained and settled at Groton in 1827. He was settled over the Edwards Church, Northampton, Mass., in 1833; the First Congregational Church, Philadelphia, Pa., in 1836; and the First Congregational Church, Pittsfield, Mass., from 1842 to 1872. He died in Pittsfield, Aug. 24, 1873. He was one of the founders of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary, and for several years president of the trustees of the Young Ladies Institute of Pittston. His degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Williams College in 1845. The following are some of his numerous publications: *Lectures to Children* (Northampton, 1834, 16mo), with translations and extended *circulation*: — *Student's Manual* (ibid. 1835, 12mo): — *Index Rerum* (ibid. 1834, 4to): — *Sabbath-school Teacher* (ibid. 1836, 12mo): — *Truth Made Simple* (ibid. 1839, 18mo): — *The Young Man* (ibid. 1843, 18mo): — *Simple Sketches* (Pittsfield, 1843, 2 vols. 16mo): — *Stories on the Shorter Catechism* (Northampton, 1850-51, 2 vols. 18mo): — *The Daughter at School* (ibid. 1854, 12mo): — *Questions on the Lives of the Patriarchs* (ibid. 1855, 18mo): — *Questions on the Life of Moses; Questions on the Books of Joshua and Judges* (ibid. 1853): — *The Bible Companion* (Phila. 18mo): *Future Punishment* (N. Y. 1863, 32mo): — *Hints and Thoughts for Christians* (ibid. 1867, 12mo): — *Woman's Rights* (ibid. 1867, 18mo, 27 p.) *Hints and Thoughts for Christians* (Lond. 1869, 12mo): — *Old-fashioned Lives* (1870). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *John Todd, the Story of his Life*, etc. (N. Y. 1876, 16mo).

Todd, Jonathan

a Congregational minister, was born in New Haven, Conn., March 20, 1713, and graduated at Yale College in 1732. After studying theology a

few months, he commenced preaching, and was settled at East Guilford, Conn., Oct. 24, 1733. During 1750 and 1751, a pestilence prevailed among his people, taking off many of his substantial friends and supporters. He continued his labors until the last year of his life, which ended Feb. 24, 1791. Mr. Todd published a *Sermon, Young People Warned* (1740): — *Election Sermon* (1749): several memorial sermons and pamphlets. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 383.

Todd, Nathaniel

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Rowley, Essex Co., Mass., Jan. 27, 1780; graduated at Brown University in September, 1800; studied theology privately; was licensed by Philadelphia. Presbytery, Oct. 19, 1803; ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Schenectady, N. Y., in 1805, where he labored with great success for several years. He was afterwards teacher and pastor at Woodbury, N. J.; thence successively principal of an academy at Westchester, Harrisburg, Lebanon, Mifflinburg, and Beaver, Pa., and for many years of a classical school in Allegheny City, Pa. He spent the greater part of his life in teaching, and died July 8, 1867. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 152.

Todros, ben-Joseph, ha-Levi Abulafia

a celebrated Cabalist, was born in 1234 at Toledo, and died about 1305. He occupied a high position as physician and financier in the court of Sancho IV, king of Castile, and was a great favorite of queen Maria de Molina. When this royal pair met Philip IV, the Fair, king of France, in Bayonne (1290), he formed one of the cortege; and his advocacy of his theosophy secured for the doctrines of the Cabala a kindly reception from the French Jews. His writings on the Cabala are, *An Exposition of the Talmudic Hagadoth*, entitled **rxwa dwbkh** : — *A Commentary on Psalm 119* : — *A Commentary on the Pentateuch*, in which he propounds the tenets of the Cabala. These works, however, have not yet been published. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:204 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catal. Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* 26772680; De' Rossi, *Dizionario Storico*, p. 315 (Germ. transl.); Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah*, p. 111; First, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 428. (B. P.)

Togar'mah

(Heb. *Togarmah'*, *hmrḡiḡw* [briefly *hmrḡiḡp*⁰¹⁰³-Genesis 10:13], of uncertain derivation; Sept. *θοργαμά* v.r. *θέργαμα*, etc.; Vulg. *Thogarma*), third named of the three sons of Gomer (the son of Japheth), his brothers being Asbkenaz and Riphath (⁰¹⁰³-Genesis 10:13; 1 Chronicles 1, 6) B.C. post 2513. The descendants of Togarmah are mentioned among the merchants who trafficked with Tyre, the house of Togarmah being said to trade “in its fairs with horses, and horsemen, and mules” (⁰²⁷⁴-Ezekiel 27:14). They are named with Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya as followers of Gog, of the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, or, as it may be rendered (making the Hebrew *Rosh*. for chief, a proper name, as it is in the Sept. ⁰³⁸⁵ *Ρώς*, and as the Jews say it ought to be rendered), the prince of Rosh or Russ, Meshech or Moshk, and Tubal or Tobolsk (⁰³⁸⁵-Ezekiel 38:5, 6). supposed by some to mean the prince or power of Russia, the title of the emperor of Russia being prince or emperor of Russia, Moscow, and Tobolsk. Togarmah is said to be of the north quarters, and Gog is represented as a guard to it, possibly professing to guard. it, or offering to it a protectorate (ver. 7). The Jews say that by Togarmah, or the house of Togarmah, we are to understand the *Turks*. Torgama, therefore, as it is given in the Sept. (and in some Heb. MSS. *hmgrwt*), has been thought by many to mean *Turkoman*, or the Turkoman hordes from whom the Turks have sprung. Togarmah, however, as a geographical term, is connected with Armenia, and the subsequent notices of the name (⁰²⁷⁴-Ezekiel 27:14; 38:6) accord with this view. Armenia was, according to Strabo (11, 13, 9, 529), distinguished by the production of good horses (comp. Xenoph. *Anab.* 4:5, 24; Herod. 7:40). The countries of *frra*, and *ynm* (*Μινυάς*), and also *l wh*, were contiguous to Togarmah (Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 1, 6). The name itself may possibly -have reference to Armenia, for, according to Grimm (*Gesch. d. deutsch. Spi.* 2, 825), Togarmah comes from the Sanskrit *toka*, “tribe,” and *Arma* =Armenia, which he further connects with Hermino the son of Mannus. The most decisive statement respecting the ethnographic relation of the Armenians in ancient literature is furnished by Herodotus, who says that they were Phrygian colonists, that they were armed in the Phrygian fashion, and were associated with the Phrygians under the same commander (Herod. 7:73). The remark of Eudoxus (Steph. Byz. s.v. *Ἀρμενία*) that the Armenians resemble the Phrygians in many respects in language (*τῆ*

φωνῆ πολλὰ φρυγίζουσι) tends in the same direction. It is hardly necessary to understand the statement of Herodotus as implying more than a common origin of the two peoples; for, looking at the general westward progress of the: Japhetic races, and on the central position which Armenia held in regard to their movements, we should rather infer that Phrygia was colonized from Armenia than *vice versa*-. The Phrygians were indeed reputed to have had their first settlements in Europe, and thence to have crossed into Asia (Herod. 7:73); but this must be regarded as simply a retrograde movement of a section of the great Phrygian race in the direction of their original home. The period of this movement is fixed subsequently to the Trojan war (Strabo, 14:680),. whereas the Phrygians appear as an important race in; Asia Minor at a far earlier period (id. 7:321; Herod 7, 8, 11). There can be little doubt that they were once the dominant race in the peninsula, and that they: spread westward from the confines of Armenia to the-shores of the Aegean. The Phrygian language is undoubtedly to be classed with the Indo-European family. The resemblance between words in the Phrygian and Greek tongues was noticed by the Greeks themselves (Plato, *Cratyl.* p. 410), and the inscriptions still existing in the former are decidedly Indo-European. (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 666). The Armenian language presents many peculiarities which distinguish it from other branches of the Indo-European family; but these may be accounted for partly by the physical character of the country, and partly by the large amount of foreign admixture that it has experienced. In spite of this, however, no hesitation is felt by philologists in placing Armenian among the Indo-European languages (Pott, *Etym. Forsch.* introd. p. 32; Diefenbach, *Orig Europ.* p. 43). With regard to the ancient inscriptions at Wan, some doubt exists; some of them, but apparently not the most ancient, are thought to bear a Tuiranian character (Layard, *Nin and Bab.* p. 402; Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 652); but, even. were this fully established, it fails to prove the Turanian character of the population, inasmuch as they may have been set up bforeign conquerors. The Armen'ians themselves have associated the name of Togarmah with their early history in that they represent the founder of their race-. Haik, as a son of Thorgom (Moses Choren. 1, 4, 9-11. See Moses Chorenensis, *Historiae Armen.* lib. 3, *Armeneditit, Lat. vert. notisque illustr* W, et G. Whistonii [Lond. 1736]); Heeren, *Ideen*, 1, 1, 305; Michaelis, *Spicilegium Geographie*, 1, 67-78; Klaproth, *Travels*, 2, 64. **SEE ARMAENIA.**

Toggenburg War

the name given to an outbreak between Protestants and Catholics in Toggenburg (or Tockenburg), a district of the canton of St. Gall, Switzerland. The dispute between the Toggenburgers and the abbot of St. Gall, Leodegar Buirgisser, appeared at first to be purely political, and related mainly to the labor in road-building, which the abbot had enforced upon those under his jurisdiction. At first even Catholic localities, such as Schwyz, took part with the Toggenburgers against the abbot, without regard to ecclesiastical differences. But the confessional differences soon led to serious disturbances. In the lower country, especially in Hennau, the majority were Catholics. About Easter, in 1709, they closed the church against the evangelical party, and the result was a scuffle, in which many were wounded. Alarmed at this treatment, the Protestants sought shelter in the neighboring churches, but encouraged by their neighbors of Oberglatt, they returned in a week to Hennau, and sought to enter the church. The Catholic priest refused them, but, seeing the Protestants assembled in large numbers in the churchyard, counseled submission. But the Protestant minister was at this moment felled to the earth by a stone, and a severe struggle ensued. The priest was roughly handled, but was rescued by a member of the council, and one of his followers killed. The Reformed preacher, a native of Basle, was recalled, and a citizen of Zurich substituted, who was obliged to disguise himself for fear of the Catholics. The Catholic priest, after an absence of six weeks, was restored to his parish, under the protection of the abbot. The different cantons now took sides with the contending parties, and party feeling ran very high. Attempts were made, however, at mediation. An assembly was held at Baden, May 29, 1709, arbitrators were appointed, and proceedings begun; but all in vain. In the spring of 1712 the war broke out. It began in Toggenburg. The city of Wyl, to which the forces of the abbot had retired, was captured; the commander, Felber, was most shockingly mangled by his own people, and his corpse was thrown into the Sitter. Nabholz, at the head of the victors, marched to St. Gall, and seized the Thurgau and the Rhine valley. Meantime, the theatre of the war extended to the shores of the Reuss and the Aar. A murderous conflict, "the battle of the bushes," gave the Bernese a bloody victory. The city of Baden surrendered to Zurich, and was allowed to retain its Catholic worship, but did not dare to interfere with the erection of a Reformed Church outside of the walls of the city. Through the interference of pope Clement IX, the fire of war, which seemed about

to be extinguished, was again stirred; and while the government was hesitating, the Catholic cantons of Schwyz, Unterwalden, and Zug, to the number of 4000, stormed the village of Sins. Bloody battles were fought in the vicinity of Lake Zurich, and at Bellenschantze. In Lucerne, the government was compelled by an uprising of the people to enter into the war. The Catholic parties to the war, about 12,000 strong, assembled at Mury. The Bernese were encamped at Vilmergen, and the great battle was fought on St. James's Day, July 25, and was not decided until six P.M., when the victory of the Reformers was complete. The peace, which was concluded in August at Aarau, provided religious liberty for Toggenburg. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Cent.* 1, 34 sq.

To'hu

(Heb. *To'cihu*, WJ Tρlowly; Sept. θοοú v.r. θοκέ; Vulg. *Thohu*), son of Zuph and father of Elihu among the ancestors of Samuel (^{<000>}1 Samuel 1:1); probably the same elsewhere called TOAH (^{<000>}1 Chronicles 6:34) or NAHATH *SEE NAHATH* (q.v.) (ver. 26).

To'l

(Heb. *Toi'*, y[~~to~~ Samuel, but in Chronicles *To'l*, Heb. *Tou'*, W[Tρ both meaning *erring*; Sept. θοοú or θωοú v.r. θαεί and θωά; Josephus, θαίνοϋς; Vulg. *Thou*), the king of Hamath on the Orontes, who, after the defeat of his powerful enemy the Syrian king Hadadezer by the army of David, sent his son Joram, or Hadoram to congratulate the victor and do him homage with presents of gold and silver and brass (2 Samuel 8; 9, 10; ^{<000>}1 Chronicles 18:9, 10). B.C. 1036. "For Hadadezer had wars with *Toi*," and Ewald (*Gesch.* 2, 199) conjectures that he may have even reduced him to a state of vassalage. There was probably some policy in the conduct of *Toi*, and his object may have been, as Josephus says it was (*Ant.* 7:5, 4), to buy off the conqueror with the "vessels of ancient workmanship" (σκεύη τῆς ἀρχαίας κατασκευῆς) which he presented.

Tokens

(*tesserce*), *bits* of lead or of pewter, or cards, given to the members of a Church in full communion, which they hand to the elders as they approach the Lord's table. The object is to keep out those who are -not known, or

who are under scandal, or for other reasons are deemed unworthy. *SEE TESSEMIE.*

To'la

(Heb. *Tola'*, [I װֹ, a worm, as in ^{<0261>}Exodus 16:20; Sept. **θωλό** v.r. **θωλέ**, etc.; Vulg. *Thola*), the name of two Hebrews.

1. The first-born of Issachar (^{<0463>}Genesis 46:13; ^{<1301>}1 Chronicles 6:1). B.C. 1856. He had six sons (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 7:2), who became progenitors of families known collectively as the Tolaites (^{<0453>}Numbers 26:23), and these in David's time mustered 22,600 valiant soldiers (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 7:2).

2. Judge of Israel after Abimelech (^{<0701>}Judges 10:1, 2). He is described in that passage as "the son of Puah, the son of Dodo, a man of Issachar." In the Sept. and Vulg. he is made the son of Abimelech's uncle, Dodo (װדװֹ) being considered an appellative. But Gideon, Abimelech's father, was a Manassite. Tola judged Israel for twenty-three years (B.C. 1319-1296) at Shamir in Mount Ephraim, where he died and was buried. Josephus does not mention him (*Ant.* 5, 7.,6); but (as Whiston remarks) inasmuch as the total of the years there agree, his name seems to have fallen out of our copies. *SEE JUDGE.*

To'lad

(Heb. *Tolad'*, דל װֹ, birth; Sept. **θωλάδ** v.r. **θουλαέμ**), one of the towns in the tribe of Simeon in David's time (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 4:29); probably the same elsewhere (^{<0650>}Joshua 15:30) called EL-TOLAD *SEE EL-TOLAD* (q.v.).

To'laite

(Heb. *Tola'*, y[I װֹ, patronymic; Sept. **θολαί**; Vulg. *Tholaites*), the general name of the descendants of Tola (q.v.) the son of Issachar (^{<0453>}Numbers 26:23).

Toland, John

one of the founders of modern deism, was born Nov. 30, 1669 or 1670, in the most northern isthmus of Ireland. His Christian-name was *Janus Junius*, but at school his master ordered him to be called John, which name he retained ever after. From the school at Redcastle, near Londonderry, he

went, in 1687, to the College of Glasgow, and after three years stay there visited the University of Edinburgh, where he was made A.M. in June, 1690. He afterwards went to the University of Leyden, where he was generously supported by, some eminent Dissenters in England. After a residence there of two years, he returned to England, and went to Oxford, which place he left in 1695, and went to London, whence he returned to Ireland in 1697. But so strong was the feeling aroused by his deistic notions and his own imprudent conduct that he soon returned to London. He accompanied the earl of Macclesfield to Hanover in 1701, and also made an excursion to Berlin, at which latter place he remained for some time, and then returned to England. In the spring of 1707 he again visited Germany, Holland, etc., reaching England in 1710. He died at Putney, near London, March 11, 1722. Of his many treatises we notice, *Christianity not Mysterious* (Lond 1 1696, 8vo) which elicited at least fifty-four replies: — *An Apology for Mr. Toland* (ibid. 1697): — *Amyntor, or a Defence of Milton's Life*, etc. (1699, 8vo); this attack upon the canon of the New Test. was answered by Samuel Clark, Jeremiah Jones, Stephen Nye, and John Richardson, *Socinianism Truly Stated* (1705): — *Dissertationes duce: Adeisidemon et Origines Judaicae* (1709, 8vo): — *Nazarenus* (ibid. 1718, 8vo): — *History of the Druids* (Montrose, 1814, 8vo), etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; *Contemp. Rev.* June, 1868.

Tol'banes

(Sept. Τολβάνης, Vulg. *Tolbanes*), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:25) for the name TELEM *SEE TELEM* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (^{<1510b>}Ezra 10:24).

Toledo, Councils of

(*Concilium Toletannum*). These councils, of which there were twenty-four, were held in the city of Toledo, in the province of the same name, in Spain. Toledo is the seat of an archbishopric; has a cathedral, founded in 1258, and completed in 1492; a foundling hospital, founded by cardinal Mendoza in 1494; and a theological seminary.

I. The First Council of Toledo was held on Sept. 1, 400, under Patronus, the bishop. The reason for assembling this council, which consisted of nineteen bishops, was the troubles and disturbances caused by the heresy of

the Priscillianists, which sprang up towards the close of the 4th century. Nineteen bishops, from all the Spanish provinces, attended. Many of the sect of the Priscillianists who presented themselves were received back into communion with the Church after having abjured their errors. In this council the bishop of Rome is, for the first time, spoken of simply by the title of “pope.” Twenty canons were also published.

- 1.** Permits to admit married men to the office of deacon, provided they will observe continence.
- 2.** Forbids to admit to any higher order than that of subdeacon a man who has publicly done penance, and even restricts his administration of that office.
- 4.** Enacts that a subdeacon marrying a second time, shall be reduced to the rank of porter or reader, and shall not be permitted to read the Gospel or epistle; should he marry a third time, he shall be separated from the Church for two years, and then be admitted to lay communion only.
- 5.** Deprives all priests and clerks who, having been appointed to any church in town or country, do not assist daily at mass.
- 7.** Permits clerks whose wives do not lead a decorous life to bind them or shut them up, and to make them fast; forbids them to eat with them Until they have done penance.
- 12.** Forbids a clerk to leave his own bishop in order to attach himself to another.
- 13.** Warns those who attend the other offices of the Church, but who do not communicate, that they must either receive the holy communion, or take place among the penitents, upon pain of excommunication.
- 14.** Orders that any one who shall have received the holy eucharist without eating it shall be driven from the Church as guilty of sacrilege.
- 17.** Excommunicates a married man keeping a concubine but permits unmarried men to do so. Allows either a wife or a concubine.
- 20.** Restricts the consecration of the chrism to the bishops; orders all priests to send a deacon or subdeacon to the bishop at Easter, in order to receive it from him. See Mansi, *Concil.* 2, 1222.

II. The Second Council of Toledo was held about 447, during the popedom of Leo I, against the Priscillianists. Nineteen bishops attended, who condemned the heresy and the followers of Priscillian in a formulary of faith directed against all heretics, to which eighteen anathemas are attached. See Mansi, *Concil.* 3, 1465; Baronius, ann. 447, § 17, etc.

III. The Third Council of Toledo was held May 17, 531; Montanus, bishop of Toledo, presiding over seven other bishops. Five canons were published.

1. Relates to the treatment of children offered by their parents to be brought up for holy orders. Others relate to the continence of the clergy, the preservation of church property, etc.

In this council Toledo is, for the first time, spoken of as a metropolitan see. See Mansi, *Concil.* 4:1734.

IV. The Fourth Council of Toledo was held May 8, 589; Leander, the primate of Seville, presiding over seventy-two bishops, from the different provinces under the rule of king Reccaredus, who attended in person. Eight deputies were also present. The main object of the council was to confirm the conversion of the Goths who had abjured Arianism, and who here presented a confession of faith, in which they declared their assent to the first four ecumenical councils, and anathematized the principal errors of the Arian party. Twenty-three canons were published, and as many anathemas directed, as against other heresies and evils, so against those who deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and those who refuse to anathematize the Council of Arminum.

2. Directs that, according to the king's writ, the Constantinopolitan creed shall be sung by the people in every church in the kingdom before the Lord's Prayer in the encharistical office.

5. Relates to the rule of continence to be observed by heretical bishops, priests, and deacons, when reconciled to the Church, as well as by all clerks.

7. Orders that some portion of Holy Scripture shall be read daily at the tables of priests, to prevent idle conversation.

11 and **12.** Relate to penitence. Forbid to reconcile without penance; forbid the priest to admit to penance without first cutting off the hair of the penitent, if a man, or changing her dress, if a woman.

14. Forbids Jews to have Christian women for wives or concubines.

19. Leaves it to the bishop to fix the endowment to be given to a newly founded church.

22. Forbids to say anything but psalms at the funerals of the religious. See Mansi, 5, 997.

V. The Fifth Council of Toledo was held May 17, 597; sixteen bishops attended; two canons only remain, and the subscription of thirteen bishops only appear.

1. Orders that priests and deacons who will not observe the law of continence shall be degraded, shut up in a cloister, and put to penance.

2. Forbids the bishop to appropriate to himself the revenues of any church or chapel in his diocese, and declares that they belong to the ministering priest. See Mansi, 5, 1603.

VI. The Sixth Council of Toledo was held in 610; Aurasius, bishop of Toledo, presiding over fifteen bishops. The primacy of the see of Toledo over all the churches of Carthagenia was established, and subsequently confirmed by an edict of king Gundemar. See Mansi, 1620.

VII. A national council was held in this city on Dec. 9, 633, assembled from the whole of Spain, and that part of Gaul which was in subjection to the Goths; Isidore of Seville presided, sixty-six archbishops and bishops being present among them were the metropolitans of Narbonne, Merida, Braga, Toledo, and Tarragona. Seventy-five canons were published.

1. Contains a profession of faith upon the subject of the Blessed Trinity and the incarnation.

2. Directs that the same order of prayer and of psalmody shall be observed throughout the kingdom, and the same manner of celebrating mass.

3. Orders that a national council shall be held annually, if possible; otherwise a council in each province.

4. Relates to the proper mode of holding synods, and is of some length. It orders that on the first day of the synod the church shall be cleared before sunrise and all the doors shut except one; that the bishops shall enter first and take their seats in a circle, according to the date of their consecration; then the priests; after them the deacons, who are ordered to stand in sight of the bishops; and, last of all, the laity and notaries. This done, the door is directed to be suit, and silence and devotion enjoined upon all. Then the archdeacon, standing up, shall bid them pray; upon which all shall prostrate themselves upon the floor, and, after private prayer mingled with sobs and tears, one of the bishops shall rise up and say a prayer, to which an shall respond Amen. All having risen up and taken their places, a deacon in an alb shall read the canons relating to the holding of councils, and the metropolitan shall invite the bishops to proceed to business. It is forbidden to proceed to another matter until the first has been disposed of. Any clerk or layman desiring to appeal to the council is enjoined to mention his cause to the metropolitan archdeacon; who shall declare it to the council. No bishop is allowed to leave the synod before the others, nor shall the council be dissolved until everything is settled.

5. Directs that metropolitans shall consult together before Epiphany concerning the proper time for celebrating Easter, and shall signify their determination to their suffragans.

6. Approves of leaving the question about single and trine immersion open; but orders single immersion to be practiced throughout Spain, to prevent schism.

7. Orders that the Passion be preached on Good-Friday, and that the people, in an audible voice, ask forgiveness of their sins, in order that, being thereby purified from sin, they may worthily celebrate the great festival of Easter, and partake of the holy Eucharist with a pure, heart.

8. Deprives of the Easter communion those who break their fast on Good-Friday before sunset, exception being made in favor of old and sick persons and children.

9. Relates to the benediction of the candles, etc., on Easter-eve.

10. Is directed against all abuse then prevalent in many churches-in which the Lord's Prayer was said on Sundays only orders all clerks to say it daily at the office, either openly or privately.

- 11.** Forbids singing the Hallelujah during Lent.
- 12.** Orders that immediately after the epistle the gospel should be read, which should be followed by the Lauds, which in some churches were improperly sung after the epistle.
- 13.** Condemns the opinion of those who deemed it wrong to sing thymus composed by men in honor of the apostles and martyrs on account of their not being taken out of Holy Scripture nor authorized by tradition.
- 14.** Orders that the canticle *Benedicite Opera Omnia* be sung on Sundays and feast-days at mass at the entrance of the chancel [in *pulpito*].
- 15.** Orders, under pain of excommunication, that at the end of each psalm shall be sung “*Glory and honor be to the Father,*” etc., and not merely “Glory be,” etc.
- 17.** Excommunicates those who refuse to acknowledge the inspiration of the Apocalypse, and also those who refuse to read it in church from Easter to Pentecost.
- 19.** Enumerates the cases in which persons may not be admitted to holy orders.
- 25.** Is directed against ignorance in the clergy; requires them to be acquainted with Holy Scripture and the canons.
- 26.** Orders that a priest when appointed to any parish shall receive a copy of the ritual from the bishop, and that when the priests attend the litanies or synods they shall give account to the bishop of their manner of celebrating the holy office and administering holy baptism.
- 33.** Forbids the bishop to take for his own share more than one third of the revenue of the churches within his diocese.
- 34.** Enacts that thirty years possession shall give to a bishop lawful right over a Church situated in the diocese of another bishop if in the *same province*.
- 39.** Forbids the deacons to pretend to the privileges of the priesthood and to sit ill the first places.

40. Forbids them to wear two stoles, which it declares to be unfit for even a bishop or priest; directs them to wear the stole over the left shoulder, and also that it be clean, and not worked with colors or with gold.

41. Orders all clerks, as well as the priests and deacons, to shave the entire crown of the head and to leave but a slight rim of hair in the form of a circle.

46. Orders that a clerk found plundering a tomb be deposed from every ecclesiastical rank and office, and subjected to three years penance.

51. Forbids bishops to ill-treat monks, but grants to them the exercise of their canonical authority over them, such as exhorting them to observe a good and holy life, instituting abbots and other officers, correcting those who infringe the rules, etc.

52. Enacts that monks forsaking the monastic state in order to marry and settle in the world shall be brought back and put to penance.

57. Forbids to compel Jews to profess Christianity; with regard to the compulsory conversions under king Sisbertus, it allows that they should continue to be considered as Christians because they had received baptism, chrism, and the holy Eucharist.

The following nine relate to the Jews, and to Christians who had apostatized to Judaism. The 66th and following eight relate to the case of slaves,

75. Anathematizes all who conspire against regal authority. See Mansi, 5, 1700.

VIII. The Eighth Council of Toledo was held in 636, under king Chintila, Eugenius, bishop of Toledo, presiding; twenty-two bishops in all were present. Nine canons were published, of which

1. Orders public litanies every year for three days, beginning Dec. 14, except one of the three should prove to be Sunday, in which case the-litany days were to be observed in the week following. All the others relate to the prince and the strengthening of his powers, etc. See Mansi, 5, 1735.

IX. This council was held Jan. 9, 638, under Silva, metropolitan of Narbonne, in the second year of the reign of king Chintila. Fifty-two

Spanish and Gallic bishops were present, either in person or by deputy. Eighteen canons were published.

3. Enacts that for the future no king should ascend the throne without making a vow to defend the Catholic faith and to rid the country of infidels; pronounces anathema against those who should violate this oath.

7. Orders that persons who, after having been admitted to penance, quit that state and resume the secular dress shall be arrested by the bishop, and compelled to perform their course of penance, whether they will or not, in some monastery. Fleury observes that this is the first time that we find mention of this compulsory penance, which evinced entire ignorance of the sound practice of antiquity. See Mansi, 5, 1740.

X. The Tenth Council was held about 646, under king. Chintasuinthus, by twenty-eight bishops present and the deputies of eleven who were absent. Six canons were published.

2. Allows the bishop, or any other priest who may be present, to complete the celebration of the sacred mysteries when the celebrating priest is unable to proceed thorough sickness; excommunicates those -who, without such cause, leave the celebration unfinished, or who celebrate after having partaken of the slightest particle of food. See Mansi, 5, 1863.

XI. This council was held in 653, under Orontius of Merida; the king, Resesuinthus, being present, and fifty-two bishops, with the deputies of ten absent. The prince read his profession of faith, in which he acknowledged the first four ecumenical councils. Twelve canons were published.

1. Contains a definition of faith.

2. Condemns all oaths and vows to commit evil actions.

3. Condemns all persons guilty of simony.

7. Condemns those who forsake the episcopal or sacerdotal office upon pretext of having been admitted to such holy office unwillingly; orders those who so return into the world and marry to be shut up for life in a monastery.

8. Forbids ordaining ignorant clerks.

9. Excludes from the Easter communion and from the privilege of eating meat for twelve months those who break the Lent fast.

12. Confirms the canons of a former council concerning the Jews. Besides the bishops and deputies present, we find among the signatures those of ten abbots; the archpriest of Toledo, and sixteen counts. After the subscriptions there is a synodal decree concerning the disposition of the king's property, and an edict of the king confirming it. See Mansi, 6:394.

XI. The Twelfth Council of Toledo was held Nov. 2, 655, Eugenius, the archbishop, presiding; sixteen bishops attended, and seventeen canons were published, most of which tend to repress the abuses committed by bishops in the administration of Church property.

11. Forbids to confer orders upon the slaves of the Church except they have been first set free by the bishop.

18. Orders that newly baptized Jews shall show themselves in the assemblies of the Christians on all Jewish festivals. See Mansi, 6:451.

XIII. Held Dec. 1, 656, under Reccasuinthus; twenty bishops were present, among whom were Eugenius, the metropolitan of Toledo; Fugitivus, the metropolitan of Seville; and St. Fructuosus, the metropolitan of Braga; five bishops who were absent sent deputies. Seven canons were published.

1. Orders that the Feast of the Annunciation shall in future be kept on Dec. 18, because that, falling in Lent, it interfered with the fast, and often with the celebration of Good-Friday.

3. Forbids bishops to present churches to their relations and friends for the sake of the revenue to be derived.

6. Directs that children devoted by their parents to the tonsure shall be compelled to lead the life of the religions; does not allow parents so to devote their children after they have attained ten years of age without their own consent.

7. Forbids selling Christians to Jews. See Mansi, 6:459.

XIV. Held Nov. 7, 675, under king Wamba; seventeen bishops (among whom was Quiritius of Toledo), the deputies of two others, and six abbots

were present. In this council the division of the country into dioceses was made, and sixteen canons of discipline were published.

3. Orders all the bishops of the province to conform to the order and ritual in use in the metropolitan Church.

4. Forbids suffering priests who are at variance to approach the altar of to receive their offerings.

6. Deprives ecclesiastics who take part in the judgment of capital cases.

8. Enacts penalties to be enforced against priests who demand a fee for christening or for the chrism; orders bishops to punish such offenders under pain of suspension.

13. Forbids persons possessed with a devil to serve at the altar or to approach it.

14. Orders that mass shall never be celebrated by one priest only; lest he should be taken ill and the mass left unfinished. See Mansi, 6:539.

XV. Held Jan. 9, 681, under king Ervigius. Julian of Toledo presided at the head of thirty-four bishops, among whom were the metropolitans of Seville, Braga, and Merida. Thirteen canons were published.

1. Approves of the resignation of king Wamba, who had assumed the religious habit.

4. Declares to be null and void the consecration of a bishop for a little town in the immediate vicinity of Toledo made by the bishop of Merida against his own will and against the canons at the command of Wamba; and generally forbids to consecrate a bishop to a place which has not hitherto had a bishop.

6. Enacts that, in order to prevent any further delay in filling up the vacant bishoprics, it shall be lawful for the bishop 'of Toledo to consecrate those persons whom the king shall choose,; without prejudice, however, to the rights of the province.

10. Confirms, with the king's consent, the privilege of asylum to those who take refuge in a church, or anywhere within thirty paces of it.

11. Orders the abolition of every remnant of idolatry. See Mansi, 6:1221.

XVI. Held in November, 683, under king Ervigius, who was present; forty-eight bishops, four of whom were metropolitans, attended, Julian of Toledo presiding. Twelve canons were published, the Nicene Creed having been first read, which from this time was sung in all churches in Spain.

The fifth is the extraordinary canon, which absolutely forbids the widows of kings to remarry, even with princes. From the tenth it appears not to have been uncommon at this period for persons (even bishops), in time of dangerous illness, to submit to be put to public penance without confessing, or their conscience accusing them of any particular sin, but for greater security. See Mansi, 6:1253.

XVII. This council was held at the request of pope Leo II, under king Ervigius, in 684, to receive and approve the Sixth (Ecumenical Council held at Constantinople against the Monothelites; seventeen bishops, ten deputies, and six abbots attended. In the answer of the bishops to Leo they make no mention of the fifth ecumenical council, saying, in canon 7, that they, decree that this council, the Seventh (Ecumenical) shall rank after the Council of Chalcedon in honor, place, and order. See Mansi, 6:1278.

XVIII. Held May 11, 688, under king Egica, Julian of Toledo presiding over sixty bishops, in order to explain certain expressions made use of in a confession of faith drawn up by the Spanish bishops some years before which had given offence to pope Benedict II. These expressions related to the two wills in our Lord Jesus Christ; and it was decreed to be not contrary to Christian ‘truth to maintain that in God the will proceeds from the will—“voluntatem ex voluntate procedere.” ‘See Mansi, 6:1294.

XIX. This council was held May 2. 693; composed of fifty-nine bishops, five abbots, and the deputies of three bishops absent; there were also present the king, Egica, and sixteen lords. In this council the decision of the previous council concerning the procession of the will from the will, and of the essence from the essence, in God was further explained. Twelve or thirteen canons were published.

6. Relates to the conduct of some priests, who, instead of using bread made for the purpose in the holy Eucharist, contented themselves with offering on the holy table common bread cut into a round form. The canon orders that the bread used at the altar shall be made expressly for that purpose.

9. Excommunicated for life and deposed Sisbertus of Toledo, convicted of conspiring against the person of king Egica and his family. See Xansi, 6:1327.

XX. This council was held Nov. 9, 694. The, subscriptions of the bishops present are lost. Eight canons were published.

1. Directs that during the three days preceding the opening of any council, and during which a strict fast ought to be observed, nothing shall be discussed which does not refer to matters of faith, morals; and ecclesiastical discipline.

3. Orders that bishops, following the example of our Lord, shall observe the ceremony of washing the feet of the poor on Holy Thursday.

5. Condemns to excommunication and perpetual imprisonment priests who, from a vile and wicked superstition, shall say the office of the mass for the dead for the living, in order by so doing to cause their death. See Mansi, 6:1361.

XXI. This council was held Nov. 21, 1324, by John, archbishop of Toledo. Eight canons were published, in the preface to which it is ordered that they shall be observed together with those which the legate William de Gondi, bishop of Sabino, had made in the Council of Valladolid (1322). These canons, among other things, order bishops to attend the synods, and relate to the conduct and dress of clerks; forbid priests to demand anything for masses said by them but allow them to receive voluntary offerings; forbid to say more than one mass in a day, except on Christmas-day. See Mansi, 11; 1712.

XXII. This was held in 1339 by AEgidius, archbishop of Toledo, six bishops being present. Five canons were published.

2. Forbids to ordain any illiterate person.

3. Provides that in cathedral or collegiate churches some shall be compelled to study theology, the canon law, and the liberal arts.

5. Orders all rectors to keep a list of such of their parishioners as are of age, in order to effect the observation of the canon “omnis utriusque sexus.” See Mansi, 11:1869.

XXIII. (Also called COUNCIL OF ARENDA.) Held Dec. 5, 1473, in the borough of Arenda, by Alphonso de Carille, archbishop of Toledo. This council was numerously attended, and twenty-nine canons were published.

- 1.** Orders that provincial councils shall be held biennially and diocesan synods annually.
- 2.** Orders curates to instruct their flocks in the principal articles of belief.
- 3.** Forbids to promote to holy orders persons ignorant of Latin.
- 4.** Forbids to receive a clerk from another diocese without letters from his bishop.
- 5 and 6.** Relate to the dress of bishops and clerks; forbid them to wear garments made of red and green silk, short garments, and white shoes, etc.
- 7.** Relates to the proper observance of Sundays and festivals.
- 8.** Forbids ecclesiastics to wear mourning.
- 9.** Orders the punishment of incontinent clerks.
- 10.** Forbids to admit to parochial churches or prebends persons ignorant of Latin, unless, for good cause, the bishop shall think fit to dispense With it.
- 11.** Inflicts a pecuniary fine upon ecclesiastics who play with dice.
- 12.** Orders that all priests shall celebrate mass four times in the year at the least, and bishops three times.
- 13.** Forbids all preaching without the bishop's license.
- 14.** Enacts penalties to be enforced against clerks in the minor orders who do not wear the clerical habit and observe the tonsure.
- 15.** Forbids ecclesiastics to furnish soldiers to any temporal lord except the king, or to accept of lands upon condition of so doing.
- 16.** Forbids the celebration of marriages at uncanonical times.
- 17.** Excommunicates those who are married clandestinely without five witnesses, and suspends for three months the priest who shall officiate.
- 18.** Excommunicates those who buy or sell the property of a vacant benefice.

- 19.** Forbids the custom of performing, at certain times, spectacles, etc., and singing songs, and uttering profane discourses in churches.
- 20.** Directs that persons dying of wounds received in duels shall not be allowed Christian burial, even though they may have received the sacrament of penance before death.
- 21.** Excommunicates those who hinder the clergy from receiving tithes and enjoying their privileges, etc
- 23.** Orders that sentences of excommunication pronounced in any one diocese shall be observed in all others.
- 24.** Puts under an interdict the place from which any clerk has been forcibly expelled.
- 25.** Forbids any sort of fee on account of ordination. 27. 'Grants to the bishop the power of absolving from synodal censures.
- 28.** Provides for the publication of these canons in diocesan synods and in cathedral churches. See Mansi, 13:1448.

XXIV. Held Sept. 8, 1565. Christopher de Sandoval, bishop of Cordova, was called upon to preside on account of his being the oldest bishop of the province. The bishops of Sigüenza, Segovia, Palencia, Cuenga, and Osma attended, with the abbot of Alcalá el Real. Three sessions were held; in the first the decree of Trent relating to the celebration of provincial synods was read; also a profession of faith which was signed by all present. In the second session thirty-one articles of reformation were published relating to bishops, curates, officials, proctors, residence, and divine service. In the third session, held March 25, twenty-eight articles were drawn up, and the decrees of Trent relating to residence were read. Bishops were directed not to admit to the tonsure those who had no benefices immediately in view. Rules were laid down to guide curates in preaching and instructing their people, etc. See Mansi, 15:751.

Toledo (French Tolet), Francisco De

a Spanish cardinal, was born at Cordova, Nov. 10, 1532. His education was gained at the University of Salamanca, and, after receiving his degree, he taught philosophy in the same institution. In 1558 he joined the Jesuits, and was sent to Rome to teach theology. Pius V, admiring his eloquence,

secured his services as preacher in ordinary, and Toledo held the position under four succeeding popes. At the same time he was councilor of the Inquisition, and was employed in many ecclesiastical embassies. Among others, he went to Germany to urge a league with Poland against the Turks. Clement VIII gave him the cardinal's hat in 1593. Toledo died at Rome, Sept. 14, 1596. His works are chiefly commentaries: *In Joannis Evangelium* (Rome, 1588): —In *XII Capita Evang. secundae Lucam* (Venice, 1601, fol.): —In *Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (Rome, 1602, 4to): —*Summ. Casuum Conscientiae* (ibid. 1602; Lyons, 1630, 4to). See Antonio, *Bibl. Hisp. Nova*; De Thou, *Hist. sui Temp.* —*Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.*

Toledo, Roderigo de

an eminent Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Rada, in Navarre, about 1170. He was sent to Paris to complete his education, and on his return he attached himself to Sancho V, king of Navarre, by whom he was employed to negotiate a peace with Alfonso VIII of Castile. Procuring the favor of Alfonso, he was appointed by him bishop of Sigüenza, and was afterwards made archbishop of Toledo. He showed great zeal in the frequent wars with the Moors, often directing in person incursions upon the Mohammedan territory. Nor did he have any less zeal for learning; he persuaded Alfonso to found the University of Palencia. At the Fourth Lateran Council he not only harangued the fathers in elegant Latin, but gained over the secular nobles and ambassadors by conversing with each of them in his mother tongue. He died in France in 1247, after attending the Council of Lyons convoked by Innocent IV. He wrote several historical works, most of which are still unedited. His *Rerum in Hispania Gestarum Chronicon* (Granada, 1545) is an invaluable production. It was subsequently published in a collection entitled *Hispania Illustrata*, by Andreas Schott (Frankf. 1603-8, 4 vols. fol.). He also wrote, *Historia Arabum*, published in vol. 2 of Andreas Schott's collection (1603); and subsequently (1625) by Erpenius, as an appendix to his *Historia Salracenica* of Georgius Elmacin. He wrote a history of the Ostrogoths, of the Huns, Vandals, Suevi, Alans, and Silingi, published by R. Bell, in the collection entitled *Rerum Hispanicarum Scriptoies Aliquot* (Frankf. 1579, 3 vols. fol.): — also *Breviarium Ecclesiae Catholicae*, and others still unedited.

Toledoth Jeshu

([Wvy]twdl T̄oi.e. *History of Jesus*). Under this title a Jewish apocryphal work, or rather libel, is extant, purporting to give the history of Jesus. It first became known to Christians in the 13th century; but who was the author of the *Toledoth Jeshu* is not known. In reality, we have two such books, each called *Toledoth Jeshu*, not recensions of an earlier text, but independent collections of the stories circulating among the Jews relative to the life of Christ. The name of *Jesus*, which in Hebrew is *Joshua'or Jehoshua*, is in both contracted into *Jeshu* by the dropping of an *Ain*, WQY for [WQY Elias in Tishbi, s.v.” Jeshu,” says, “Because the Jews will not acknowledge him to be the Savior, they do not call him Jeshua, but reject the *Ain* and call him Jeshu.” Rabbi Abraham Perizol, or Farrissol, in his book *Maggen Abraham*, c. 59, says, “His name was Jeshua, but as’rabbi Moses Mairnonides has written it, and as we find it throughout the Talmud, it is written Jeshu. They have carefully left out the *Ain* because he was not able to save himself.” By omitting the *Ain*, the Cabalists gave a signification to the name. In its curtailed form it is composed of the letters Jod, Shin, Vav, which are taken to stand for hmy wnwrkzw wmq̄, i.e. “his name and remembrance shall be extinguished.” This is the reason given in the *Toledoth Jeshu*.

The *Toledoth Jeshu* was known to Luther, who condensed it in. his *Schenz Iamphoras* (see his *Werke* [Hemberg, 1566], 5, 509-535), as the following passage (p. 515) will show, “The proud evil spirit carries on all sorts of mockery in this book. First he mocks God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and his Son Jesus Christ, as you may see for yourself, if you believe as a Christian that Christ is the Son of God. Next he mocks us, all Christendom, in that we believe in such a Son of God. Thirdly, he mocks his own fellow Jews, telling them such disgraceful, foolish, senseless affairs, as of brazen dogs and cabbage-stalks and such like, enough to make all dogs bark themselves to death, if they could understand it, at such a pack of idiotic, blustering, raging, nonsensical fools. Is not that a masterpiece of mockery which can thus work all three at once? The fourth mockery is this, that whoever wrote it has made a fool of himself, as we, thank God, may see any day.” Voltaire also knew the work; for in his *Lettres sur les Juifs* (*Euvres*, 1, 69, p. 36) he says, “*Le Toledos Jeschu* est le plus ancien écrit Juif qui nous ait été transmis contre notre religion. C’est une vie de Jesus Christ, toute contraire à nos Saints Evangiles elle

paraît tre du premier siecle, et meme ecrite avant les evangiles.” He evidently seems to identify this work with the one mentioned by Justin Martyr in his colloquy with Tryphon, 17:108. Of the two widely differing recension of this book of unknown authorship, the first edition was published by Wagenseil, in his *Tela Ignea Satanae*, etc. (Altdorf, 1681); the second by Huldreich, at Leyden, in 1705, under the title *Histo ia Jeschuce Nazareni, a’ Judceis Blaspheme Corrupta*. Neither can boast of an antiquity greater than, at the outside, the 12th century. It is difficult to say with certainty, which is the earlier of the two. Probably both came into use about the same time; the second certainly in Germany, for it speaks of Worms in the German empire. According to the first, Jesus was born in the year of the world 4671 =B.C. 910, in the reign of Alexander Jannseus (B.C. 106-79)! According to the second, he was born in the reign of Herod the Proselyte, i.e. B.C. 704. A comparison of both shows so many gross anachronisms as to prove that they were drawn up at a very late date, and by Jews singularly ignorant of the chronology of their history. As to the contents, its blasphemies are too gross and grotesque to need further notice. Being a late and detestable compilation, put together out of fragmentary. Talmudic legends, all respectable Jews themselves have regarded it as utterly contemptible.

Besides the editions of Wagenseil and Huldreich, see Clemens, *Die geheimgehaltenen oder spanannten apokryo phischen Evangelien* (Stuttg. 1850), pt 5; Aim, *Die Urtheile heidnischer undjüdischer Schrif tsteller der vier ersten christlichen Jah rhunderte iiber Jesus und die ersten Christen* (Leips.’ 1864), p. 137 sq.; Baring-Gould, *The Lost and Hostile Gospels* (Lond. 1874), p. 67 sq.; De’Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 316 sq. **SEE JESUS CHRIST.** (B. P.)

Toleration is the allowance given to that which is not approved. The Church, as the depository and dispenser of religious truth, cannot bring within the range of its theory the allowance of that which it holds to be an error. The Church of England holds (Art. vi) that it is not required of any man that anything should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation, which is not read in Holy Scripture or may not be proved thereby. . But if any man profess what is clearly contrary to that which the Church has laid down as an article of the faith, then, in the Church’s view, he professes what is contrary to the Scripture, and there can be no warrant for allowing that which is contrary to Scripture. The Church, however, while refusing any allowance to error,

may refrain from denunciation and persecution of those who profess and maintain erroneous doctrines. —Hook, *Church Dict.* s.v. *SEE PERSECUTION.*

Toleration, Acts of

Previous to 1868 the statute law of Great Britain (see 35 Eliz. and 22 Car, II) forbade the public exercise of any other religion than that of the Church of England. The Toleration Act (I Will. and Mary, c. 18) frees from the penalty of nonconformity those who take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and who subscribe the declaration against popery of 30 Car. II, 2, c. 1, reserving in force 35 Car. II, c. 2, and 13 Car. II, c. 1, the acts, that is, for preventing dangers which may happen from popish recusants, and for preserving the king's person and government by disabling papists from sitting in Parliament. It did not relieve Dissenters from such previous acts as required members of town corporations, and all persons holding office, under the crown, to receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper according to the usage of the Church of England, which were continued in force until 1828, when they were repealed by the 9 Geo. IV, c. 17. Preachers taking the oaths and subscribing the Articles of Religion, except 34:35:36:and the clause of 20 regarding the power and authority of the Church, are freed from the penalties of the Acts of Nonconformity; and Baptist preachers are excused the part of Art. 27 touching infant baptism. Quakers, upon making a declaration of fidelity, and subscribing a profession of Christian belief, are exempted from the oaths and enjoy the privileges of other Dissenters.

By the 19 Geo. III, c. 44, Protestant Dissenting ministers and schoolmasters are exempted from the subscription to the articles on making and subscribing a declaration that the Scriptures contain the revealed will of God, and are received as the rule of doctrine and practice. By the 53 Geo. III, c. 106. the provisions of the Act of Will and Mary, also those of 9 and 110 Will. III respecting the denial of the Trinity, were repealed, the common law with respect to impugning the doctrine of the Trinity not being altered. By the 52 Geo. III, c. 155, the Five-mile and Conventicle acts, and an Act relating to Quakers (13 and 14 Car. II, c. 1), are repealed; all religious assemblies of fewer than twenty persons become lawful without registration; those of more than twenty persons are to be registered and certified; and a fine of twenty pounds is laid upon those who disturb any congregation assembled for worship. By 9 Geo. IV, c. 17,-the Test and Corporation acts are repealed, and a declaration substituted in

lieu of the sacramental test. See Blunt, *Hist. of Doct.* s.v.; Hook, *Church Dict.* s.v.

Tolet (or Toletanus)

SEE TOLEDO.

Toll

(*hDmæ*[†] Ezra 4:20, or [Chald.] *hDmæ*[†]:13; 7:24, *tribute* [so called from being measured or apportioned], as Nehemiah 5, 4) is strictly a tax for passing along a highway or other thoroughfare. *SEE TAX; SEE TRIBUTE.* In the Roman period taxes were collected along the roads or along the navigable waters by the *postiloces*, or custom-house officers. There was also a class of publicans who had houses or booths built for them at the foot of bridges, at the mouth of rivers, and by the seashore, where they took toll of passengers that went to and fro. For this purpose they used tickets or seals, which, when a man had paid toll on one side of a river, were given him by the publican to show to him that sat on the other side that it-might appear he had paid. On these were written two great letters, larger than those in common use. Modern Oriental usages illustrate the custom referred to in [†]Matthew 9:9. Arriving at Persepolis, Mr. Morier observes, “Here is a station of *rahdars*, or toll-gatherers, appointed to levy a toll upon *kafilahs*, or caravans of merchants, and who in general exercise their office with so much brutality and extortion as to be execrated by all travelers. The collections of the toll are farmed, consequently extortion ensues; and, as most of the *rahdars* receive no other emolument than what they can exact over and above the prescribed dues from the traveler, their insolence is accounted for, and a cause sufficiently powerful is given for their insolence, on the one hand, and the detestation in which they are held on the other. *Baf-gah* means the place of tribute; it may also be rendered the receipt of custom, and perhaps it was from a place like this that our Savior called Matthew to follow him.” *SEE CUSTOM, RECEIPT OF.* At Smyrna the *miriji* sits in the house allotted to him, as Matthew sat at the receipt of custom (or in the custom-house of Capernaum), and receives the money which is due from various persons and commodities entering the city. “The exactions and rude behavior of these men,” says Mr. Hartley, “are just in character with the conduct of the publicans mentioned in the New Test. When men are guilty of such conduct as this, no wonder that

they were detested in ancient times as were the publicans, and in modern times as are the mirijis.” *SEE PUBLICAN.*

Tollner, Johann Gottlieb

a German theologian, was born Dec. 9, 1724, at Charlottenburg. He completed his studies at the Orphanage and the University of Halle under the guidance of Baumgarten, Knapp, Michaelis, Wolff, Weber, and Meier, and then became private tutor and military chaplain. In 1760 he was made professor of theology and philosophy at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. He delivered four lectures each day, wrote numerous learned books-his practice being to write upon one while dictating to an amanuensis the contents of another, so that two were in process of simultaneous preparation-and entered into most intimate and direct relations with his numerous students. He was accustomed to conduct devotional meetings after the ending of the public services of the Sabbath, and to train the students in homiletical and catechetical duties. During much of his public life his health was infirm. Extreme terrors sometimes came over him when about to ascend the pulpit, and rendered it impossible for him to preach; and upon these followed asthma and a racking cough, to which he finally succumbed at the age of forty-nine years. He died Jan. 20, 1774, while uttering the word “Overcome.”

Of Tollner’s writings, the following may perhaps be regarded as of chief importance: *Gedanken von der wahren Lehrart in d. dogm. Theologie* (1759): —*Grundriss der dogm. Theologie* (1760): —*Grundriss der MoralTheologie* (1773): —*Grundriss der Hermeneutik* (1773): *Grundriss der Pastoral-Theologie* (1773): —*Der thtige Gehorsam Christi* (1773): —*Theologische Untersuchungei* (1773). He occupied entirely orthodox ground in theology, though the ethics of Christianity held the foremost place in his thoroughly practical mind, and though he made far-reaching concessions to rationalism. With reference to confessions of faith his position was independent, and with reference to the contradictions of his time he stood midway between the extremes. The school of Spener and Francke had gradually come to assume a position of hostility, or at least indifference, towards science, and over against it stood the scholastic or philosophical school of the Wolfidian type, which undertook to demonstrate everything mathematically. Tollner regarded both extremes as overstrained, and adopted the *scientific* method, which regarded ‘all dogmatic truths as constituting a science, i.e. a learned and comprehensive knowledge, and

which attempted a logical explanation of every tenet without the employment of any illustrations whatsoever.

Literature. —Hamberger, *Gelehrtes Deutschland* (with the first supplement by Mensel); Mensel, *Lexikon d. teutschen Schriftsteller voni Jahre 1750-1800*; Hirsching, *Hist. —lit. Handbuch berühmter u. denkw. Professoren des 18ten Jahrhunderts* (Leips. 1818), XIV, 2; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex. s.v.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Tomasini, Jacopo Filippo

an Italian prelate, was born at Padua, Nov. 17, 1597; instructed by Benedetti of Legnano; afterwards entered the congregation of the regular canons of St. George, in Alga; and received the degree of doctor at Padua in 1619. He went to Rome, where he was cordially received, especially by Urban VIII, who would have appointed him to a bishopric in the island of Candia. At his own request, this was exchanged for the see of Citta Nuova, in Istria, to which he was consecrated in 1642. There he remained until his death, in 1654. He wrote, *Illustrium Virorum Elogia Iconibus Exornata* (Padua, 1630, 4to; 2nd vol. 1644): —*Titus Livius Patavinus* (ibid. 1630, 4to): —*Petrarcha Redivivus Integrana Poetce Celeberrimi Vitam Iconibus Ere Ccelatis Exhibens* (ibid. 1635, 4to): —*Clarissimce Feminimce Cassandrae Fidelis Venetae Epistolae et Orationes Posthumae* (ibid. 1636, 12mo): —*De Donariis ac Tabellis Votivis*, etc. (Utin. 1639, 4to): —*Laurisce Ceratae Epistolce, curm Notis*, etc. (Padua, 1640, 12mo): *Bibliothecce Patavince Manuscripta*, etc. (ibid. 1639, 4to): *Bibliothecae Venefce Manuscripta*, etc. (Utin. 1650, 4to).

Tomb

(*vydĕ* *a tumulus*, ^{<קבר>} Job 21:32; elsewhere “stack” or “shock” of corn; *τάφος*, *μνήμα*, or , *μνημείον*, usually “sepulcher”). The most conspicuous objects in Palestine to this day are its *tombs*, called, according to the person commemorated, or the purpose of commemoration, *keber*, or *mazar*, or *wely*. One does not find this to be the case throughout Europe, where tombs are not usually conspicuous; but in Egypt and Syria they meet the eye in all directions, and are, with a few exceptions, Mohammedan erections. In Egypt, the tombs of its ancient kings, and the more modern tombs of the Mamelukes, are very remarkable and interesting. In the Sinaitic desert there are some interesting graveyards, dotted with unhewn

stones and adorned with the *retem*, or broom; and one of these places of sepulture is known as Turbbet-es-Yahuid, the graves of the Jews. There is only one conspicuous monument in it, Kuber Nebi Harmin, the “tomb of the prophet Aaron,” on Mount Hor. But soon after entering Palestine you find tombs in all directions. At Hebron you have the tomb of Abraham and the patriarchs in the well-known cave of Machpelah, marked or rather concealed by a Moslem mosque. On one of the eastern hills, seen from the heights above Hebron, you have the tomb of Lot; farther on, the tomb of Rachel; and, then, as you approach Jerusalem, the tomb of David, outside the modern city, and the tomb of Samuel, on a height above Gibeon, some seven miles to the north-west, greets your eye. As you traverse the land you meet with these monuments in all positions—the tomb of Jonah near Sidon, and even the tomb of Abel a little farther north!

Besides these conspicuous objects, there are others less visible, but quite as remarkable. At Hebron there is the Jewish burying-ground covered with large slabs, and, curious tombs cut in the rock, with loculi on all sides, which are probably patriarchal, or at least Jewish. Around Jerusalem there are numerous tombs, many of them remarkable for their beauty, their size, their peculiar structure. *SEE JERUSALEM*. Almost all of these are Jewish, and give us a good idea of “how the manner of the Jews was to bury.” Whoever could afford it chose the *rock*, not the *earth*, for the covering of his body, and preferred to have his body deposited on a clean rocky shelf, not let down into and covered over with the soil. Hence our ideas of burial are not the same as those of the Jews. According to us, there is always the letting down into the earth; according to them, there is the taking possession of some stony chamber for the last sleep. Hence the expression “*buried* with him by baptism into death” would not to a Hebrew suggest immersion, as it seems to do to us, and to the early Christian the symbol of baptismal burial would be associated with the Lord’s own tomb.

The first mention of a *eber*, or burying-place, in Scripture is in ^{Q1234}Genesis 23:4, where Abraham asks the sons of Heth for the “possession of a *keber*,” receiving for answer, “In the choice of our kebers bury thy dead.” After this there is frequent mention of these sepulchers, and some of them are specially singled out for notice. Yet Machpelah was the most memorable; and we know not if ever a tomb was more touchingly and poetically described than by Jacob on his death-bed in Egypt, when, looking back on the land from which he was an exile, the land of his fathers sepulchers, he points as with his finger to the well-known patriarchal

burying place—" There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah" (^{<0148E>}Genesis 49:31). We have also Kibroth-hataavah, the graves of lust, in the wilderness (^{<0113E>}Numbers 11:34); the tomb of Joash in Ophrah, where Gideon was buried (^{<0182>}Judges 8:32); the tomb of Manoah between Zorah and Eshtaol, where Samson was buried (^{<0163>}Judges 16:31); the tomb of Zeruah (or her husband) in Bethlehem, where Asahel was buried (2 Samuel 2, 32); the tomb of Abner in Hebron (^{<0182>}2 Samuel 3:32; 4:12); the tomb in Giloh of Ahithophel's father, where his suicide son was buried; the paternal and maternal tomb in Gilead, in which Barzillai sought burial (^{<0187>}2 Samuel 19:37); the tomb of Kish in Zelah, where the bones of Saul and Jonathan were deposited (^{<0214>}2 Samuel 21:14); the tomb of the old prophet in Bethel (1 Kings 13, -30); the tomb of Elisha, probably near Jericho (^{<0231>}2 Kings 13:21); the tombs of "the children of the people," in the valley of the Kedron (23, 6); the tombs in "the Mount," near Bethel (ver. 16); the tomb or tombs of David (^{<0186>}Nehemiah 3:16); the tombs of the kings (^{<0211>}2 Chronicles 21:20). The Newest references to "tombs" are chiefly in connection with the Lord's burial. His tomb is called sometimes **τάφος** (^{<0273>}Matthew 27:61), sometimes **μνῆμα** (^{<0253>}Luke 23:53), and sometimes **μνημεῖον** (^{<0304>}John 19:41).

At this day the tombs of Syria are either like our own, underground, as at Hebron, Tiberias, and the valley of Jehoshaphat; or in artificial excavations in the rock, as in the ridge south of Jerusalem (Aceldama), the tombs of the prophets on Olivet, the tombs of the kings and judges north and north-west of the city; or entirely above ground, as the tomb of Rachel, of Absalom, of Samuel, and of Joseph.

All (in Jewish ages) who could bear the cost seem to have chosen the rocky excavation for sepulture, as in the case of Joseph of Arimathsea. This is evident from such a passage as ^{<0226>}Isaiah 22:16, addressed to Shebna the treasurer," What hast thou here, and whom hast thou here, that thou hast hewed thee out a *sepulcher* here, as he that heweth him out a sepulcher on high, that graveth an habitation for himself in a rock?" It is supposed by Lowth, Scott, Alexander, etc., that Shebna was a foreigner, and that the questions *what* and *whom* refer to this, implying that he had no right to such an honor. It was, perhaps, peculiarly a national privilege, so that, as no Gentile could inherit the land, none could obtain such a place for a tomb as he could call his own. The question then would be, "What connection hast thou with Israel that thou assumest one of Israel's special

privileges?" Possibly, however, he was only a person of low origin from a distant part of the country, and of ungodly principles, who vainly thought to establish for himself a name and a place in Jerusalem.

The large tombs, such as those of the kings and judges, have no inscriptions; but the flat stones in the valley of Jehoshaphat have their epitaphs, some of considerable length in Hebrew, with the title ^{וַיִּשָׁאֵר} at the top, that word meaning originally a cippus or pillar (^{וַיִּשָׁאֵר} 2 Kings 23:17; ^{וַיִּשָׁאֵר} Ezekiel 39:15), and in Talmudical Hebrew denoting a sign or mark (Levi, *Lingua Sacra*, vol. 5, s.v.; Carpzov, *Notes on Goodwin*, p. 645). 'This last writer tells us that the use of such a mark was specially to warn off passers-by lest they should contract uncleanness by touching the grave. For this end, also, the tombs were whitewashed every year on the 15th of Adar (Lamy, *Apparatus Biblicus*, I, 14). *SEE SEPULCHRE.*

Tombs, John

a learned Baptist divine, was born at Bewdley, in Worcestershire, in 1603, and graduated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. There he gained such a distinction for ability and learning that he was appointed in 1624, catechetical lecturer, which position he held for about seven years. He then, we may presume, took orders and went to Worcester and after that to Leominster, Hertfordshire, of which he had the living. Being obliged to leave it in 1641 by the king's soldiers, he went to Bristol, where the parliamentary general, Fiennes, gave him the living of All-Saints'. The next year he removed to London, when he made known his scruples respecting infant baptism; and not only made no converts among the clergy, but, being appointed preacher at Fenchurch, his congregation refused him both hearing and stipend. He accepted a call from Temple Church, where he remained four years, when he was dismissed for publishing a treatise on infant baptism. After this he went to Bewdley, and there-formed a Baptist church, while he continued minister of the parish, and had also the parsonage of Ross given to him. This last he resigned on being made master of Ledbury Hospital; and, his parishioners at Bewdley having forsaken him, he was restored to his first living at Leominster, and these two he held till the Reformation. He died at Salisbury, May 22, 1676. He published many tracts against infant baptism, Romanists, and Socuinars.

Tombstone

Picture for Tombstone 1

is a mark of a grave, or a *monument*, to remind the passer by that a person is buried beneath. In the earliest ages a heap of stones, or a single upright stone, such as the *menhir*, seems to have marked the resting place of the dead. Among the early Britons the cromlech that is, two or three stones standing upright, with one or more across them on the top was a common form of tomb. But contemporary with them was the simplest of all structures, the mound of earth.

When the Romans came, they brought over with them, among other customs their modes of burial. Considering the time of their occupation, the remains of their tombs belonging to this period are not so numerous as might be expected; but still there are several, and in most cases they consisted of a single stone with an inscription commonly addressed to one or more of the heathen gods. A few instances of stone coffins of this period have been found, as at York. To this kind of tomb, or rather stone coffin, the name of *sarcophagus* is usually applied.

The Saxon marks of interment were probably mounds of earth only; and it is only by the nature of the pottery or other implements and articles of dress found in the graves that the burial places of the Saxons can be distinguished from those of the Britons. Of course among the later Saxons, when Christianity prevailed and they were buried in the church-yard, more lasting memorials were erected, though, with the exception, perhaps, of a few doubtful fragments, we have no examples to refer to.

The sepulchral monuments throughout the Middle Ages were of great importance from an architectural point of view; and, while we find them following the prevailing style, we frequently find also that on them was lavished the most elaborate work possible. The examples which remain to us are those which were placed within the church. No doubt there were many tombs of no mean design or work placed in the church-yard, but they have, for the most part, perished.

Picture for Tombstone 2

Of the former we have many of the 12th century (some, perhaps, of the 11th). The covers of these were at first simply coped, afterwards frequently

ornamented with crosses of various kinds and other devices, and sometimes had inscriptions on them; subsequently they were sculptured with recumbent figures in high-relief, but still generally diminishing in width from the head to the feet to fit the coffins of which they formed the lids. Many of the figures of this period represent knights in armor with their legs crossed; these are supposed to have been either Templars, or such as had joined, or vowed to join, in a crusade to the Holy Land. The figures usually had canopies, which were often richly carved over the heads, supported on small shafts which ran along each side of the effigy, the whole worked in the same block of stone. This kind of tomb was sometimes placed beneath a low arch or recess formed within the substance of the church wall, usually about seven feet in length, and not more than three feet above the coffin, even in the center. These arches were at first semicircular or segmental at the top, afterwards obtusely pointed; they often remain when the figure or brass, and perhaps the coffin itself, has long disappeared and been forgotten. On many tombs of the 13th century there are plain pediment-shaped canopies over the heads of the recumbent effigies, the earliest of which contain a pointed trefoil-arched recess. Towards the end of the century, these canopies became gradually enriched with crockets, finials, and other architectural details.

In the reign of Edward I the tombs of persons of rank began to be ornamented on the sides with armorial bearings and small sculptured statues within pedimental canopied recesses; and from these we may progressively trace the peculiar *minutiae* and enrichments of every style of ecclesiastical architecture up to the Reformation.

Picture for Tombstone 3

Altar, or table tombs, called by Leland "high tombs," with recumbent effigies, are common during the whole of the 14th century. These sometimes appear beneath splendid pyramidal canopies, as the tomb of Edward II in Gloucester Cathedral, Hugh le Despenser and Sir Guy de Brian at Tewkesbury; or flat festoons, as the tombs of Edward III and Richard II at Westminster, and Edward the Black Prince at Canterbury. Towards the middle of the 13th century the custom commenced, and in the earlier part of the 14th prevailed, of inlaying flat stone with brasses; and sepulchral inscriptions, though they had not yet become general, are more frequently to be met with. The sides of these tombs are sometimes relieved with niches, surmounted by decorated pediments, each containing a small

sculptured figure, sometimes with arched panels filled with tracery. Other tombs about the same period, but more frequently in the 15th century, were decorated along the sides with large square-paneled compartments, richly foliated or quatrefoil, and containing shields.

Picture for Tombstone 4

Many of the tombs of the 15th and 16th centuries appear beneath arched recesses fixed in or projecting from the wall, and enclosing the tomb on three sides. These were constructed so as to form canopies, which are often of the most elaborate and costly workmanship: they are frequently flat at the top, particularly in the later period. These canopies were sometimes of carved wood of very elaborate workmanship; and sometimes the altar tomb of an earlier date was at a later period enclosed within a screen of open-work, with a groined stone canopy, and an upper story of wood, forming a mortuary chapel or chantry, as the shrine of St. Frideswide at Christ Church, Oxford.

Picture for Tombstone 4

In the early part of the 16th century the monuments were generally of a similar character to those of the preceding age; but alabaster slabs with figure on them, cut in outline, were frequently used. The altar-tombs with figures in niches, carved in bold relief, were also: frequently of alabaster, which was extensively quarried in Derbyshire. Towards the middle of this century the Italian style of architecture had come into general use; Wade's monument, in St. Michael's Church, Coventry, 1556, is a good example of the mixture of the two styles which then prevailed.

Picture for Tombstone 5

In the two following centuries every sort of barbarism was introduced on funeral monuments; but the ancient style lingered longer in some places than in others. The tomb of Sir Thomas Pope, founder of Trinity College, Oxford—who died in 1558—in the chapel of that society, shows the altar-tomb in its debased form, after the true era of Gothic architecture had passed away.

A few traces of square tombs remain in our churchyards, but they are in all cases much decayed by the weather. There is also a kind of stone known as a head-stone, which is chiefly used in modern times; but while there are

few medieval examples remaining, there is no reason to suppose but that they were very numerous. One at Temple Bruer is probably of the 12th century; another at Lincoln is probably of the 13th. A very simple example from Handborough church-yard is possibly of the 15th century.

Tomline, George D.D.

an English prelate, the son of George and Susan Pretyman, was born at Bury St. Edmund's, Suffolk, Oct. 9, 1750. He was educated at Bury School and at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he took his A.B. degree, and was senior wrangler in 1772, The following year he was elected a fellow of his college, and was immediately appointed tutor to Mr. Pitt. Between 1773 and 1775 he was ordained deacon and priest, and in the latter year proceeded A.M., becoming in 1781 moderator of the university. He became private secretary to Mr. Pitt when -the latter was made chancellor of the exchequer, in 1782. In this year he was collated to the rectory of Corwen, in Merionethshire, and in 1784 he was appointed to a prebendal stall in Westminster. He was presented in 1785 to the rectory of Sudborne-cum-Offord, in Suffolk; and in January, 1787, was advanced to the bishopric of Lincoln and the deanery of St. Paul's, when he ceased to be private secretary to Mr. Pitt. In 1813 he refused the see of London, and continued bishop of Lincoln over thirty-two years, being translated to the see of Winchester in July, 1820, in which he continued till the time of his death, Nov. 14, 1827. His publications are, *Elements of Christian Theology* (1799, 2 vols. 8vo; republished din: 19. editions): — *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, with an Account of English Translations of the Bible and Liturgy* (Oxf. 1835, 12mo): — *Refutation of Calvinism* (Lond. 1811, 8v.o; 4th ed. in preparation the same year): — *Sermons*, etc. See *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tomlinson, George, D.D.

a prelate of the Church of England, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, from which he graduated in 1822. After having served for several years as minister of St. Matthew's Chapel, Spring Gardens, Westminster; he was nominated, in 1842, to the bishopric of Gibraltar; which extends over Malta and the neighboring islands. He died at Gibraltar in 1863. See *Amer. Quar. Church Rev.* April, 1863, p. 154.

Tomlinson, Joseph Smith, D.D.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Georgetown, Ky., March 15, 1802. He was educated at the Transylvania University, and was licensed to preach before his graduation in 1825. He was appointed professor of mathematics and natural philosophy of Augusta College the same year, and also admitted to the traveling connection. In due time he was ordained both deacon and elder. After having served some time as professor of Augusta College, he was chosen its president, and held the office until the institution ceased to exist in 1849. He was subsequently elected to a professorship in the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O., but did not accept it, though he acted as agent for the institution for two years. He then accepted a professorship in the Ohio University at Athens, and after a year's service was chosen its president. This he declined because of ill-health. Subsequently he was elected to the presidency of the Springfield High-school and of the State University of Indiana, both of which he declined under the conviction that the state of his body and mind disqualified him for them. He died at Neville, O., June 4, 1853. Dr. Tomlinson was a man of superior accomplishments; as a preacher and pulpit orator, his high reputation was well founded; and his religious life was pure and consistent. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:706.

Tommasi, Giuseppe Maria

a learned Italian cardinal, and son of Julius Tommasi, duke of Palma, was, born at Alicata, Sicily, Sept. 14, 1649. He entered the society of the Theatines, and cardinal Albani, when he became pope, appointed in first qualifiicator of the Holy Office, then consultor of the Congregation of the Rites, and lastly cardinal (May 18, 1712). This last honor he did not long enjoy, as his death occurred Jan. 1, 1713. In the Vatican and other libraries Tommasi discovered many manuscripts of importance in ecclesiastical history, and published, *Codices Sacramentorum Nongentis Annis Vetustiores* (1680, 4to), a collection of MSS. — *Responsoria et Antiphonaria* (1686). See. Chalmers, *Biog. Dict. s.v.*; *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Généralé, s.v.*

Tongan Version

The Tonga dialect, belonging to the Polynesian or Malayan languages, is spoken in, Tonga, or Tongataboo, the largest of the Friendly Islands. In

1850 it was estimated to contain 9000 inhabitants, of whom considerably more than half had been converted to Christianity, the Protestants among them numbering, 5000. As early as 1797 the London Missionary Society had sent nine missionaries to that island, but they had; to give up that station on account of the ferocious disposition of the natives. The agents of the Wesleyan; Missionary Society were at length enabled in 1826, to settle peaceably in Tonga, and they now extend the blessings of Christian instruction to all the islands of this archipelago. At first only detached portions of Scriptures were translated into Tongan, until, in. theyear 1847, the version of the New Test. was completed, and an edition of 4000 copies left the mission press at Vavau. A new edition, consisting of 10,000 copies, was furnished in 1852 by the British and Foreign Bible Society; and, owing to the rapid circulation, of this edition, another of 10,000 copies was undertaken in 1860, under the editorial care of the Rev; Thomas West. In the same year the preparation for translating, printing, etc., of the Old Testament was commenced, which was completed in 1863. As to the results of the dissemination of the Word of God, we may notice that up to March 31, 1889, 35,276 copies, either in part or in whole, were circulated. (B. P.)

Tongs

is the rendering, in the A.V., of two Heb. words:

1. **μϋϣαϥ ϩη**, *melkacha yinr* (^{<1074>}1 Kings 7:49; ^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 4:21; ^{<3016>}Isaiah 6:6'), or **μϋϣαϥ ϩη**, *malkachac yin* (^{<0258>}Exodus 25:38; 27:23 ["snuffers"]; ^{<0049>}Numbers 4:9), both from **ϣ ϥ** ; *to take*, and signifying prop. *pincers*, either for holding coals or for trimming a lamp, **SEE SNUFFERS**; and

2. **dx[ϩη** *maatsad* (^{<2442>}Isaiah 44:12), an *axe* (q.v.) (as rendered in ^{<2403>}Jeremiah 10:3), from **dx[** ; *to fell a tree*.

Tongue

(**λωϥ** ; *lashbnd* γλωσσα) is used in Scripture in various senses.

1. It stands, *literally*, for the human tongue (^{<0005>}Judges 7:5; ^{<1820>}Job 27:4; ^{<0958>}Psalms 35:28; 39:1, 3; 51:14; 66:17; ^{<0152>}Proverbs 15:2; ^{<3142>}Zechariah 14:12; ^{<4073>}Mark 7:33, 35; ^{<0164>}Luke 1:64; 16:24; ^{<8183>}Romans 3:13; ^{<4141>}1

Corinthians 14:9; ^{<3026>}James 1:26; 3, 5, 6,8; ^{<6180>}1 Peter 3:10; ^{<6660>}Revelation 16:10; Eccles. 17:6; Wisd. 10:21; 2 Macc. 7:4); and so for the tongue of the dog (^{<3683>}Psalm 68:23), of the viper (^{<3716>}Job 20:16), of idols (Baruch 6:8); the tongues of the seven brethren cut out (2 Macc. 7:4, 10; comp. ^{<3000>}Proverbs 10:20).

Various explanations have been offered why (in the passage first cited above) Gideon's three hundred followers should have been selected because they lapped water out of their hands, standing or perhaps moving onward, while they who stayed and "bowed down to drink" were rejected. Josephus says that the former thereby showed their timorousness and fear of being overtaken by the enemy, and that these poor-spirited men were chosen on purpose to illustrate the power of God in the victory (*Ant.* 5, 6, 3).

On ^{<4073>}Mark 7:33, 35, Dr. A. Clarke offers the interpretation that it was the deaf and stammering man himself who put his own fingers into his ears to intimate his deafness; spat or emptied his mouth that the Savior might look at his tongue; touched his own tongue to intimate that he could not speak; looked up to heaven as imploring divine aid; and groaned to denote his distress under his affliction; and that our Savior simply said, "Be opened" (*Commentary*). This explanation certainly clears the passage of some obscurities.

^{<398>}James 3:8, Dr. Macknight translates, "But the tongue of men no one can subdue;" that is, the tongue of other men, for the apostle is exhorting the Christian to subdue his own (comp. ver. 13). He observes that (Ecumenius read the passage interrogatively, as much as to say, "Wild beasts, birds, serpents, marine animals, have been tamed by man, and can no man tame the tongue?")

2. It is *personified*. "Unto me every tongue shall swear," that is, every man (^{<2363>}Isaiah 45:23; comp. ^{<6441>}Romans 14:11; Philipians 2, 11; ^{<2547>}Isaiah 54:17). The tongue is said to rejoice (Acts 2, 26); to meditate (^{<6510>}Psalm 52:2); to hate (^{<1138>}Proverbs 26:28); to be bridled (^{<3026>}James 1:26); to be tamed (3:8; comp. Eccles. 28:18, etc.). It is apostrophized (^{<3000>}Psalm 120:3).

3. It is used by *metonymy* for speech generally. Let us not love in tongue only" (1 John 3, 18 'comp. *γλώσση φίλος*, Theogn. 63, 13; ^{<1815>}Job 6:30; 15:5; ^{<1164>}Proverbs 6:24); a soft tongue," i.e. soothing language

(²⁵¹⁵Proverbs 25:15); “accuse not a servant to his master,” literally “hurt not with thy tongue” (²¹⁰⁰Proverbs 30:10); “the law of kindness is in her tongue,” i.e. speech (²¹⁰⁵Proverbs 31:26; ²¹⁰⁸Isaiah 3:8; 1, 4; Wisd. 1, 6). On the “confusion of tongues,” *SEE BABEL*; *SEE ETHNOLOGY*; *SEE LANGUAGE*, etc.

4. For a *particular language* or dialect spoken by any particular people. “Every one after his tongue” (⁰¹⁰⁵Genesis 10:5, 20, 31); “So also in ⁶⁸⁹Deuteronomy 28:49; ¹⁰¹²Esther 1:22; ²¹⁰⁴Daniel 1:4; ⁴¹⁰²John 5:2; ⁴⁰¹⁹Acts 1:19; 2:4, 8, 11; 26:14; ⁴⁶²⁰1 Corinthians 12:10; 13:1; 14:2; ⁶¹⁶⁶Revelation 16:16).

5. For the *people* speaking a language (²¹⁰⁸Isaiah 66:18; ²¹⁰⁴Daniel 3:4, 7, etc.; ⁶¹⁰²Revelation 5:9; 7:9; 10:11; 11:9; 14:6; 17:15).

6. It is *used figuratively* for anything resembling a tongue in shape. -Thus, “a wedge of gold,” literally a “tongue” (⁴¹⁰²Joshua 7:21, 24; *γλῶσσα μία χρυσῆ*; Vulg. *regula aurea*). The French still say, un *lingot dor*, “a little tongue of gold,” whence, by corruption, our word “ingot,” “The bay that looketh southward,” literally “tongue” (⁴⁶⁵²Joshua 15:2; 18:19); “a tongue of fire” (²¹⁰⁴Isaiah 5:24; comp. ⁴⁰¹⁸Acts 2:3; ²¹¹⁵Isaiah 11:15).

7. Some of the Hebrew *idioms, phrases*, etc., formed of this word are highly expressive. Thus, “an evil speaker” (⁴¹⁰¹Psalm 140:11; *~\vl ; vyaæ* literally “a man of tongue;” comp. Ecclus. 8:3, and see ²¹⁰¹Ecclesiastes 10:11, Hebrew, or margin); “a forward” or rather “false tongue” (²¹⁰⁸Proverbs 10:31; *tw&PbTj~\vl]* “a tongue of revolvings”); “a wholesome tongue” (²¹⁰⁴Proverbs 15:4; *aPεαῖ~\vl*; literally “the healing of the tongue,” reconciliation, etc.; Sept. *ἴασις γλώσσης, lingua placabilis*); “a backbiting tongue” (²¹²³Proverbs 25:23; *rt̄s̄secret*); “slow of speech” (⁰¹⁴⁰Exodus 4:10; *~\vl ; db̄k̄]*, literally “heavy of tongue,” unfit to be an orator, *βραδύγλωσσο*; contrast Ecclus. 4:29); “the tongue of the stammerer” (²¹⁰⁴Isaiah 32:4), i.e. rude, illiterate (comp. 35:6; on ²³³¹Isaiah 28:11, see Lowth). In ²³³⁹Isaiah 33:19, it means a foreign language, which seems gibberish to those who do not understand it (comp. ²¹⁰⁵Ezekiel 3:5); “the tongue of the learned” (²¹⁰⁴Isaiah 1:4), i.e. of the instructor. The lexicons will point out many other instances.

8. Some *metaphorical* expressions are highly significant. Thus, ²¹¹⁶Hosea 7:16, “the rage of the tongue,” i.e. verbal abuse; “strife of tongues” (Psalm

31:—20); scourge of the tongue” (^{<1862>}Job 5:21, *SEE EXECRATION*; comp. Eccus. 26:6; 28:17); “snare of the slanderous tongue” (51:2); on the phrase “strange tongue” (^{<2381>}Isaiah 28:11), see Lowth, notes on ver. 9-12, and afterwards the vivid -rendering of the Vulg.; “to slip with the tongue” (Eccus. 20:18; 25:8), i.e. use inadvertent or unguarded speech; “they bend their tongues, their bows, for lies” (^{<2408>}Jeremiah 9:3), i.e. tell determined and malicious falsehoods; “they sharpen their tongues” (^{<1948>}Psalms 104:3), i.e. prepare cutting speeches (comp. 57:4) “to smooth the tongue” (^{<2438>}Jeremiah 23:31), employ flattering language; “to smite with the tongue” (^{<2488>}Jeremiah 18:18), i.e. to traduce-if it should not be rendered, “on the tongue,” alluding to a punishment for false witness; ‘to lie in wait with the tongue’ (Eccus. 5, 14); “to stick out the tongue” (^{<2574>}Isaiah 57:4), i.e. to mock; “against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue” (^{<1217>}Exodus 11:7), i.e. none shall hurt them; but both Sept. and Vulg. have “not a dog belonging to the children of Israel shall howl,” which, as opposed to the “great cry” in Egypt over the first-born, means, not one of the children of Israel shall have cause to wail (^{<1612>}Joshua 10:21; Judith 11:9). “To hide under the tongue” means to have in the mouth, whether spoken of hidden wickedness (^{<1812>}Job 20:12; comp. ^{<1917>}Psalms 10:7) or delicious language (^{<2041>}Song of Solomon 4:11); “the word of God in the tongue” denotes inspiration (^{<1232>}2 Samuel 23:2); “to divide the tongues of the wicked” is to raise up dissensions among them (^{<1859>}Psalms 55:9; comp. ^{<1054>}2 Samuel 15:34; 17, 14, 15). “The tongue cleaving to the palate” signifies profound attention (^{<1830>}Job 29:10) or excessive thirst (^{<2004>}Lamentations 4:4; comp. 22:16); “to cause the tongue to cleave to the palate” is to inflict supernatural dumbness (Ezekiel 3, 26; ^{<1476>}Psalms 137:6). To gnaw one’s tongue is a sign of fury, despair, and torment (^{<1660>}Revelation 16:10).

9. Some beautiful *comparisons* occur. “An evil tongue is a sharp sword” (^{<1874>}Psalms 57:4); “the tongue of the wise is health” (^{<2128>}Proverbs 12:18); “like choice silver” (10, 20), i.e. his words are solid, valuable, sincere.

10. The *vices* of the tongue are specified in great variety: flattery (Psalms 5, 9; ^{<2088>}Proverbs 28:33); backbiting (^{<1958>}Psalms 15:3), literally “run about with the: tongue” (^{<1253>}Proverbs 25:23); deceit (^{<1900>}Psalms 1:19); unrestrained speech (^{<1971>}Psalms 73:9); lying (^{<1949>}Psalms 109:2); “a lying tongue hateth those that are afflicted by it” (^{<2138>}Proverbs 26:28; comp. Tacit. *Agr.* 42,” *Proprium humani ingenii est, odisse quem laeseris*). “They have taught their tongue to speak lies. and weary themselves to

commit iniquity” (^{<2495>}Jeremiah 9:5) words which beautifully illustrate the fact that falsehood and vice are not natural, but are a restraint and compulsion upon nature: “double-tongued” (^{<5008>}1 Timothy 3:8), *δίλογος*, saying one thing to this man and another to that (comp. Ecclus. 5, 9, 14; 28:13). The retribution of evil-speakers is represented as brought on themselves (^{<2648>}Isaiah 64:8).

11. The *virtuous* uses of the tongue are specified: “keeping the tongue” (^{<1343>}Psalm 34:13; 1 Peter 3, 10; ^{<3223>}Proverbs 21:23); “ruling the tongue” (Ecclus. 19:6; ^{<5033>}James 1:26); the origin of the right and wrong use of the tongue traced to the heart (^{<4023>}Matthew 12:34).

12. Mistranslations: as “holding the tongue;” the Hebrews had no such idiom (^{<1340>}Psalm 39:2; Ecclus. 20:1, 7; comp. the Bible and Prayer-book version of ^{<3013>}Habakkuk 1:13). In ^{<1507>}Ezra 4:7, “the Syrian tongue,” literally “in Syriac” (^{<1004>}Esther 7:4). Our mistranslation of ^{<1001>}Proverbs 16:1 has misled many: “The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord;” literally, “Of man are the dispositions of the heart, but a hearing of the tongue is of the Lord.”

13. The miraculous *gift of tongues*, as well as its corresponding gift of interpretation, has been the subject of two opinions. It was promised by Christ to believers: they shall speak *γλώσσαις καιναῖς* (^{<4167>}Mark 16:17); and fulfilled at Pentecost, when the apostles and their companions “began to speak *ἑτέροις γλώσσαις* (Acts 2, 4, 11; comp. ^{<4406>}Acts 10:46; 19:6; ^{<6121>}1 Corinthians 12:30; 14:2, 39). In the last passage we have “to pray in a tongue” (ver. 14), “to speak words in a tongue” (ver. 19), “tongues” (^{<4620>}1 Corinthians 12:10, 28; 13:8; 14:22, 26). The obvious explanation of most of these passages is, to speak in *other living languages*, the supernatural acquisition of which demonstrated the truth of the Gospel, and was a means of diffusing it. Some verses in 1 Corinthians 14: however, have given rise to the notion of a *strange*, ecstatic, inspired, unearthly language; but these all admit of a different solution. In ver. 2, “he who speaketh in a tongue” evidently means, he who speaks some foreign living language; the supplied word “unknown” in the A.V. is needless, and misleads the English reader. It is further said that “he edifieth himself” (which, as Macknight justly pleads, required that he should understand himself), and edifieth the Church also if an interpreter were present (ver. 28). The apostle says (ver. 14), “If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful,” which words in English seem to intimate that

the speaker might not understand himself; but the words ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου signify “my *meaning*” (comp. 2:16; Vulg. “sensus Domini”), or, as Hammond and Schleusner say, “my faculty of thinking upon and explaining to others the meaning of what I utter” (comp. ver. 15,19), though in ver. 15 some take τῷ νοί as a *dativus commodi*, and ‘render “that others may understand.” The key to the difficulties of this subject is the supposed absence of an inspired interpreter (ver. 28), in which case the gift would not be *profitable* to the hearers. ‘The gift of tongues was to cease (~~413~~ 1 Corinthians 13:8). Irenaeus testifies (5, 6) that it subsisted in the Church in his time. When Paul says, that though he should speak with the tongue of men and of angels, it would be nothing without charity, he uses a supposed ‘hyperbole; as when we say, angelical beauty, angelical voice, etc., e.g. “I would have every one set a due value on the gift of tongues; but though a man possessed the most exquisite eloquence, this inestimable gift would be of little use to him, as to salvation, if he be without charity.” See Macknight, *Notes on 1 Corinthians 14*; Oihausen, *Comment. on Acts 2, 4*; Neander, *Hist. of the Apostolic Age*, and in *Bibl. Repos.* 4:249, etc.; Stosch, *Archaeol. (Econ. N.T.* p. 93; Gataker, *ad M. Anton.* p. 120; and Ernesti, *Lex. Techn. Gr. Rhet.* p. 62. **SEE SPIRITUAL GIFTS.**

Tongues, Confusion of

The Biblical account of this is given in the usual anthropomorphic style of Scripture in ~~4110~~ Genesis 11:1-9, and has been the occasion of much discussion and speculation. To inquire into the date of this part of Genesis would lead us into a long discussion it may be sufficient to express an opinion that the indications of 10:12 perhaps (strangely ignored by most writers), and ver. 18 certainly, seem to point to an age much before that of Moses. See below. We propose under the present head to treat the subject under two aspects, the historical and the linguistic, referring the reader to other and kindred articles for further details on this disputed question.

I. The Event. —The part of the narrative relating to the present subject thus commences: “And the whole earth [or *land*, /*ra*,] was of one language [or *lip*, *hpc*] and of one speech [or *words*, *μῦρᾱ*].” The journey and the building of the tower are then related and the divine determination to “confound their language that they may not understand one another’s speech.” The scattering of the builders and the discontinuance of the building of the city having been narrated, it is added,

“Therefore is the name of it called Babel, because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth, and [or *for*] from: thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth” (^{<0110>}Genesis 11:1-9).

1. Character of the Infliction. — An orderly and peaceful distribution and migration of the families descended from Noah had been directed by divine authority and carried into general effect. But there was a part of mankind who would not conform themselves to this wise and benevolent arrangement. This rebellious party, having discovered a region to their taste, determined to remain in it. They built their houses in contiguity, and proceeded to the other method described for guarding against any further division of their company. This was an act of rebellion against the divine government. The omniscient and righteous God therefore frustrated it by inflicting upon them a remarkable affection of the organs of speech, which produced discord and separation.

At the same time, we cannot dogmatically affirm that this infliction was absolutely and visibly miraculous. It is an undeniable character of the scriptural idiom, especially in the Old Test., that verbs denoting *direct* efficiency are used when only *mediate* action is to be understood, or permission, or declaration. Instances are numerous, e.g.:” God caused me to wander” (^{<0113>}Genesis 20:13); “I have made-given-sustained” (^{<0273>}Genesis 27:37); the “hardening of wicked men’s hearts” (Exodus 7; - Isaiah 6:etc.); “I will come up into the midst of them” (^{<0235>}Exodus 33:5). All such declarations are perfectly true. The Infinitely Wise and Holy and Powerful worketh all things according to the counsel: of his own will, as much when his operation is through the instrumentality of rational creatures and the free exercise of their own faculties as when there is a miraculous intervention. Shuckford inclines at least to the opinion that the whole was the result of natural and moral second causes, fulfilling the purposes of the Most High (*Connect. of Hist.* 1, 133-135). This view, however, does not seem to meet adequately the judicial character of the passage.

Still it is unnecessary to assume that the judgment inflicted on the builders of Babel amounted to a loss, or even a suspension, of articulate speech. The desired object would be equally attained by a miraculous forestallment of those dialectical differences of language which are constantly in process of production, but which, under ordinary circumstances, require time and

variations of place and habits to reach such a point of maturity that people are unable to understand one another's speech. The elements 'of the one original language may have remained, but so disguised by variations of pronunciation, and by the introduction of new combinations, as to be practically obliterated. Each section of the, human family may have spoken a tongue unintelligible to the remainder, and yet containing a substratum which was common to all. Our own experience suffices to show how completely even dialectical differences render strangers unintelligible to one another; and if we further take into consideration the differences of habits and associations, of which dialectical differences are the exponents, we shall have no difficulty in accounting for the result described by the sacred historian.

2. *Date of the Incident.* —This is not definitely given in the sacred narratives. By many interpreters it is thought that we cannot satisfactorily place it so early as at one hundred years after the Flood, as it is in the commonly received chronology, and hence they are inclined to one of the larger systems—that of the Septuagint, which gives five hundred and thirty years, or that of Josephus, adopted, with a little emendation, by Dr. Hales, which gives six hundred years; and thus we have at least five centuries for the intervening period. Prof Wallace, in his elaborate work, makes 'it more than eight centuries (*Dissertation on the True Age of the World and the Chronology to the Christian Era* [1844], p. 29.8). We see no reason to depart from the usual view, countenanced by the position of the incident in the context and the express indication in ^{<01102>}Genesis 11:2 ("as they journeyed from the east"), that it took place not very long after the Deluge.

3. *Extent of the Catastrophe.* —Upon the question whether all of mankind were engaged in this act of concerted disobedience, or only a part, we confess ourselves unable to adduce irrefragable evidence on either side, but we think that there is a great preponderance of argument on the part of the latter supposition. The simple phraseology of the text wears an appearance of favoring the former; but the extreme brevity and insulated character of these primeval fragments forbid our arguing from the mere juxtaposition of the first and the second sentence. It is a common idiom in Hebrew that a pronoun, whether separate or suffixed, stands at the introduction of a new subject, even when that subject may be different and remote from the nearest preceding, and requires to be supplied by the intelligence of the reader (see. e.g., ^{<14913>}Psalms 9:13 [12]; 18:15 [14]; 44:3 [2]; 65:10 [9];

105:37). So far as the grammatical structure is concerned, we may regard the two sentences as mutually independent, and that, therefore, the question is open to considerations of reason and probability. It is difficult to suppose that Noah and Shem, and all others of the descendants of Noah, were confederates in this proceeding. Hence the opinion has been maintained, more or less definitely, by many critics and expositors that it was perpetrated by only a part of mankind, chiefly, if not solely, the posterity of Ham, and upon the instigation and under the guidance of Nimrod, who (~~1000~~Genesis 10:10) is declared to have had Babel for the head place of his empire. The latter part of this position is asserted by Josephus, and the whole by Augustine and other ancients. Of modern writers who have maintained this opinion, we may specify Luther, Calvin (by apparent implication), Cornelius Lapse, Bonfrere, Poole (in his *English Annotations*), Patrick, Wells, Samuel Clarke (the annotator), Henry (by implication); narratives derived from Arabian and Hindu sources, in Charles Taylor's *Illustrations of Calmet*, frag. 528; and the late Jacob Bryant, who, though too imaginative and sanguine a theorist, and defective in his knowledge of the Oriental tongues, often gives us valuable collections of facts, and sound reasonings from them. A considerable part of his celebrated work, the *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*, is occupied with tracing the historical vestiges of the builders of Babel, whom, on grounds of high probability at least, he regards as Cuthites (assumed to be a dialectic variety for Cushites), the descendants of Cush, the son of Ham, but with whom were united many dissatisfied and apostate individuals of the branches of Japheth. Dr. Doig, in the article "Philology," in the *Encyclop. Britannica* (7th ed. 1842), has entered at some length into this question, and arrives at the following conclusion "From these circumstances, we hope it appears that the whole mass of mankind was not engaged in building the tower of Babel; that the language of all the human race was not confounded upon that occasion, and that the dispersion reached only to a combination of Hamites, and of the most profligate part of the two other families who had joined their wicked confederacy." Nevertheless, as this was the first occurrence of any dialectical variety, it is properly given by the sacred writer as the initial point of that wide ethnic diversity of tongues which has since gradually spread over the earth.

4. *Traces of the Event.* —

(1.) *Monumental.* —The history of the confusion of languages was preserved at Babylon, as we learn by the testimonies of classical and

Babylonian authorities (Abydenus, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* [ed. Didot], vol. 4). Only the Chaldaeans themselves did not admit the Hebrew etymology of the name of their metropolis; they derived it from *Babel*, the door of *El* (Kronos, or Saturnus), whom Diodorus Siculus states to have been the planet most adored by the Babylonians.

The Talmudists say that the true site of the tower of Babel was at Borsif, the Greek Borsippa, the Birs Nimrid, seven miles and a half from Hillah, S.W., and nearly eleven miles from the northern ruins of Babylon. Several passages state that the air of Borsippa makes forgetful (j kçm rywa, *avir mashkach*); and one rabbi says that Borsif is Bulsif, the confusion of tongues (*Bereshith Rabba*, fol. 42, p. 1). The Babylonian name of this locality is Barsip, or Barzipa, which we explain by "Tower of Tongues." The French expedition to Mesopotamia found at the Birs Nimrud a clay cake, dated from Barsip the 30th day of the 6th month of the 16th year of Nabonid, and the discovery confirmed the hypothesis of several travellers, who had supposed the Birs Nimrid to contain the remains of Borsippa.

Borsippa (the Tongue Tower) was formerly a suburb of Babylon, when the old Babel was merely restricted to the northern ruins, before the great extension of the city, which, according to ancient writers, was the greatest that the sun ever warmed with its beams. 'Nebuchadnezzar included it in the great circumvallation of 480 stades, but left it out of the second wall of 360 stades; and when the exterior wall was destroyed by Darius, Borsippa became independent of Babylon. The historical writers respecting Alexander state that Borsippa had a great sanctuary dedicated to Apollo and Artemis (Strabo, 16:739; Stephanus Byz. s.v. (Βόρσιππα), and the former is the building elevated in modern times on the very basement of the old tower of Babel.

This building, erected by Nebuchadnezzar, is the same that Herodotus describes as the tower of Jupiter Belus. In the *Expedition en Messopotamie*, I, 208, there is given a description of this ruin, proving the identity. This tower of Herodotus has nothing to do with the pyramid described by Strabo, which is certainly to be seen in the remains called now Babil (the Mujellibeh of Rich). The temple of Borsippa is written with an ideogram (*bit-zi-da*), composed of the signs for *house* and *spirit* (anima), the real pronunciation of which was probably *sarakh*, tower. The temple consisted of a large substructure, a stade (six hundred Babylonian feet) in breadth and seventy-five feet in height, over which were built seven other

stages of twenty-five feet each. Nebuchadnezzar gives notice of this building in the Borsippa inscription. He named it the temple of the *Seven Lights of the Earth*, i.e. the planets. The top was the temple of Nebo, and in the substructure (*igar*) was a temple consecrated to the god Sin, god of the month. This building, mentioned in the East India House inscription (col. 4:l. 61), is spoken of by Herodotus (1, 181, etc.).

Here follows the Borsippa inscription: “Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, shepherd of peoples, who attests the immutable affection of Merodach, the mighty ruler-exalting Nebo; the savior, the wise man who lends his ears to the orders of the highest god; the lieutenant without reproach, the repairer of the Pyramid and the Tower, eldest son of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.

“We say Merodach, the great master, has created me: he has imposed on me to reconstruct his building. Nebo, the guardian over the legions of the heaven and the earth, has charged my hands with the scepter of justice.

“The Pyramid is the temple of the heaven and the earth, the seat of Merodach, the chief of the gods; the place of the oracles, the spot of his rest, I have adorned in the form of a cupola, with shining gold.

“The Tower, the eternal house, which I founded and built; I have completed its magnificence with silver, gold, other metals, stone, enameled bricks, fir, and pine.

“The first, which is the house of the earth’s base, the most ancient monument of Babylon, I built and finished it; I have highly exalted its head with bricks covered with copper.

“We say for the other, that is, this edifice, the house of the Seven Lights of the Earth, the most ancient monument of Borsippa: A former king built it (they reckon forty-two ages), but he did not complete its head. *Since a remote time people had abandoned it, without order expressing their words.* Since that time, the earthquake and the thunder had dispersed its sun-dried clay; the bricks of the casing had been split, and the earth of the interior had been scattered in heaps.” Merodach, the great lord, excited my mind to repair this building. ‘I did not change the site, nor did I

take away the foundation-stone. In a fortunate month, an auspicious day, I undertook to build porticos around the crude brick Inasses, and the casing of burnt bricks. I adapted the circuits. I put the inscription of my name in the *Kitir* of the porticos.

“I set my hand to finish it, and to exalt its head. As it had been in former times, so I founded, I made it; as it had been in ancient days, so I exalted its summit.

“Nebo, son of himself, ruler who exaltest Merobach, be propitious to my works to maintain my authority. Grant me a life until the remotest time, a sevenfold progeny, the stability of my throne, the victory of my sword, the pacification of foes, the triumph over the lands! In the columns of thy eternal table, that fixes the destinies of the heaven and of the earth, bless the course of my days, inscribe the fecundity of my race.

“Imitate, O Merodach, king of heaven and earth, the father who begot thee; bless my buildings, strengthen my authority. May Nebuchadnezzar, the king-repairer, remain before thy face!”

This allusion to the Tower of the Tongues is the only one that has as yet been discovered in the cuneiform inscriptions (see *Expedition en Mesopotamie*, 1, 208). The story is a Shemitic and not merely a Hebrew one, and we have no reason whatever to doubt of the existence of the same story at Babylon. The ruins of the building elevated on the spot ‘where the story placed the tower of the dispersion of tongues have therefore a more modern origin, but interest, nevertheless, by their stupendous appearance. *SEE BABEL.*

(2.) *Historical.* —The following are the principal passages of ancient authors, rescued from the wreck of time by the quotations of Josephus and Eusebius. It scarcely need be said that we do not adduce these fragments as authorities in any other sense than that they repeat the traditional narratives which had descended from the remotest antiquity among the people to whom they relate. The “Sibyl” cited by Josephus is the fictitious appellation of some unknown author, probably about the 2nd century B.C. Alexander Cornelius Polyblistor flourished about one hundred years before Christ. Eupolemus was probably an Asiatic Greek, two or three centuries earlier. Abydenus (if he was Palaephatils) lived in the middle of the 4th century B.C.

“Concerning this tower, and the discordance of language; among men, the Sibyl also makes mention, saying thus: All men having one language, some of them built a very high tower, as if they proposed by means of it to climb to heaven; but the gods, by sending storms of wind, overthrew the tower, and gave to each person a peculiar language: and on this account the city came to be called Babylon” (Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 4, 3).

The Sibyl here quoted may be that very ancient anonymous authority to which we have obscure references (in the discourse of Theophilus to Autolytus) in Plutarch’s *Morals*, in Virgil’s *Pollio*, and 2 the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus.

“Alexander Polyhistor a man of the highest celebrity for talents and attainments, in the estimation of those Greeks who are the most profoundly and accurately learned has the following passage: Eupolems, in his book concerning the Jews of Assyria, says that the city of Babylon was first) built by those who had been preserved from the Deluge; that they were giants [the Greeks used this word to signify, not so much men of enormous stature as their mythological heroes, of great prowess, and defying the gods]; that they also erected the tower of which history gives account; but that it was overthrown -by the mighty power from God, and consequently the giants were scattered abroad over the whole earth” (Eusebius, *Praepar. Evang.* col. 16SS).

“Further, with respect to the narrative of Moses concerning the building of the tower and how, from one tongue, they were confounded so as to be brought into the use of many dialects, the author before mentioned [Abydenus], in his book concerning the Assyrians, gives his confirmation in these words: ‘There are some who say that the first men sprang out of the earth; that they boasted of their strength and size; that they contemptuously maintained themselves ‘to be superior to the gods that they erected a lofty tower where now is Babylon; then, when it had been carried on almost up to heaven, the very winds came to assist the gods, and overthrew the vast structure upon its builders. Its ruins were called Babylon. The men, who before had possessed one tongue, were brought by the gods to a many sounding voice; and afterwards war arose between Kronos [Saturn] and Titan. Moreover, the place in

which they built the tower is now called Babylon, on account of the confusion of the prior clearness with respect to speech; for the Hebrews call confusion Babel” (Eusebius, *Praepar. Evang.* 9:14).

Abydenus, the Grecian historian of Assyria, is known to us only by citations in Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Syncellus, but they confirm his respectability as a writer.

On the event under discussion, see the Latin monographs by Linck (Vitemb. 1656), Zobell (*ibid.* 1664), Schroeder (Groning. 1752), Kanne (Norimb. 1819), and in English by Wetton (Lond. 1732); also the literature cited by Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* col. 179,180.

II. Philological and Ethnological Considerations. The unity of the human race is most clearly implied, if not positively asserted, in the Mosaic writings. The general declaration “So God created man in his own image ... male and female created he them” (Genesis 1, 27) is limited as to the mode in which the act was carried out by the subsequent narrative of the creation of the protoplast Adam, who stood alone on the earth amid the beasts of the field until it pleased Jehovah to create “an help meet for him” out of the very substance of his body (2, 22). From this original pair sprang the whole antediluvian population of the world; and hence the author of the book of Genesis conceived the unity of the human race to be of the most rigid nature—not simply a generic unity nor, again, simply a specific unity (for unity of species may not be inconsistent with a plurality of original centers), but a specific based upon a numerical unity, the species being nothing else than the enlargement of the individual. Such appears to be the natural meaning of the first chapters of Genesis when taken by themselves; much more so when read under the flected light of the New Test.; for not only do we meet with references to the historical fact of such an origin of the human race — e.g. in Paul’s declaration that God “hath made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth” (~~4:17~~ Acts 17:26)—but the same is evidently implied in the numerous passages which represent Jesus Christ as the counterpart of Adam in regard to the universality of his connection with the human race. Attempts have indeed been made to show that the idea of a plurality of original pairs is not inconsistent with the Mosaic writings; but there is a wide distinction between a view not inconsistent with and a view drawn from, the words of the author the latter is founded upon the facts i.e. relates, as well as his mode of relating them; the former takes advantage of the weaknesses

arising out of a concise or unmethodical style of composition. Even if such a view could be sustained in reference to the narrative of the original creation of man, it must inevitably fail in reference to the history of the repopulation of the world in the postdiluvian age; for, whatever objections may be made to the historical accuracy of the history of the Flood it is at all events clear that the historian believed in the universal destruction of the human race, with the exception of Noah and his family, and consequently that the unity of the human race was once more reduced to one of a numerical character. To Noah the historian traces up the whole postdiluvian population of the world: "These are the three sons of Noah: and of them was the whole earth overspread" (~~Gen~~Genesis 9:19).

Unity of language is assumed by the sacred historian apparently as a corollary of the unity of race. No explanation is given of the origin of speech, but its exercise is evidently regarded as coeval with the creation of man. No support can be obtained in behalf of any theory on this subject from the first recorded instance of its exercise ("Adam gave names to all cattle"), for the simple reason that this notice is introductory to what follows: "but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him" (Genesis 2, 20). It was not so much the intention of the writer to state the fact of man's power of speech as the fact of the inferiority of all other animals to him, and the consequent necessity for the creation of woman. The proof of that inferiority is, indeed, most appropriately made to consist in the authoritative assignment of names, implying an act of reflection on their several natures and capacities, and a recognition of the offices which they were designed to fill in the economy of the world. The exercise of speech is thus most happily connected with the exercise of reflection, and the relationship between the inner act of the mind (*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*) and the outward expression (*λόγος προφορικός*) is fully recognized. Speech, being thus inherent in man as a reflecting being, was regarded as handed down from father to son by the same process of imitation by which it is still perpetuated. Whatever divergences may have arisen in the antediluvian period, no notice is taken of them, inasmuch as their effects were obliterated by the universal catastrophe of the Flood. The original unity of speech was restored in Noah, and would naturally be retained by his descendants as long as they were held together by social and local bonds.

The confusion of tongues and the dispersion of nations are spoken of in the Bible as contemporaneous events. "So the Lord scattered them abroad" is stated as the execution of the divine counsel "Let us confound their

language.” The divergence of the various families into distinct tribes and nations ran parallel with the divergence of speech into-dialects and languages, and thus the tenth chapter of Genesis is posterior in historical sequence to the events recorded in the eleventh chapter. Both passages must be taken into consideration in any disquisition on the early fortunes of the human race. We propose, therefore, to inquire, in the first place, how far modern researches into the phenomena of language favor the idea that there was once a time when “the whole earth was of one speech and language; and, in the second place, whether the ethnological views exhibited in the Mosaic table accord with the evidence furnished by history and language, both in regard to the special facts recorded in it and in the general scriptural view of a historical, or, more properly, a gentilic unity of the human race. These questions, though independent, yet exercise a reflexive influence on each other’s results. Unity of speech does not necessarily involve unity of race, nor yet *vice versa*; but each enhances the probability of the other, and therefore the arguments derived from language, physiology, and history may ultimately furnish a cumulative amount of probability which will fall but little below demonstration.

(A.) The advocate of the historical unity of language has to encounter two classes of opposing, arguments: one arising out of the differences, the other out of the resemblances, of existing languages. On the one hand, it is urged that the differences are of so decisive and specific a character as to place the possibility of, a common origin wholly out of the question; on the other hand, that the resemblances do not necessitate the theory of a historical unity, but may be satisfactorily accounted for on psychological principles. It will be our object to discuss the amount, the value, and the probable origin of the varieties exhibited by languages, with a view to meet the first-class of objections. But, before proceeding to this, we will make a few remarks on the second class, inasmuch as these, if established, would nullify any conclusion that might be drawn from the other.

A psychological unity is not necessarily opposed to a gentilic unity. It is perfectly open to any theorist to combine the two by assuming that the language of the one protoplast was founded on strictly psychological principles. But, on the other hand, a. psychological unity does not necessitate a gentilic unity. It permits of the theory of a plurality of protoplasts, who, under the influence of the same psychological laws, arrived at similar independent results. Whether the phenomena of language are consistent with such a theory, we think extremely doubtful; certainly

they cannot furnish the basis of it. The whole question of the origin of language lies beyond the pale of historical proof, and any theory connected with it admits neither of being proved nor disproved. We know, as a matter of fact, that language is communicated from one generation to another solely by force of imitation, and that there is no play whatever for the inventive faculty in reference to it. But in what manner the substance of language was originally produced we do not know. No argument can be derived against the common origin from analogies drawn from the animal world; and when Prof. Agassiz compares similarities of language with those of the cries of animals (Voan Bohlen, *Introd. to Genesis 2*, 278), he leaves out of consideration the important fact that language is not identical with sound, and that the words of a rational being, however originally produced, are perpetuated in a manner wholly distinct from that whereby animals learn to utter their cries. Nor does the internal evidence of language itself reveal the mystery of its origin; for, though a very large number of words may be referred either directly or mediately to the principle of onomatopoeia, there are others as, for instance, the first and second personal pronouns which do not admit of such an explanation. In short, this and other similar theories cannot be reconciled with the intimate connection evidently existing between reason and speech, which is so well expressed in the Greek language by the application of the term *λόγος* to each, reason being nothing else than inward speech, and speech nothing else than outward reason, neither of them possessing an independent existence without the other. As we conceive that the psychological as opposed to the gentile unity involves questions connected with the origin of language, we can only say that in this respect it falls outside the range of our inquiry.

Reverting to the other class of objections, we proceed to review the extent of the differences observable in the languages of the world in order to ascertain whether they are such as to preclude the possibility of a common origin. Such a review must necessarily be imperfect, both from the magnitude of the subject and also from the position of the linguistic science itself, which as yet has hardly advanced beyond the stage of infancy. On the latter point we would observe that the most important links between the 'various language families may yet be discovered in languages that are either unexplored or, at all events, unplaced. Meanwhile, no one can doubt that the tendency of all linguistic research is in the direction of unity. Already it has brought within the bonds of a well-established relationship

languages so remote from each other in external guise, in age, and in geographical position as Sanskrit and English, Celtic and Greek. It has done the same for other groups of languages equally widely extended, but presenting less opportunities of investigation. It has recognized affinities between languages which the ancient Greek ethnologist would have classed under the head of "barbarian" in reference to each other, and even in many instances where the modern philologist has anticipated no relationship. The lines of discovery, therefore, point in one direction, and favor the expectation that the various families may be combined by the discovery of connecting links into a single family, comprehending in its capacious bosom all the languages of the world. But should such a result never be attained, the probability of a common origin would still remain unshaken; for the failure would probably be due to the absence, in many classes and families, of that chain of historical evidence which in the case of the Indo-European and Shemitic families enables us to trace their progress for above three thousand years. In many languages no literature at all, in many others no ancient literature, exists to supply the philologist with materials for comparative study: in these cases it can only be by laborious research into existing dialects that the original forms of words can be detected amid the incrustations and transmutations with which time has obscured them.

In dealing with the phenomena of language, we should duly consider the plastic nature of the material out of which it is formed, and the numerous influences to which it is subject. Variety in unity is a general law of nature, to which even the most stubborn physical substances yield a ready obedience. In the case of language it would be difficult to set any bounds to the variety which we might *a priori* expect it to assume. For, in the first place, it is brought into close contact with the spirit of man, and reflects with amazing fidelity its endless variations, adapting itself to the expression of each feeling, the designation of each object, the working of each cast of thought or stage of reasoning power. Secondly, its sounds are subject to external influences, such as peculiarities of the organ of speech, the result either of natural conformation, of geographical position, or of habits of life and associations of an accidental character. In the third place, it is generally affected by the state of intellectual and social culture of a people, as manifested more especially in the presence or absence of a standard literary dialect, and in the processes of verbal and syntactical structure, which again react on the very core of the word and produce a variety of sound mutations. Lastly, it is subjected to the wear and tear of time and use,

obliterating, as in an old coin, the original impress of the word, reducing it in bulk, producing new combinations, and occasionally leading to singular interchanges of sound and idea. The varieties resulting from the modifying influences above enumerated may be reduced to two classes, according as they affect the formal or the radical elements of language.

(I.) Widely as languages now differ from each other in external form, the raw material (if we may use the expression) out of which they have sprung appears to have been in all cases the same. A substratum of significant monosyllabic roots underlies the whole structure, supplying the materials necessary, not only for ordinary predication, but also for what is usually termed the “growth” of language out of its primary into its more complicated forms. It is necessary to point this out clearly in order that we may not be led to suppose that the elements of one language are in themselves endued with any greater vitality than those of another. Such a distinction, if it existed, would go far to prove a specific difference between languages, which could hardly be reconciled with the idea of their common origin. The appearance of vitality arises out of the manipulation of the roots by the human mind, and is not inherent in the roots themselves.

1. The proofs of this original equality are furnished by the languages themselves. Adopting for the present the threefold morphological classification into isolating, agglutinative, and inflecting languages, we shall find that no original element exists in the one, which does not also exist in the other. With regard to the isolating class, the terms “monosyllabic” and “radical,” by which it is otherwise described, are decisive as to its character. Languages of this class are wholly unsusceptible of grammatical mutations; there is no formal distinction between verb and noun, substantive and adjective, preposition and conjunction; there are no inflections, no case or person terminations of any kind; the bare root forms the sole and whole substance of the language. In regard to the other two classes, it is necessary to establish the two distinct points (1) that the formal elements represent roots, and (2) that the roots both of the formal and the radical elements of the word are monosyllabic. Now it may be satisfactorily proved by analysis that all the component parts of both inflecting and agglutinative languages are reducible to two kinds of roots, predicable and pronominal—the former supplying the material element of verbs, substantives, and adjectives; the latter that of conjunctions, prepositions, and particles; while each kind, but more particularly the pronominal, supplies the formal element, or, in other words, the terminations of verbs,

substantives, and adjectives. Whether the two classes of roots, predicable and pronominal, are further reducible to one class is a point that has been discussed, but has not as yet been established (Bopp, *Compar. Gram.* § 105; Müller, *Lectures*, p. 269). We have further to show that the roots of agglutinative and inflecting languages are monosyllabic. This is an acknowledged characteristic of the Indo-European family; monosyllabism is, indeed, the only feature which its roots have in common; in other respects they exhibit every kind of variation, from a unilateral root, such as *i* (*ire*), up to combinations of five letters, such as *scand* (*scandere*), the total number of admissible forms of root amounting to no less than eight (Schleicher, § 206). In the Shemitic family monosyllabism is not a *prima facie* characteristic of the root; on the contrary, the verbal stems exhibit bisymbolism with such remarkable uniformity that it would lead to the impression that the roots also must have been bisyllabic. The bisymbolism, however, of the Shemitic stem is in reality triconsonantalism, the vowels not forming any part of the essence of the root, but being wholly subordinate to the consonants. It is at once apparent that a triconsonantal and even a quadriconsonantal root may be in certain combinations unisyllabic. But, further, it is more than probable that the triconsonantal has been evolved out of a biconsonantal root, which must necessarily be unisyllabic if the consonants stand, as they invariably do in Shemitic roots, at the beginning and end of the word. With regard to the agglutinative class, it may be assumed that the same law which we have seen to prevail in the isolating and inflecting classes prevails also in this holding as it does an intermediate place between those opposite poles in the world of language.

2. From the consideration of the crude materials of language, we pass on to the varieties exhibited in its structure, with a view to ascertain whether in these there exists any bar to the idea of an original unity.

(1.) Reverting to the classification already noticed, we have to observe, in the first place, that the principle on which it is based is the nature of the connection existing between the predicable and the relational or inflectional elements of a word. In the isolating class these two are kept wholly distinct; relational ideas are expressed by juxtaposition or by syntactical arrangement, and not by any combination of the roots. In the agglutinative class the relational elements are attached to the principal or predicable theme by a mechanical kind of junction, the individuality of each being preserved even in the combined state. In the inflecting class the

junction is of a more perfect character, and may be compared to a chemical combination, the predicable and relational elements being so fused together as to present the appearance of a single and indivisible word. It is clear that there exists no insuperable barrier to original unity in these differences, from the simple fact that every inflecting language must once have been agglutinative, and every agglutinative language once isolating. If the predicable and relational elements of an isolating language be linked together, either to the eye or the ear, it is rendered agglutinative; if the material and formal parts are pronounced as one word, eliminating, if necessary, the sounds that resist incorporation, the language becomes inflecting.

(2.) In the second place, it should be noted that these three classes are not separated from each other by any sharp line of demarcation. Not only does each possess, in a measure, the quality predominant in each other, but, moreover, each graduates into its neighbor through its bordering members. The isolating languages are not wholly isolating: they avail themselves of certain words as relational particles, though these still retain elsewhere their independent character; they also use composite, though not strictly compound, words. The agglutinative are not wholly agglutinative; the Finnish and Turkish classes of the Ural-Altai family are in certain instances inflectional, the relational adjunct being fully incorporated with the predicable stem, and having undergone a large amount of attrition for that purpose. Nor, again, are the inflectional languages wholly inflectional; Hebrew, for instance, abounds with agglutinative forms, and also avails itself largely of separate particles for the expression of relational ideas; our own language, though classed as inflectional, retains nothing more than the vestiges of inflection, and is in many respects as isolating and juxtapositional as any language of that class. While, therefore the classification holds good with regard to the predominant characters of the classes, it does not imply differences of a specific nature.

(3.) But, further, the morphological varieties of language are not confined to the exhibition of the single principle hitherto described. A comparison between the westerly branches of the Ural-Altai, on the one hand, and the Indo-European, on the other, belonging respectively to the agglutinative and inflectional classes, will show that the quantitative amount of synthesis is fully as prominent a point of contrast as the qualitative. The combination of primary and subordinate terms may be more perfect in the Indo-European, but it is more extensively employed in

the Ural-Altai family. The former, for instance, appends to its verbal stems the notions of time, number, person, and occasionally of interrogation; the latter further adds suffixes indicative of negation, hypothesis, causativeness, reflexiveness, and other similar ideas, whereby the word is built up tier on tier to a marvelous extent. The former appends to its substantial stems suffixes of case and number; the latter adds governing particles, rendering them post-positional instead of prepositional, and combining them synthetically with the predicable stem. If, again, we compare the Shemitic with the Indo-European languages, we shall find a morphological distinction of an equally diverse character. In the former the grammatical category is expressed by internal vowel-changes, in the latter by external suffixes. So marked a distinction has not unnaturally been constituted the basis of a classification, wherein the languages that adopt this system of internal flexion stand by themselves as a separate class, in contradistinction to those which either use terminational additions for the same purpose, or which dispense wholly with inflectional forms (Bopp, *Compar. Gram.* 1, 102). The singular use of preformatives in the Coptic language is, again, a morphological peculiarity of a very decided character. Even within the same family, say the Indo-European, each language exhibits an idiosyncrasy in its morphological character whereby it stands out apart from the other members with a decided impress of individuality. The inference to be drawn from the number and character of the differences we have noticed is favorable, rather than otherwise, to the theory of an original unity. Starting from the same common ground of monosyllabic roots, each language-family has carried out its own special line of development, following an original impulse, the causes and nature of which must remain probably forever a matter of conjecture. We can perceive, indeed, in a general way, the adaptation of certain forms of speech to certain states of society. The agglutinative languages, for instance, seem to be specially adapted to the nomadic state by the prominence and distinctness with which they enunciate the leading idea in each word, an arrangement whereby communication would be facilitated between tribes or families that associate only at intervals. We might almost imagine that these languages derived their impress of uniformity and solidity from the monotonous steppes of Central Asia, which have in all ages formed their proper habitat. So, again, the inflectional class reflects cultivated thought and social 'organization, and its languages have hence been termed "state or political." Monosyllabism, on the other hand, is pronounced to be suited to the most primitive stage of thought and society,

wherein the family or the individual is the standard by which things are regulated (Miller, *Philos. of list.* 1, 285). We should hesitate, however, to press this theory as furnishing an adequate explanation of the differences observable in language families. The Indo-European languages attained their high organization amid the same scenes and in the same nomad state as those wherein the agglutinative languages were nurtured, and we should rather be disposed to regard both the language and the higher social status of the former as the concurrent results of a higher mental organization.

3. If from words we pass onto the varieties of syntactical arrangement, the same degree of analogy will be found to exist between class and class, or between family and family in the same class; in other words, no peculiarity exists in one which does not admit of explanation by a comparison with others. The absence of all grammatical forms in an isolating language necessitates a rigid collocation of the words in a sentence according to logical principles. The same law prevails to a very great extent in our own language, wherein the subject, verb, and object, or the subject, copula, and predicate, generally hold their relative positions in the order exhibited, the exceptions to such an arrangement being easily brought into harmony with that general law. In the agglutinative languages the law of arrangement is that the principal word should come last in the sentence, every qualifying clause or word preceding it, and being, as it were, sustained by it. The syntactical is thus the reverse of the verbal structure, the principal notion taking the precedence in the latter (Ewald, *Sprachw. Abhandl.* 2, 29). There is in this nothing peculiar to this class of languages, beyond the greater uniformity with which the arrangement is adhered to; it is the general rule in the classical, and the occasional rule in certain of the Teutonic, languages. In the Shemitic family the reverse arrangement prevails; the qualifying adjectives follow the noun to which they belong, and the verb generally stands first; short sentences are necessitated by such a collocation, and hence more room is allowed for the influence of emphasis in deciding the order of the sentence. In illustration of grammatical peculiarities, we may notice that in the agglutinative class adjectives qualifying substantives, or substantives placed in apposition with substantives, remain undeclined; in this case the process may be compared with the formation of compound words in the Indo-European languages, where the final member alone is inflected. So, again, the omission of a plural termination in nouns following a numeral may “be paralleled with a similar usage in our own language, where the terms “pound” and “head”

are used collectively after a numeral. We may again cite the peculiar manner of expressing the genitive in Hebrew. This is effected by one of the two following methods — placing the governing noun in the *status constructus*, or using the relative pronoun with a preposition before the governed case. The first of these processes appears a strange inversion of the laws of language; but an examination into the origin of the adjuncts, whether prefixes or affixes, used in other languages for the indication of the genitive will show that they have a more intimate connection with the governing than with the governed word, and that they are generally resolvable into either relative or personal pronouns, which serve the simple purpose of connecting the two words together (Garnett, *Essays*, p. 214-227). The same end may be gained by connecting the words in pronunciation, which would lead to a rapid utterance of the first, and consequently to the changes which are witnessed in the *status constructus*. The second or periphrastic process is in accordance with the general method of expressing the genitive; for the expression “the Song which is to Solomon” strictly answers to “Solomon’s Song,” the *s* representing (according to Bopp’s explanation) a combination of the demonstrative *sa* and the relative *ya*. It is thus that the varieties of construction may be shown to be consistent with unity of law, and that they therefore furnish no argument against a common origin.

4. Lastly, it may be shown that the varieties of language do not arise from any constitutional inequality of vital energy. Nothing is more remarkable than the compensating power apparently inherent in all language, whereby it finds the means of reaching the level of the human spirit through a faithful adherence to its own guiding principle. The isolating languages, being shut out from the manifold advantages of verbal composition, attain their object by multiplied combinations of radical sounds, assisted by an elaborate system of accentuation and intonation. In this manner the Chinese language has framed a vocabulary fully equal to the demands made upon it; and though this mode of development may not commend itself to our notions as the most effective that can be devised yet it plainly evinces a high susceptibility on the part of the linguistic faculty, and a keen perception of the correspondence between sound and sense. Nor does the absence of inflection interfere with the expression even of the most delicate shades of meaning in a sentence; a compensating resource is found partly in a multiplicity of subsidiary terms expressive of plurality, motion, action, etc., and partly in strict attention to syntactical arrangement. The

agglutinative languages, again, are deficient in compound words, and in this respect lack the elasticity and expansiveness of the Indo-European family; but they are eminently synthetic, and no one can fail to admire the regularity and solidity with which its words are built up, suffix on suffix, and, when built up, are suffused with a uniformity of tint by the law of vowel harmony. The Shemitic languages have worked out a different principle of growth, evolved, not improbably, in the midst of a conflict between the systems of prefix and suffix, whereby the stem, being, as it were, enclosed at both extremities, was precluded from all external increment, and was forced back into such changes as could be effected by a modification of its vowel sounds. But whatever may be the origin of the system of internal inflection, it must be conceded that the results are very effective, as regards both economy of material and simplicity and dignity of style.

The result of the foregoing observations is to show that the formal varieties of language present no obstacle to the theory of a common origin. Amid these varieties there may be discerned manifest tokens of unity in the original material out of which language was formed, in the stages of formation through which it has passed, in the general principle of grammatical expression, and, lastly, in the spirit and power displayed in the development of these various formations. Such a result, though it does not prove the unity of language in respect to its radical elements, nevertheless tends to establish the *a priori* probability of this unity; for if all connected with the forms of language may be referred to certain general laws, if nothing in that department owes its origin to chance or arbitrary appointment, it surely favors the presumption that the same principle would extend to the formation of the roots, which are the very core and kernel of language. Here, too, we might expect to find the operation of fixed laws of some kind or other, producing results of a uniform character; here, too, actual variety may not be inconsistent with original unity.

(II.) Before entering on the subject of the radical identity of languages, we must express our conviction that the time has not yet arrived for a decisive opinion as to the possibility of establishing it by proof. Let us briefly review the difficulties that beset the question. Every word as it appears in an organic language, whether written or spoken, is resolvable into two distinct elements, which we have termed predicable and formal, the first being what is commonly called the root, the second the grammatical termination. In point of fact, both of these elements consist of independent roots; and in

order to prove the radical identity of two languages, it must be shown that they agree in both respects, that is, in regard both to the predicable and the formal roots. As a matter of experience, it is found that the formal elements (consisting, for the most part, of pronominal bases) exhibit a greater tenacity of life than the others; and hence agreement of inflectional forms is justly regarded as furnishing a strong presumption of general radical identity. Even foreign elements are forced into the formal mould of the language into which they are adopted, and thus bear testimony to the original character of that language. But though such a formal agreement supplies the philologist with a most valuable instrument of investigation, it cannot be accepted as a substitute for complete radical agreement: this would still remain to be proved by an independent examination of the predicable elements. The difficulties connected with these latter are many and varied. Assuming that two languages or language-families are under comparison, the phonological laws of each must be investigated in order to arrive, in the first place, at the primary forms of words in the language in which they occur, and, in the second place, at the corresponding forms in the language which constitutes the other member of comparison, as has been done by Grimm for the Teutonic as compared with the Sanskrit and the classical languages. The genealogy of sound, as we may term it, must be followed up by a genealogy of signification, a mere outward accordance of sound and sense in two terms being of no value whatever, unless a radical affinity be proved by an independent examination of the cognate words in each case. It still remains to be inquired how far the ultimate accordance of sense and sound may be the result of onomatopoeia, of mere borrowing, or of a possible mixture of languages on equal terms. The final stage in etymological inquiry is to decide the limit to which comparison may be carried in the primitive strata of language—in other words, how far roots, as ascertained—from groups of words, may be compared with roots, and reduced to yet simpler elementary forms. Any flaw in the processes above described will, of course, invalidate the whole result. Even where the philologist is provided with ample materials for inquiry in stores of literature ranging over long periods of time, much difficulty is experienced in making good each link in the chain of agreement; and yet in such cases the dialectic varieties have been kept within some degree of restraint by the existence of a literary language, which, by impressing its authoritative stamp on certain terms, has secured both their general use and their external integrity. Where no literature exists, as is the case with the general mass of languages in the world, the difficulties are infinitely increased by

the combined effects of a prolific growth of dialectic forms, and an absence of all means of tracing out their progress. Whether, under these circumstances, we may reasonably expect to establish a radical unity of language is a question, which each person must decide for himself. Much may yet be done by a larger induction and a scientific analysis of languages that are yet comparatively unknown. The tendency hitherto has been to enlarge the limits of a "family" according as the elements of affinity have been recognized in outlying members. These limits may perchance be still more enlarged by the discovery of connecting-links between the language-families, whereby the criteria of relationship will be modified, and new elements of internal unity be discovered amid the manifold appearances of external diversity.

Meanwhile we must content ourselves with stating the present position of the linguistic science in reference to this important topic. In the first place, the Indo-European languages have been reduced to an acknowledged and well-defined relationship: they form one of the two families included under the head of "inflectional" in the morphological classification. The other family in this class is the (so-called) Shemitic, the limits of which are not equally well defined, inasmuch as it may be extended over what are termed the sub-Shemitic languages, including the Egyptian or Coptic. The criteria: of the proper Shemitic family (i.e. the Aramsean, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic languages) are distinctive enough; but the connection between the Shemitic and the Egyptian is not definitely established. Some philologists are inclined to claim for the latter an independent position, intermediate between the Indo-European and Shemitic families (Bunsen, *Philippians of-Hist.* 1, 185 sq.). The agglutinative languages of Europe and Asia are combined by Prof. M. Muller in one family named "Turanian." It is conceded that the family bond in this case is a loose one, and that the agreement in roots is very partial (*Lectures*, p. 290-292). Many philologists of high standing, and more particularly Pott (*Ungleich. d. mensch. Rassen*, p. 232), deny the family relationship altogether, and break up the agglutinative languages into a great number of families. Certain it is that within the Turanian circle there are languages such, for instance, as the Ural-Altaiian which show so close an affinity to one another as to be entitled to form a separate division, either as a family, or a subdivision of a family; and, this being the case, we should hesitate to put them on a parity of footing with the remainder of the Turanian languages. The Caucasian group, again, differs so widely from the other members of the family as to

make the relationship very dubious. The monosyllabic languages of South-eastern Asia are not included in the Turanian family by Prof. M. Muller (*Lectures*, p. 290, 326), apparently on the ground that they are not agglutinative; -but as the Chinese appears to be connected radically with the Burmese. (Humboldt, *Verschied.* p. 368), with the Thibetan (*Philippians of Hist. 1*, 393-395), and with the Ural-Altaiian languages (Schott, in *Abh. Ab. Berl.* 1861, p. 172), it seems to have a good title to be placed in the Turanian family. With regard to the American and the bulk of the African languages, we are unable to say whether they can be brought under any of the heads already mentioned, or whether they stand by themselves as distinct families. The former are referred by writers of high eminence to an Asiatic or Turanian origin (Bunsen, *Philippians of Hist. 2*, 111; Latham, *Man and his Migrat.* p. 186); the latter to the Shemitic family (Latham, p. 148).

The problem that awaits solution is whether the several families above specified can be reduced to a single family by demonstrating their radical identity. It would be unreasonable to expect that this identity should be coextensive with the vocabularies of the various languages; it would naturally be confined to such ideas and objects as are common to mankind generally. Even within this circle the difficulty of proving the identity may be infinitely enhanced by the absence of materials. There are, indeed, but two families in which these materials are found in anything like sufficiency, viz. the Indo-European and the Shemitic, and even these furnish us with no historical evidence as to the earlier stages of their growth. We find each, at the most remote literary period, already exhibiting its distinctive character of stem and word-formation, leaving us to infer, as we best may, from these phenomena the processes, by which they had reached that point. Hence there arises abundance of room for difference of opinion, and the extent of the radical identity will depend very much on the view adopted as to these earlier processes. If we could accept in its entirety the system of etymology propounded by the analytical school of Hebrew scholars, it would not be difficult to establish a very large amount of radical identity; but we cannot regard as established the prepositional force of the initial letters, as stated by Delitzsch in his *Jeshurun* (p. 166, 173, note), still less the correspondence between these and the initial letters of Greek and Latin words (p. 170-172). The striking uniformity of bisyllabism in the verbal stems is explicable only on the assumption that a single principle underlies the whole; and the existence of groups of words differing slightly in form,

and having the same radical sense, leads to the presumption that this principle was one not of composition, but of euphonisri and practical convenience. This presumption is still further favored by an analysis of the letters forming the stems, showing that the third-letter is in many instances a reduplication, and in others a liquid, a nasal, or a sibilant, introduced either as the initial, the medial, or the final letter. The Hebrew alphabet admits of a classification based on the radical character of the letter according to its position in the stem. The effect of composition would have been to produce, in the first place, a greater inequality in the length of the words, and, in the second place, a greater equality in the use of the various organic sounds.

Many supposed instances of etymological correspondence have been falsely based on the analytical tenets; but there still exists a considerable amount of radical identity, which appears to be above suspicion. Under *SEE PHILOLOGY, SEE COMPARATIVE*, we have given a list of terms in which that identity is manifested. After deducting whatever may be due to fanciful or accidental agreement, there still remain many instances which cannot possibly be explained on the principle of onomatopoeia and which would therefore seem to be the common inheritance of the Indo-European and Shemitic families. Whether this agreement is, as Renan suggests, the result of a keen susceptibility of the onomatopoeic faculty in the original framers of the words (*Hist. Genesis* 1, 465) is a point that can neither be proved nor disproved. But even if it were so, it does not follow that the words were not framed before the separation of the families. Our list of comparative words might have been much enlarged if we had included comparisons based on the reduction of Shemitic roots to a bisyllabic form. A list of such words may be found in Delitzsch, *Jeshurun*, p. 177-180. In regard to pronouns and numerals, the identity is but partial. We may detect the t sound, which forms the distinctive sound of the second personal pronoun in the Indo-European languages, in the Hebrew *attah*, and in the personal terminations of the perfect tense; but the m, which is the prevailing -sound of the first personal pronoun in the former, is supplanted by an n in the latter. The numerals *shesh* and *sheba*, for “six” and “seven,” accord with the Indo-European forms: those representing the numbers from “one” to “five” are possibly, though not evidently, identical. With regard to the other language families, it will not be expected, after the observations already made, that we should attempt the proof of their radical identity. The Ural-Altian languages have been extensively studied,

but are hardly ripe for comparison. Occasional resemblances have been detected in grammatical forms and in the vocabularies; but the value of these remains to be proved, and we must await the results of a more extended research into this and other regions of the world of language.

(B.) We pass on to the second, point proposed for consideration, viz. the ethnological views expressed in the Bible, and more particularly in ch. 10 of Genesis, which records the dispersion of nations consequent on the confusion of tongues.

(I.) The Mosaic table does not profess to describe the process of the dispersion; but, assuming that dispersion as a *fait accompli*, it records the ethnic relations existing between the various nations affected by it. These relations, are expressed under the guise of a genealogy; the ethnological character of the document is, however, clear both from the names, some of which are gentile in form, as Ludim, Jebusite, etc., others geographical or local, as Mizraim, Sidon, etc., and, again, from the formulary which concludes each section of the subject, “after their families, after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations” (ver. 5, 20, 31).

Incidentally, the table is geographical as well as ethnological; but this arises out of the practice of designating nations by the countries they occupy. It has, indeed, been frequently surmised that the arrangement of the table is purely geographical, and this idea is, to a certain extent, favored by the possibility of explaining the names Shem, Ham, and Japheth on this principle, the first signifying the “high” lands, the second the “hot” or “low” lands, and the third the “broad,” undefined regions of the north. The three families may have been so located, and such a circumstance could not have been unknown to the writer of the table. But neither internal: nor external evidence satisfactorily proves such to have been the leading idea or principle embodied in it, for the Japhethites are mainly assigned to the “isles” or maritime districts of the west and north-west, while the Shemites press down into the plain of Mesopotamia, and the Hamites, on the other hand, occupy the high lands of Canaan and Lebanon. We hold, therefore, the geographical as subordinate to the ethnographical element, and avail ourselves of the former only as an instrument for the discovery of the latter.

The general arrangement of the table is as follows: The whole human race is referred back to Noah’s three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The Shemites are described last, apparently that the continuity of the narrative

may not be further disturbed; and the Hamites stand next to the Shemites, in order to show that these were more closely related to each other than to the Japhethites. The comparative degrees of affinity are expressed, partly by coupling the names together, as in the cases of Elishah and Tarshish. Kittim and Dodanim (ver. 4), and partly by representing a genealogical descent, as when the nations just mentioned are said to be “sons of Javan.” An inequality may be observed in the length of the genealogical lines, which, in the case of Japheth, extends only to one, in Ham to two, in Shem to three, and even four degrees. This inequality clearly arises out of the varying interest taken in the several lines by the author of the table, and by those for whose use it was designed. We may lastly observe that the occurrence of the same name in two of the lists, as in the cases of Lud (ver. 13, 22) and Sheba (ver. 7, 28), possibly indicates a fusion of the races.

a. The identification of the Biblical with the historical or classical names of nations is by no means an easy task, particularly where the names are not subsequently noticed in the Bible. In these cases, comparisons with ancient or modern designations are the only resource, and where the designation is one of a purely geographical character, as in the case of Riphath compared with *Ripaei Montes*, or Mash compared with *Masius Mons*, great doubt must exist as to the ethnic force of the title, inasmuch as several nations may have successively, occupied the same district. Equal doubt arises where names admit of being treated as appellatives, and so of being transferred from one district to another. Recent research into Assyrian and Egyptian records has, in many instances, thrown light on the Biblical titles. In the former we find Meshech and Tubal noticed under the forms *Juskaiand Tuplai*, while Javan appears as the appellation of Cyprus, where the Assyrians first met with Greek civilization. In the latter the name Phut appears under the form of *Pount*, Hittite as *Khita*, Cush as *Keesh*, Canaan as *Kannaa*, etc.

1. The list of Japhethites contains fourteen names, of which seven represent independent and the remainder affiliated nations, as follows:

(i.) Gomer, connected ethnically with the *Cimmerii*, *Cimbri* (?), and *Cymrn*; and geographically with *Crinlea*. Associated with Gomer are the three following:

(a.) Ashkenaz, generally compared with Lamke *Ascanius* Bithynia, but by Knobel with the tribe *Asci*, *As*, or *Ossetes* in the Caucasian district. On the

whole, we prefer, Hasse's suggestion of a connection between this name and that of the *Axenus*, later the *Euxinus* Pontus.

(b.) Riphath, the *lipcei* Mointes, which Knobel connects etymologically and geographically with *Carpates* Mons.

(c.) Togarmah, undoubtedly *Armenia*, or a portion of it.

(ii.) Magog, the *Scythians*.

(iii.) Madai, *Media*.

(iv.) Javan, the *Ionians*, as a general appellation for the Hellenic race, with whom are associated the four following:

(a.) Elishah, the *Eolians*, less probably identified with the district *Elis*.

(b.) Tarshish, at a later period of Biblical history certainly identical with *Tartessts* in Spain, to which, however, there are objections as regards the table, partly from the too extended area thus given to the Mosaic world, and partly because Tartessus was a Phoenician, and consequently not a Japhetic, settlement. Knobel compares the *Tyrseni*, *Tyrrhe-ni*, and *Tusci-of* Italy; but this is precarious.

(c.) Kittim, the town *Citium* in Cylrus. **(d.)** Dodanim, the *Dardani* of Illyria and Mysia; *Dodona* is sometimes compared.

(v.) Tubal, the *Tibareni* in Pontus.

(vi.) Meshech, the *Moschi* in the north-western part of Armenia.

(vii.) Tiras, perhaps *Thracia*.

2. The Hamitic list contains thirty names, of which three represent independent and the remainder affiliated nations, as follows:

(i.) Cush, in two branches, the western or African representing *Ethiopia*, the *Keesh* of the old Egyptian, and the eastern or Asiatic being connected with the unamles of the tribe *Cosscei*, the district *Cissia*, and the province *Susiana* or *Khuzistanl*. With Cnuh are associated:

(a.) Seba, the *Sabcei* of Yemen in South Arabia.

(b.) Havilah, the district *Khauldn* in the same part of the peninsula.

(c.) Sabtah, the town *Sabatha* in Hadramaurt.

(d.) Ramah, the town *Rhegma* on the south-eastern coast of Arabia, with whom are associated:

(a.) Sheba, a tribe probably connected ethnically or commercially with the one of the same name already mentioned, but located on the west coast of the Persian Gulf.

(b.) Dedanm, also on the west coast of the Persian Gulf, where the name perhaps still survives in the island *Dadan*.

(e.) Sabtechah, perhaps the town *Samydace* on the coast of the Indian Ocean eastward of the Persian Gulf.

(f.) Nimrod, a personal and not a geographical name, the representative of the Eastern Cushites.

(ii.) Mizraim, the two *Misrs*, ie. Upper and Lower Egypt, with whom the following seven are connected:

(a.) Ludim, according to Knobel, a tribe allied to the Shemitic Lud, but settled in Egypt; others compare the river *Laud* (Pliny, 5, 2), and the *Lewdtah*, a Berber tribe on the Syrtes.

(b.) Anamim, according to Knobel, the inhabitants of the *Delta*, which would be described in Egyptian by the term *sanemhit* or *tsanemhit*, “northern district,” converted by the Hebrews into Anamiim.

(c.) Naphtuhim, variously explained as the people of *Nephtys*, i.e. the northern coast ‘district (Bochart), and as the worshippers of Phthah, meaning the inhabitants of Memphis.

(d.) Pathrusim, Upper Egypt, the name being explained as meaning in the Egyptian “the south” (Knobel).;

(e.) Casluhim, *Casius Mons*, *Cassiotis*, and *Cassium*, eastward of the Delta (Knobel) the *Colchians*, according to Bochart, but this is unlikely.

(f.) Caphtorim, most probably the district about *Coptos* in Upper Egypt **SEE CAPHTOR**; the island of Crete according to many modern critics, Cappadocia according to the older interpreters.

(g.) Phut, the *Pûnt* of the Egyptian inscriptions, meaning the Libyans.

(3.) Canaan, the geographical position of which calls for no remark in this place. The name has been variously explained as meaning the “low” land of the coast district, or the “subjection” threatened to Canaan personally (⁰⁰²⁵Genesis 9:25). To Canaan belong the following eleven:

- (a.)** Sidon, the well-known town of that name in Phoenicia.
- (b.)** Heth, or the Hittites of Biblical history.
- (c.)** The Jebusite, of *Jebus* or Jerusalem.
- (d.)** The Amorite, frequently mentioned in Biblical history.
- (e.)** The Girgasite, the same as the Girgashites.
- (f.)** The Hivite, variously explained to mean the occupants of the “interior” (Ewald), or the dwellers in “villages” (Geselnus).
- (g.)** The Atkite, of *Area*, north of Tripolis, at the foot of Lebanon.
- (h.)** The Sinite, of *Sin* or *Sinna*, places in the Lebanon district.
- (i.)** The Arvadite, of *Aradus* on the coast of Phoenicia.
- (j.)** The Zemarite, of *Simyra* on the Eleutherus.
- (k.)** The Hamathite, of *Hamath*, the classical *Epiphania*, on the Orontes.

3. The Shemitic list contains twenty-six names, of which five refer to independent and the remainder to affiliated tribes, as follows:

- (i.)** Elam, the tribe *Elyncei* and the district *Elyntais* in Susiana.:
- (ii.)** Asshur, *Assyria* between the Tigris and the range of Zagtrus.
- (iii.)** Arphaxad, *Arrapachitis*, in Northern Assyria, with whom are associated:
 - (a.)** Salah, a personal and also a geographical title, indicating a migration of the people represented by him; Salah’s son.
 - (b.)** Eber, representing geographically the district *across* (i.e. eastward of) the Euphrates; and Eber’s two sons.
 - (c.)** Peleg, a personal name indicating a “division” of this branch of the She mi tic family, and

(d.) Joktan, representing generally the inhabitants of *Arabia*, with the following thirteen sons of Joktan, viz.:

(a.) Almodad, probably representing the tribe of *Juirhum* near Mecca, whose leader was named *Modad*.

(b.) Sheleph, the *Salapeni* in *Yemen*.

(c.) Hazarmaveth, *Hadramaut* in Southern Arabia.

(d.) Jerah.

(e.) Hadoram, the *Adramitae* on the southern coast, in a-district of *Hadrama-it*.

(f.) Uzal, supposed to represent the town *Sanaa* in South Arabia, as having been founded by *Asal*.

(g.) Diklah.

(h.) Obal, or, as in ^{<302>}1 Chronicles 1:22, Ebal, which latter is identified by Knobel with the *Gebanitoe* in the south-west.

(i.) Abimael, doubtfully connected with the district *Mahra*, eastward of *Hadramauot*, and with the towns *Mara* and *Mali*.

(j.) Sheba, the *Saboei* of South-western Arabia, about Mariaba.

(k.) Ophir, probably *Adane*, on the southern const, but see article.

(l.) Havilah, the district *Khaucldn* in the northwest of *Yemen*.

(m.) Jobab, possibly the *Jobaritae* of Ptolemy (6, 7, 24), for which *Jobabitae* may originally have stood.

(iv.) Lud, generally compared with *Lydia*, but explained by Knobel as referring to the various aboriginal tribes in and about Palestine, such as the Amalekites, Rephaites, Emim, etc. We *cannot* consider either of these views as well established. Lydia itself lay beyond the horizon of the Mosaic table; as to the Shemitic origin of its population, conflicting opinions are entertained, to which we shall have occasion to advert hereafter. Knobel's view has in its favor the probability that the tribes referred to would be represented in the table; it is, however, wholly devoid of historical confirmation, with the exception of an Arabian tradition that *Amlik* was one of the sons of *Laud* or *Lawad*, the son of Shem.

(5.) Aram, the general name for *Syria* and Northern *Mesopotamia*, with whom the following fare associated:

(a.) Uz, probably the *Esitce* of Ptolemy.

(b.) Hul, doubtful, but best connected with the name *Huleth*, attaching to a district north of Lake Meroli.

(c.) Gether, not identified.

(d.) Mash, *Masius Mons*, in the north of Mesopotamia.

There is yet one name noticed in the table, viz. Philistim, which occurs in the Hamitic division, but without any direct assertion of Hamitic descent. The terms used in the A. V., "out of whom (Casluhim) came Philistim" (ver. 14), would naturally imply descent, but the Hebrew text only warrants the conclusion that the Philistines sojourned in the land of the Casluhim. Notwithstanding this, we believe the intention of the author of the table to have been to affirm the Hamitic origin of the Philistines, leaving undecided the particular branch whether Casluhim or Capthorim, with which it was more immediately connected.

The total number of names noticed in the table, including Philistim, would thus amount to seventy-one, which was raised by patristic writers to seventy-two. These totals afforded scope for numerical comparisons, and also for an estimate of the number of nations and languages to be found on the earth's surface. It is needless to say that the Bible itself furnishes no ground for such calculations, inasmuch as it does not, in any case; specify the numbers.

b. Before proceeding further, it would be well to discuss a question materially affecting the historical value of the Mosaic table, viz. the period to which it refers. On this point very various opinions are entertained; Knobel, conceiving it to represent the commercial geography of the Phoenicians, assigns it to about B.C. 1200 (*Volkert*. p. 4-9), and Renan supports this view (*Hist. Genesis* 1, 40), while others allow it no higher an antiquity than the period of the Babylonian captivity (Von Bohlen, *Genesis* 2, 207; Winer, *Realw.* 2, 665). Internal evidence leads us to refer it back to the age of Abraham on the following grounds;

(1.) The Canaanites were as yet in undisputed possession of Palestine.

(2.) The Philistines had not concluded their migration.

(3.) Tyre is wholly unnoticed, an omission which cannot be satisfactorily accounted for on the ground that it is included under the name either of Heth (Knobel, p. 323) or of Sidon (Von Bohlen, 2, 241).

(4.) Various places, such as Simyra, Sinna, and Area, are noticed which had fallen into insignificance in later times.

(5.) Kittim, which in the age of Solomon was under Phoenician dominion, is assigned to Japheth, and the same may be said of Tarshish, which in that age undoubtedly referred to the Phoenician emporium of *Tartessus*, whatever may have been its earlier significance.

The chief objection to so early a date as we have ventured to propose is the notice of the Medes under the name Madai. The Aryan nation which bears this name in history appears not to have reached its final settlement until about B.C. 900 (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 404). But, on the other hand, the name Media may well have belonged to the district before the arrival of the Aryan Medes, whether it were occupied by a tribe of kindred origin to them or by Turanians; and this probability is, to a certain extent, confirmed by the notice of a Median dynasty in Babylon, as reported by Berosus, so early as the 25th century B.C. (*ibid.* 1, 434). Little difficulty would be found in assigning so early a date to the Medes if the Aryan origin of the allied kings mentioned in ^{<0140>}Genesis 14:1 were thoroughly established, in accordance with Renan's view (*Hist. Gén.* 1, 61): on this point, however, we have our doubts. *SEE GENESIS.*

c. The Mosaic table is supplemented by ethnological notices relating to the various divisions of the Terachite family. These belonged to the Shemitic division, being descended from Arphaxad through Peleg, with whom the line terminates in the table. Reu, Serug, and Nahor form the intermediate links between Peleg and Terah (^{<0118>}Genesis 11:18-25), with whom began the movement that terminated in the occupation of Canaan and the adjacent districts by certain branches of the family. The original seat of Terah was Ur of the Chaldees (ver. 28); thence he migrated to Haran (ver. 31), where a section of his descendants, the representatives of Nahor, remained (24; 10; 27:43; 29; 4 sq.), while the two branches, represented by Abraham and Lot, the son of Haran, crossed the Euphrates and settled in Canaan and the adjacent districts (^{<0125>}Genesis 12:5). From Lot sprang the Moabites and Ammonites (^{<0133>}Genesis 19:30-38); from Abraham the

Ishmaelites through his son Ishmael (⁽¹²⁵¹²⁾Genesis 25:12), the Israelites through Isaac and Jacob, the Edomites through Isaac and Esau (ch. 36), and certain Arab tribes, of whom the Midianites are the most conspicuous, through the sons of his concubine Keturah (⁽¹²¹¹¹⁾Genesis 20:1, 1-4).

The most important geographical question in connection with the Terachites concerns their original settlement. The presence of the Chaldees in Babylonia at a subsequent period of scriptural history has led to a supposition that they were a Hamitic people, originally belonging to Babylonia, and thence transplanted in the 7th and 8th centuries to Northern Assyria (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 319). Others think it more consistent with the general direction of the Terachite movement to look for Ur in Northern Mesopotamia, to the east of Haran. That the Chaldees, or, according to the Hebrew nomenclature, the Kasdim, were found in that neighborhood is indicated by the name Chesed as one of the sons of Nahor (⁽¹²²²²⁾Genesis 22:22), and possibly by the name Arphaxad itself, which, according to Ewald (*Gesch.* 1, 378), means "fortress of the Chaldees." In classical times we find the Kasdim still occupying the mountains adjacent to Arrapachitis, the Biblical Arpachsad, under the names *Chaldaei* (Xenoph. *Anab.* 4:3, 1-4) and *Gordymeï or Carduchi* (Strabo, 16:747), and here the name still has a vital existence under the form of *Kurd*. The name Kasdim is explained by Oppert as meaning "two rivers," and thus as equivalent to the Hebrew *Naharain* and the classical *Mesopotamia* (*Zeit. d. morg. Ges.* 11:137). We receive this explanation with reserve; but, so far as it goes, it favors the northern locality. The evidence for the antiquity of the southern settlement is lessened if the term *Kaldai* does not occur in the Assyrian inscriptions until the 9th century B.C. (Rawlinson, 1, 449). But whether we conceive the original seat of the Chaldees to have been in the north or in the south, they moved along the course of the Tigris until they reached Babylon, where we find them dominant in the 7th century B.C. Whether they first entered this country as mercenaries, and then conquered their employers, as suggested by Renan (*Hist. Genesis* 1, 68), must remain uncertain, but we think the suggestion supported by the circumstance that the name was afterwards transferred to the whole Babylonian population. The sacerdotal character of the Chaldees is certainly difficult to reconcile with this or any other hypothesis on the subject.

Returning to the Terachites, we find it impossible to define the geographical limits of their settlements with precision. They intermingled with the previously existing inhabitants of the countries intervening

between the Red Sea and the Euphrates, and hence we find an Aram, an Uz, and a Chesed among the descendants of Nahor (⁽⁰²²¹⁾Genesis 22:21, 22), a Dedan and a Sheba among those of Abraham by Ketlirah (⁽⁰²³⁸⁾Genesis 25:3), and an Amalek among the descendants of Esau (⁽⁰³⁶²⁾Genesis 36:12). Few of the numerous tribes which sprang from this stock attained historical celebrity. The Israelites must of course be excepted from this description; so, also, the Nabathaeans, if they are to be regarded as represented by the Nebaioth of the Bible, as to which there is some doubt (Quatremere, *Mélanges*, p. 59). Of the rest, the Moabites, Ammonites, Midianites, and Edomites are chiefly known for their hostilities with the Israelites, to whom they were close neighbors. The memory of the westerly migration of the Israelites was perpetuated in the name Hebrew, as referring to their residence beyond the river Euphrates (⁽⁰³⁴⁸⁾Joshua 24:3).

d. Besides the nations whose origin is accounted for in the Bible, we find other early populations” mentioned in the course of the history without any notice of their ethnology. In this category we may place the Horim, who occupied Edom before the descendants of Esau (^(R212)Deuteronomy 2:12, 22); the Amalekites of the Sinaitic peninsula; the Zuzim and Zamzummim of Perea (⁽⁰¹⁴⁵⁾Genesis 14:5; Deuteronomy 2 20); the Rephaim of Bashan, and of the valley near Jerusalem named after them (⁽⁰¹⁴⁵⁾Genesis 14:5; 2 Samuel 5, 18); the Emim eastward of the Dead Sea (⁽⁰¹⁴⁵⁾Genesis 14:5) 1 the Avim of the southern Philistine plain (^(R223)Deuteronomy 2:23); and the Anakim of Southern Palestine (⁽⁰¹¹²⁾Joshua 11:21). The question arises whether these tribes were Hamites, or whether they represented an earlier population which preceded the entrance of the Hamites. The latter view is supported by Knobel, who regards the majority of these tribes as Shemites; who preceded the Canaanites, and communicated to them the Shemitic tongue (*Völkert.* p. 204, 315). No evidence can be adduced in support of this theory, which was probably suggested by the double difficulty of accounting for the name of Lud and of explaining the apparent anomaly of the Hamites and Terachites speaking the same language. Still less evidence is there in favor of the Turanian origin, which would, we presume, be assigned to these tribes in common with the Canaanites proper, in accordance with a current theory that the first wave of population which overspread Western Asia belonged to that branch of the human race (Rawlinson, *Herod. 1*, 645, note). To this theory we shall presently advert; meanwhile, we can only observe, in reference to these fragmentary populations, that, as they intermingled with the Canaanites, they probably

belonged to the same stock (comp. ^{<04132>}Numbers 13:22; ^{<0010>}Judges 1:10). They may, perchance, have belonged to an earlier migration than the Canaanitish, and may have been subdued by the later comers; but this would not necessitate a different origin. The names of these tribes and of their abodes, as instanced in ^{<0445>}Genesis 14:5; Deuteronomy 2, 23; ^{<04132>}Numbers 13:22, bear a Shemitic character (Ewald. *Gesch.* 1, 311), and the only objection to their Canaanitish origin arising out of these names would be in connection with Zamzummim, which, according to Renan (*Hist. Gén.* p. 35, note), is formed on the same principle as the Greek **βάρβαρος**, and in this case implies, at all events, a dialectical difference.

(II.) Having thus surveyed the ethnological statements contained in the Bible, it remains for us to inquire how far they are based on, or accord with, physiological or linguistic principles. Knobel maintains that the threefold division of the Mosaic table is founded on the physiological principle of color, Shem, Ham, and Japheth representing respectively the red, black, and white complexions prevalent in the different regions of the then known world (*Völkert.* p. 11-13). He claims etymological support for this view in respect to Ham (=“dark”) and Japheth (=“fair”), but not in respect to Shem; and he adduces testimony to the fact that such differences of color were noted in ancient times. . The etymological argument weakens rather than sustains his view; for it is difficult to conceive that the principle of classification would be embodied in two of the names, and not also in the third, the force of such evidence is wholly dependent upon its uniformity. With regard to the actual prevalence of the hues, it is quite consistent with the physical character of the districts that the Hamites of the south should be dark, and the Japhethites of the north fair, and, further, that the Shemites should hold an intermediate place in color as in geographical position. But we have no evidence that this distinction was strongly marked, The “redness” expressed in the name Edom probably referred to the soil (Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.* p. 87) the *Erythrcum Mare* was so called from a peculiarity in its own tint, arising from the presence of some vegetable substance, and not because the red Shemites bordered on it, the black Cushites being equally numerous on its shores; the name *Adam*, as applied to the Shemitic man, is ambiguous, from its reference to soil as-well as color. On the other hand, the Phoenicians (assuming them to have reached the Mediterranean seaboard before the table was compiled) were so called from their red hue, and yet are placed in the table among the Hamites. The argument drawn from the red hue of the Egyptian deity

Typhon is of little value until it can be decisively proved that the deity in question represented the Shemites. This is asserted by Renan (*Hist. Gén.* 1, 38), who endorses Knobel's view so far as the Shemites are concerned, though he does not accept his general theory.

The linguistic difficulties connected with the Mosaic table are very considerable, and we cannot pretend to unravel the tangled skein of conflicting opinions on the subject. The primary difficulty arises out of the Biblical narrative itself, and is consequently of old standing the difficulty, namely, of accounting for the evident identity of language spoken by the Shemitic Terachites and the Hamitic Canaanites. Modern linguistic research has rather enhanced than removed this difficulty. The alternatives hitherto offered as satisfactory solutions namely, that the Terachites adopted their language of the Canaanites, or the Canaanites that of the Terachites are both inconsistent with the enlarged area which the language is found to cover on each side. Setting aside the question of the high improbability that a wandering nomadic tribe, such as the Terachites, would be able to impose its language on a settled and powerful nation like the Canaanites, it would still remain to be explained how the Cushites and other Hamitic tribes, who did not come into contact with the Terachites, acquired the same general type of language. On, the other hand, assuming that what are called Shemitic languages were really Hamitic, we have to explain the extension of the Hamitic, area over Mesopotamia and Assyria, which, according to the table and the general opinion of ethnologists, belonged wholly to a non-Hamitic population. A further question, moreover, arises out of this explanation, viz., What was the language of the Terachites before they assumed this Hamitic tongue? This question is answered by J. Miller, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 14:238, to the effect that the Shemites originally spoke an Indo-European language — a view which we do not expect to see generally adopted.

Restricting ourselves, for the present, to the linguistic question, we must draw attention to the fact that there is a well-defined Hamitic as well as a Shemitic class of languages, and that any theory which obliterates this distinction must fall to the ground. The Hamitic type is most highly developed, as we might expect, in the country which was, *par excellence*, the land of Ham, viz. Egypt; and whatever elements of original unity with the Shemitic type may be detected by philologists, practically the two were as distinct from each other in historical times as any two languages could possibly be. We are not therefore prepared at once to throw overboard the

linguistic element of the Mosaic table. At the same time, we recognize the extreme difficulty of explaining the anomaly of Hamitic tribes speaking a Shemitic tongue. It will not suffice to say, in answer to this, that these tribes were Shemites; for again the correctness of the Mosaic table is vindicated by the differences of social and artistic culture which distinguish the Shemites proper from the Phoenicians and Cushites using a Shemitic tongue. The former are characterized by habits of simplicity, isolation, and adherence to patriarchal ways of living and thinking; the Phoenicians, on the other hand, were eminently a commercial people; and the Cushites are identified with the massive architectural erections of Babylonia and South Arabia, and with equally extended ideas of empire and social progress.

The real question at issue concerns the language, not of the whole Hamitic family, but of the Canaanites and Cushites. With regard to the former, various explanations have been offered such as Knobel's, that they acquired a Shemitic language from a prior population, represented by the Rephaim, Zulzim, Zamzummim, etc. (*Völkert-t.* p. 315); or Bunsen's, that they were a Shemitic race who had long sojourned in Egypt (*Philippians of list.* 1, 191) -neither of which is satisfactory. With regard to the latter, the only explanation to be offered is that a Joktanid immigration supervened on the original Hamitic population, the result being a combination of Cushitic civilization with a Shemitic language (Renan, *Hist. Généralé* 1, 322). Nor is it unimportant to mention that peculiarities have been discovered in the Cushite-Shemitic of Southern Arabia which suggest a close affinity with the Phoenician forms (*ibid.* 1,318). We are not, however, without expectation that time and research will clear up much of the mystery that now enwraps the subject. There are two directions to which we may hopefully turn for light, namely, Egypt and Babylonia, with regard to each of which we make a few remarks.

1. That the Egyptian language exhibits many striking points of resemblance to the Shemitic type is acknowledged on all sides. It is also allowed that the resemblances are of a valuable character, being observable in the pronouns, numerals, in agglutinative forms, in the treatment of vowels, and other such points (Renan, *Hist. Généralé* 1, 84, 85). There is not, however, an equal degree of agreement among scholars as to the deductions to be drawn from these resemblances. While many recognize in them the proofs of a substantial identity, and hence regard Hamitism as an early stage of Shemitism, others deny, either on general or on special grounds, the probability of such a connection. When we find such high authorities as

Bunsen on the former side (*Philippians of Hist.* 1, 186-189; 2, 3), and Renan (*Hist. Gén.* 1, 86) on the other, not to mention a long array of scholars who have adopted each view, it would be presumption dogmatically to assert the correctness or incorrectness of either. We can only point to the possibility of the identity being established, and to the further possibility that connecting links may be discovered between the two extremes, which may serve to bridge over the gulf, and to render the use of a Shemitic language by a Hamitic race less of an anomaly than it at present appears to be.

2. Turning eastward to the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, and the adjacent countries, we find ample materials for research in the inscriptions recently discovered, the examination of which has not yet yielded undisputed results. The Mosaic table places a Shemitic population in Assyria and Elam, and a Cushitic one in Babylon. The probability of this being ethnically (as opposed to geographically) true depends partly on the age assigned to the table. There can be no question that at a late period Assyria and Elam were held by non-Shemitic, probably Aryan, conquerors. But if we carry the table back to the age of Abraham, the case may have been different; for though Elam is regarded as etymologically identical with Iran (Renan, *Hist. Généralé* 1, 41), this is not conclusive as to the Iranian character of the language in early times. Sufficient evidence is afforded by language that the basis of the population in Assyria was Shemitic (*ibid.* 1, 70; Knobel, p. 154-156); and it is by no means improbable that the inscriptions belonging more especially to the neighborhood of Susa may ultimately establish the fact of a Shemitic population in Elam. The presence of a Cushitic population in Babylon is an opinion very generally held on linguistic grounds; and a close identity is said to exist between the old Babylonian and the *Mahri* language, a Shemitic tongue of an ancient type still living in a district of Hadramaut, in Southern Arabia (Renan, *Hist. Genesis* 1, 60). In addition to the Cushitic and Shemitic elements in the population of Babylonia and the adjacent districts, the presence of a Turanian element has been inferred from the linguistic character of the early inscriptions. We must here express our conviction that the ethnology of the countries in question is considerably clouded by the undefined use of the terms Turanian, Scythic, and the like. It is frequently difficult to decide whether these terms are used in a linguistic sense, as equivalent to *agglutinative*, or in an ethnic sense. The presence of a certain amount of Turanianism in the former does not involve; its presence in the latter sense.

The old Babylonian and Susianian inscriptions maybe more agglutinative than the later ones, but this is only a proof of their belonging to an earlier stage of the language, and does not of itself indicate a foreign population; and if these early Babylonian inscriptions graduate into the Shemitic, as is asserted even by the advocates of the Turanian theory (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 442, 445), the presence of an ethnic Turanianism cannot possibly be inferred. Added to this, it is inexplicable how the presence of a large Scythic population in the Achaemenian period, to which many of the Susianian inscriptions belong, could escape the notice of historians. The only Scythic tribes noticed by Herodotus in his review of the Persian empire are the Parthians and the Sacoe, the former of whom are known to have lived in the north, while the latter probably lived in the extreme east, where a memorial of them is still supposed to exist in the name *Seistcan*, representing the ancient Sacastene. Even with regard to these, Scythic may not mean Turanian: for they may have belonged to the Scythians of history (the Skolots), for whom an Indo-European origin is claimed (*ibid.* 3, 197). The impression conveyed by the supposed detection of so many heterogeneous elements in the old Babylonian tongue (*ibid.* 1, 442, 444, 646, notes) is not favorable to the general results of the researches.

With regard to Arabia, it may safely be asserted that the Mosaic table is confirmed by modern research. The Cushitic element has left memorials of its presence in the south in the vast ruins of Mareh and Sana (Renan, *Hist. Gén.* 1, 318), as well as in the influence it has exercised on the Himyaritic and Mahri languages, as compared with the Hebrew. The Joktanid element forms the basis of the Arabian population, the Shemitic character of whose language needs no proof. With regard to the Ishmaelite element in the north, we are not aware of any linguistic proof of its existence, but it is confirmed by the traditions of the Arabians themselves.

It remains to be inquired how far the Japhetic stock represents the linguistic characteristics of the Indo-European and Turanian families. Adopting the twofold division of the former, suggested by the name itself, into the eastern and western; and subdividing the eastern into the Indian and Iranian, and the western into the Celtic, Hellenic, Illyrian, Italian, Teutonic; Slavonian, and Lithuanian classes, we are able to assign Madai (*Media*) and Togarmah (*Armenia*) to the Iranian class; Javan (*Ionian*) and Elishah (*Eolian*) to the Hellenic; Gomer conjecturally to the Celtic; and Dodanim, also conjecturally, to the Illyrian. According to the old interpreters, Ashkenaz represents the Teutonic class, while, according to

Knobel, the Italian would be represented by Tarshish, whom he identifies with the Etruscans; the Slavonian by Magog; and the Lithuanian possibly by Tiras (*Völkert.* p. 68, 90. 130). The same writer also identifies Riphath with the Gauls, as distinct from the Cymry or Gomer (p. 45); while Kittim is referred by him not improbably to the Carians, who at one period were predominant on the islands adjacent to Asia Minor (p. 98). The evidence for these identifications varies in strength, but: in no instance approaches to demonstration. Beyond the general probability that the main branches of the human family would be represented in the Mosaic table, we regard much that has been advanced on this subject as highly precarious. At the same time, it must be conceded that the subject is an open one; and that as there is no possibility of proving, so, also, there is none of disproving, the correctness of these conjectures, Whether the Turanian family is fairly represented in the Mosaic table may be doubted. Those who advocate the Mongolian origin of the Scythians would naturally regard Magog as the representative of this family; and even those who dissent from the Mongolian theory may still not unreasonably conceive that the title Magog applied broadly to all the nomad tribes of Northern Asia, whether Indo-European or Turanian. Tubal and Meshech remain to be considered; Knobel identifies these respectively with the Iberians and the Ligurians (p. 111, 119); and if the Finnish character of the Basque language were established, he would regard the Iberians as certainly, and the Ligurians as probably, Turanians the relics of the first wave of population which is supposed to have once overspread the whole of the European continent, and of which the Finns in the north, and the Basques in the south, are the sole surviving representatives. The Turanian character of the two Biblical races above mentioned has been otherwise maintained on the ground of the identity of the names Meshech and Muscovite (*Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 652*).

(III.) Having thus reviewed the ethnic relations of the nations who fell within the circle of the Mosaic table, we propose to cast a glance beyond its limits, and inquire how far the present results of ethnological science support the general idea of the unity of the human race, which underlies the Mosaic system. The chief and in many instances the only instrument at our command for ascertaining the relationship of nations is language. In its general results this instrument is thoroughly trustworthy, and in each individual case to which it is applied it furnishes a strong *prima facie* evidence; but its evidence, if unsupported by collateral proofs is not unimpeachable, in consequence of the numerous instances of adopted

languages which have occurred within historical times. This drawback to the value of the evidence of language will not materially affect our present inquiry, inasmuch as we shall confine ourselves as much as possible to the general results.

The nomenclature of modern ethnology is not identical with that of the Bible, partly from the enlargement of the area, and partly from the general adoption of language as the basis of classification. The term Shemitic is indeed retained, not, however, to indicate a descent from Shem, but the use of languages allied to that which was current among the Israelites in historical times. Hamitic also finds a place in modern ethnology; but as subordinate to, or coordinate with, Shemitic. Japhetic is superseded mainly by, Indo-European or Aryan. The various nations, or families of nations, which find no place under the Biblical titles are classed by certain ethnologists under the broad title of Turanian, while by others they are broken up into divisions more or less numerous.

1. The first branch of our subject will be to trace the extension of the Shemitic family beyond the limits assigned to it in the Bible. The most marked characteristic of this family, as compared with the Indo-European or Turanian, is its inelasticity. Hemmed in both by natural barriers and by the superior energy and expansiveness of the Aryan and Turanian races, it retains to the present day the *status quo* of early times. The only direction in which it has exhibited; any tendency to expand has been about the shores of the Mediterranean, and even here its activity was of a sporadic character, limited to a single branch of the family, viz. the Phoenicians, and to a single phase of expansion, viz. commercial colonies. In Asia Minor we find tokens of Shemitic presence in Cilicia, which was connected with Phoenicia both by tradition (Herod. 8, 91) and by language, as attested by existing coins (Gesenius, *Mon. Phon.* 3, 2); in Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycia, parts of which were occupied by the Solymi (Pliny, 5, 24; Herod. 1, 173), whose name bears a Shemitic character, and who are reported to have spoken a Shemitic tongue (Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 9:9), a statement confirmed by the occurrence of other Shemitic names, such as Phoenix and Cabalia, though the subsequent predominance of an Aryan population in these same districts is attested by the existing Lycian inscriptions again in Caria, though the evidence arising out of the supposed identity of the names of the gods Osogo *ani* Chrysaoreus with the Οὔσωος and Χρυσώρ of Sanchoniathon is called in question (Renan, *Hist. Genesis* 1, 49); and, lastly, in Lydia, where the descendants of Lud are located by many

authorities, and where the prevalence of a Shemitic language is asserted by scholars of the highest standing, among whom we may specify Bunsen and Lassen, in spite of tokens of *the* contemporaneous presence of the *Aryan* element, as instanced in the name Sardis, and in spite, also, of the historical notices of an ethnical connection with Mysia (Herod. 1, 171). Whether the Shemites ever occupied any portion of the plateau of Asia Minor may be doubted. In the opinion of the ancients the later occupants of Cappadocia were Syrians, distinguished from the mass of their race by a lighter hue, and hence termed *Leucosyri* (Strabo, 12:542); but this statement is traversed by the evidences of Aryanism afforded by the names of the kings and deities, as well as by the Persian character of the religion (*ibid.* 15:733). If, therefore, the Shemites ever occupied this district, they must soon have been brought under the dominion of Aryan conquerors (Diefenbach, *Orig. Europ.* p. 44). The Phoenicians were ubiquitous on the islands and shores of the Mediterranean: in Cyprus, where they have left tokens of their presence at Citium and other places; in Crete; in Malta, where they were the original settlers (Diod. Sic. 5, 12); on the mainland of Greece, where their presence is betokened by the name Cadmus; in Samos, Same, and Samothrace, which bear Shemitic names; in Ios and Tenedos, once known by the name of Phoenice; in Sicily, where Panormus, Motya, and Soloeis were Shemitic settlements; in Sardinia (*ibid.* 5, 35); on the eastern and southern coasts of Spain; and on the north coast of Africa, which was lined with Phoenician colonies from the Syrtis Major to the Pillars of Hercules. They, must also have penetrated deeply into the interior, to judge from Strabo's statement of the destruction of three hundred towns by the Pharusians and Nigritians (Strabo, 17, 826). Still, in none of the countries we have mentioned did they supplant the original population; they were conquerors and settlers, but no more than this.

The bulk of the North African languages, both in ancient and modern times, though not Shemitic in the proper sense of the term, so far resemble that type as to have obtained the title of sub-Shemitic. In the north the old Numidian language appears, from the prevalence of the syllable *Mas* in the name *Massylli*, etc., to be allied to the modern Berber; and the same conclusion has been drawn with regard to the Libyan tongue. The Berber, in turn, together with the Touarick and the great body of the North African dialects, is closely allied to the Coptic of Egypt, and therefore falls under the title of Hamitic, or, according to the more usual nomenclature, sub-Shemitic (Renan, *Hist. Gén.* 1, 201, 202). Southward of Egypt the

Shemitic type is reproduced in the majority of the Abyssinian languages, particularly in the Gheez, and in a less marked degree in the Amharic, the Saho, and the Galla; and Shemitic influence may be traced along the whole east coast of Africa as far as Mozambique (*ibid.* 1, 336-340). As to the languages of the interior and of the south, there appears to be a conflict of opinions, the writer from whom we have just quoted denying any trace of resemblance to the Shemitic type, while Dr. Latham asserts very confidently that connecting-links exist between the sub-Shemitic languages of the north, the Negro languages in the center, and the Caffre languages of the south; and that even the Hottentot language is not so isolated as has generally been supposed (*Man and his Migrat.* p. 134-148). Bunsen supports this view so far as the languages north of the equator are concerned, but regards the southern as rather approximating to the Turanian type (*Philippians of Hist.* 1, 178; 2, 20). It is impossible as yet to form a decided opinion on this large subject.

A question of considerable interest remains yet to be noticed, namely, whether we can trace the Shemitic family back to its original cradle. In the case of the Indo-European family this can be done with a high degree of probability; and if an original unity existed between these stocks, the domicile of the one would necessarily be that of the other. A certain community of ideas and traditions favors this assumption, and possibly the frequent allusions to the east in the early chapters of Genesis may contain a reminiscence of the direction in which the primeval abode lay (Renan, *Hist. Gen.* 1, 476). The position of this abode we shall describe presently.

2. The Indo-European family of languages, as at present constituted, consists of the following nine classes: Indian, Iranian, Celtic, Italian, Albanian, Greek, Teutonic, Lithuanian, and Slavonian. Geographically, these classes may be grouped together in two divisions, Eastern and Western; the former comprising the first two, the latter the seven remaining classes. Schleicher divides what we have termed the Western into two, the South-west European and the North European; in the former of which he places the Greek, Albanian, Italian, and Celtic; in the latter, the Slavonian, Lithuanian, and Teutonic (*Compend.* 1, 5). Prof. M. Muller combines the Slavonian and Lithuanian classes in the Windic, thus reducing the number to eight. These classes exhibit various degrees of affinity to each other, which are described by Schleicher in the following manner: The earliest deviation from the common language of the family was effected by the Slavono-Teutonic branch. After another interval a second bifurcation

occurred, which separated what we may term the Graeco-Italo-Celtic branch from the Aryan. The former held together for a while, and then threw off the Greek (including probably the Albanian), leaving the Celtic and Italian still connected: the final division of the latter two took place after another considerable interval. The first mentioned branch the Slavono Teutonic remained intact for a period somewhat longer than that which witnessed the second bifurcation of the original stock, and then divided into the Teutonic and Slavono-Lithuanian, which latter finally broke up into its two component elements. The Aryan branch similarly held together for a lengthened period, and then bifurcated into the Indian and Iranian. The conclusion Schleicher draws from these linguistic affinities is that the more easterly of the European nations, the Slavonians and Teutons, were the first to leave the common home of the Indo-European race; that they were followed by the Celts, Italians, and Greeks; and that the Indian and Iranian branches were the last to commence their migrations. We feel unable to accept this conclusion, which appears to us to be based on the assumption that the antiquity of a language is to be measured by its approximation to Sanskrit. Looking at the geographical position of the representatives of the different language classes, we should infer that the most westerly were the earliest immigrants into Europe, and therefore probably the earliest emigrants from the primeval seat of the race; and we believe this to be confirmed by linguistic proofs of the high antiquity of the Celtic as compared with the other branches of the Indo-European family (*Bunsen, Philippians of Hist.* 1, 168).

The original seat of the Indo-European race was on the plateau of Central Asia, probably to the westward of the Bolor and Mustagh ranges. The Indian branch can be traced back to the slopes of Himalaya by the geographical allusions in the Vedic hymns (Miller, *Lectures*, p. 201); in confirmation of which we may adduce the circumstance that the sole tree for which the Indians have an appellation in common with the western nations is one which in India is found only on the southern slope of that range (Pott, *Etym. Forsch.* 1, 110). The westward progress of the Iranian tribes is a matter of history, and though we cannot trace this progress back to its fountain-head, the locality above mentioned best accords with the traditional belief of the Asiatic Aryans and with the physical and geographical requirements of the case (Renan, *Hist. Généralé* 1, 481).

The routes by which the various western branches reached their respective localities can only be conjectured. We may suppose them to have

successively crossed the plateau of Iran until they reached Armenia, whence they might follow either a northerly course across Caucasus, and by the shore of the Black Sea, or a direct westerly one along the plateau of Asia Minor, which seems destined by nature to be the bridge between the two continents of Europe and Asia. A third route has been surmised for a portion of the Celtic stock, viz. along the north coast of Africa, and across the Straits of Gibraltar into Spain (Bunsen, *Philippians of Hist.*, 1, 148); but we see little confirmation of this opinion beyond the fact of the early presence of the Celtae in that peninsula, which is certainly difficult to account for.

The eras of the several migrations are again very much a matter of conjecture. The original movements belong, for the most part, to the ante-historical age, and we can do no more than note the period at which we first encounter the several nations.; That the Indian Aryans had reached the mouth of the Indus at all events before B.C. 1000 appears from the Sanskrit names of the articles which Solomon imported from that country. *SEE INDIA*. The presence of Aryans on the Shemitic frontier is as old as the composition of the Mosaic table; and, according to some authorities, is proved by the names of the confederate kings in the age of Abraham (Gen. 14, 1; *Renan, Hist. Gen.* 1, 61). The Aryan Medes are mentioned in the Assyrian annals about B.C. 900. The Greeks were settled on the peninsula named after them, as well as on the islands of the 2Egean, long before the dawn of history, and the Italians had reached their quarters at a yet earlier period. The Celtae had reached the west of Europe at all events before, probably very long before, the age of Hecataeus (B.C. 500); the latest branch of this stock arrived there about that period, according to Bunsen's conjecture (*Philippians of Hist.* 1, 152). The Teutonic migration followed at a long interval after the Celtic: Pytheas found them already seated on the shores of the Baltic in the age of Alexander the Great (Pliny, '37:11), and the term *glesum* itself, by which amber was described in that district, belongs to them (Diefenbach, *Orig. Europ.* p. 359). The earliest historical notice of them depends on the view taken of the nationality of the Teutones, who accompanied the Cimbri on their southern expedition in B.C. 113-102. If these were Celtic, as is not uncommonly thought, then we must look to Cassar and Tacitus for the earliest definite notices of the Teutonic tribes. The Slavonian immigration was nearly contemporaneous with the Teutonic (Bunsen, *Philippians of Hist.* 1, 72): this stock can be traced back to the *Veneti* or *Venedae* of Northern Germany, first

mentioned by Tacitus (*Germ.* 46), from whom the name *Wend* is probably descended. The designation of *Slavi* or *Sclavi* is of comparatively late date, and applied specially to the western branch of the Slavonian stock. The Lithuanians are probably represented by the *Galindae* and *Sudeni* of Ptolemy (3, 5, 21), the names of which tribes have been preserved in all ages in the Lithuanian district (Diefenbach, p. 202). They are frequently identified with the *AEstui*, and it is not impossible that they may have adopted the title, which was a geographical one (the *east* men) the-Estui of Tacitus, however, were Germans. In the above statements we have omitted the problematical identifications of the Northern stocks with the earlier nations of history; we may here mention that the Slavonians are not infrequently regarded as the representatives of the Scythians (Skolots) and the Sarmatians (Knobel *Vgilkert.* p. 69). The writer whom we have just cited also endeavors to connect the Lithuanians with the Agathyrsi (p. 130). So, again, Grimm traced the Teutonic stock to the Getae, whom he identified with the Goths (*Gesch. d. deutsch. Spr.* 1, 178).

It may be asked whether the Aryan race were the first-comers in the lands which they occupied in historical times, or whether they superseded an earlier population. With regard to the Indian branch this question, can be answered decisively; the vestiges of an aboriginal population, which once covered the plains of Hindostan, still exist in the southern extremity of the peninsula, as well as in isolated localities elsewhere, as instanced in the case of the Brahuis of the North. Not only this, but the Indian class of languages possesses a peculiarity of sound (the lingual or cerebral consonants), which is supposed to have been derived from this population and to betoken a fusion of the conquerors and the conquered (Schleicher, *Compend.* 1, 141). The languages of this early population are classed as Turanian (Miller, *Lect.* p. 399). We are unable to find decided traces of Turanians on the plateau of Iran. The Sacoe, of whom we have already spoken, were Scythians, and so were the Parthians, both by reputed descent (Justin, 41, 1) and by habits of life (Strabo, 11:515); but we cannot positively assert that they were Turanians, inasmuch as the term Scythian was also applied, as in the case of the Skolots, to Indo-Europeans. In the Caucasian district the Iberians and others may have been Turanian in early as in later times; but it is difficult to unravel the entanglement of races and languages in that district. In Europe there exists in the present day an undoubted Turanian population eastward of the Baltic, viz. the Finns, who have been located there certainly since the time of Tacitus (*Germ.* 46), and

who probably at an earlier period had spread more to the southward, but had been gradually thrust back by the advance of the Teutonic and Slavonian nations (Diefenbach, *Orig. Europ.* p. 209). There exists, again, in the South a population whose language (the *Basque*, or, as it is entitled in its own land, the *Euskara*) presents numerous points of affinity to the Finnish in grammar, though its vocabulary is wholly distinct. We cannot consider the Turanian character of this language as fully established, and we are therefore unable to divine the ethnic affinities of the early Iberians, who are generally regarded as the progenitors of the Basques. We have already adverted to the theory that the Finns in the North and the Basques in the South are the surviving monuments of a Turanian population, which overspread the whole of Europe before the arrival of the Indo-Europeans. This is a mere theory which can neither be proved nor disproved.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to assign to the various subdivisions of the Indo European stock their respective areas, or, where admixture has taken place, their relative proportions. Language and race are, as already observed, by no means coextensive. The Celtic race, for instance, which occupied Gaul, Northern Italy, large portions of Spain and Germany, and even penetrated across the Hellespont into Asia Minor, where it gave name to the province of Galatia, is now represented linguistically by the insignificant populations among whom the Welsh and the Gaelic or Erse languages retain a lingering existence. The Italian race, on the other hand, which must have been well nigh annihilated by or absorbed in, the overwhelming masses of the Northern hordes, has imposed its language outside the bounds of Italy over the peninsula of Spain, France, and Wallachia. But, while the races have so intermingled as in many instances to lose all trace of, their original individuality, the broad fact of their descent from one or other of the branches of the Indo-European family remains unaffected. It is, indeed, impossible to affiliate all the nations whose names appear on the roll of history to the existing divisions of that family, in consequence of the absence or the obscurity of ethnological criteria. Where, for instance, shall we place the languages of Asia Minor and the adjacent districts? The Phrygian approximates perhaps to the Greek, and yet it differs from it materially both in form and vocabulary (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 666); still more is this the case with the Lycian, which appears to possess a vocabulary wholly distinct from its kindred languages (*ibid.* 1, 669, 677-679). The Armenian is ranged under the Iranian division; yet this, as well as the language of the Caucasian Ossetes,

whose indigenous name of Ir or *Iron* seems to vindicate for them the same relationship, is so distinctive in its features as to render the connection dubious. The languages prevalent in the mountainous district answering to the ancient Pontus are equally peculiar (Diefenbach, *Orig. Europ.* p. 51). Passing to the westward, we encounter the Thracians, reputed by Herodotus (5, 3) the most powerful nation in the world, tie Indians excepted; yet but one word of their language (*bria* = "town") has survived, and all historical traces of the people have been obliterated. It is true that they are represented in later times by the Getae, and these in turn by the Daci; but neither of these can be tracked either by history or language, unless we accept Grimm's more than doubtful identification which would connect them with the Teutonic branch. The remains of the Scythian language are sufficient to establish the Indo-European affinities of that nation (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 3, 196-203), but insufficient to assign to it a definite place in: the family, The Scythians, as well as most of the nomad tribes associated with them, are lost to the eye of the ethnologist, having been either absorbed into other nationalities or swept away by the ravages of war. The Sarmatae can be traced down to the Iazyges of Hungary and Podlachia, in which latter district they survived until the 10th century of our era (Smith, *Dict. of Geog.* 2, 8), and then they also vanish. The Allanian language presents a problem of a different kind: materials for research are not wanting in this case, but no definite conclusions have as yet been drawn from them. The people who use this tongue (the *Skipetares*, as they call themselves) are generally regarded as the representatives of the old Illyrians, who in turn appear to have been closely connected with the Thracians (Strabo, 7:315; Justin, 11:1), the name Dardani being, found both in Illyria and on the shores of the Hellespont; it is not, therefore, improbable that the Albanian may contain whatever vestiges of the old Thracian tongue still survive (Diefenbach, *Orig. Europ.* p. 68). In the Italic peninsula the Etruscan tongue remains as great an enigma as ever its Indo-European character is supposed to be established, together with the probability of its being a mixed language (Bunsen, *Philipians of Hist.* 1, 85-88). The result of researches into the Umbrian language, as represented in the Eugubine tablets, the earliest of which date from about B.C. 400; into the Sabellian, as represented in the tablets of Velletri and Antino; and into the Oscan, of which the remains are numerous, have decided their position as members of the Italic class (*ibid.* 1, 90-94). The same cannot be asserted of the Mesapian or Iapygian language, which stands apart from all neighboring dialects. Its Indo-

European character is affirmed, but no ethnological conclusion can as yet be drawn from the scanty information afforded us (*ibid.* 1, 94). Lastly, within the Celtic area there are ethnological problems which we cannot pretend to solve. The Ligurians, for instance, present one of these problems: were they Celts, but belonging to an earlier migration than the Celts of history? Their name has been referred to a Welsh original, but on this no great reliance can be placed, as it would be in this case a local (*coast men*) and not an ethnical title, and might have been imposed on them by the Celts. They evidently hold a posterior place to the Iberians, inasmuch as they are said to have driven a section of this people across the Alps into Italy. That they were distinct from the Celts is asserted by Strabo (2, 128), but the distinction may have been no greater than exists between the British and the Gaelic branches of that race. The admixture of the Celts and Iberians in the Spanish peninsula is again a somewhat intricate question, which Dr. Latham attempts to explain on the ground that the term Celt (**Κέλται**) really meant Iberian (*Ethn. of Eur.* p. 35). That such questions as these should arise: on a subject which carries us back to times of hoar antiquity forms no ground for doubting the general conclusion that we can account ethnologically for the population of the European continent.

3. The Shemitic and Indo-European families cover, after all, but an insignificant portion of the earth's surface the large areas of Northern and Eastern Asia, the numerous groups of islands that line its coast and stud the Pacific in the direction of South America, and, again, the immense continent of America itself, stretching well nigh from pole to pole, remain to be accounted for. Historical aid is almost wholly denied to the ethnologist in his researches in these quarters; physiology and language are his only guides. It can hardly, therefore, be matter of surprise if we are unable to obtain certainty, or even a reasonable degree of probability, on this part of our subject. Much has been done; but far more remains to be done before the data for forming a conclusive opinion can be obtained. In Asia the languages fall into two large classes the monosyllabic and the agglutinative. The former are represented ethnologically by the Chinese, the latter by the various nations classed together by Prof. M. Muller under the common head of Turanian. It is unnecessary for us to discuss the correctness of his view in regarding all these nations as members of one and the same family. Whether we accept or reject his theory, the fact of a gradation of linguistic types and of connecting links between the various

branches remains unaffected, and for our present purpose the question is of comparatively little moment. The monosyllabic type apparently betokens the earliest movement from the common home of the human race, and we should therefore assign a chronological priority to the settlement of the Chinese in the east and southeast of the continent. The agglutinative languages fall geographically into two divisions, a Northern and Southern. The Northern consists of a well-defined group, or family, designated by German ethnologists the Ural-Altaiian. It consists of the following five branches:

- (1.) The Tungusian, covering large area east of the river Yenisei, between Lake Baikal and the Tunguska.
- (2.) The Mongolian, which prevails over the Great Desert of Gobi, and among the Kalmucks, wherever their nomad habits lead them on the steppes either of Asia or Europe, in the latter of which they are found about the lower course of the Volga.
- (3.) The Turkish, covering an immense area from the Mediterranean in the south-west to the river Lena in the north-east; in Europe spoken by the Osmanli, who form the governing class in Turkey; by the Nogai, between the Caspian and the Sea of Azof; and by various Caucasian tribes.
- (4.) The Samoiedic, on the coast of the Arctic Ocean, between the White Sea in the west and the river Anabara in the east.
- (5.) The Finnish, which is spoken by the Finns and Lapps; by the inhabitants of Esthonia and Livonia to the south of the Gulf of Finland; by various tribes about the Volga (the Tcheremissians and Mordvinians) and the Kama (the Votiakes and Permians); and, lastly, by the Magyars of Hungary.

The Southern branch is subdivided into the following four classes: —

- (1.) The Tamulian, of the south of Hindostan.
- (2.) The Bhotlya, of Thibet, the sub-Himalayan district (Nepaul and Bhotan), and the Lohitic languages east of the Brahmapootra.
- (3.) The Tai, in Siam, Laos, Anam, and Pegu.

(4.) The Malay, of the Malay peninsula, and the adjacent islands; the latter being the original settlement of the Malay race, whence they spread in comparatively modern times to the mainland.

The early movements of the races representing these several divisions can only be: divined by linguistic tokens. Prof. M. Miller assigns to the Northern tribes the following chronological order: Tungusian, Mongolian, Turkish, and Finnish; and to the Southern division the following: Tai, Malay, Bhotiya, and Tamulian (*Philippians of Hist.* 1, 481). Geographically it appears more likely that the Malay preceded the Tai, inasmuch as they occupied a more southerly district. The later movements of the European branches of the Northern division can be traced historically. The Turkish race commenced their Westerly migration from the neighborhood of the Altai range in the 1st century of our era; in the 6th they had reached the Caspian 'and the Volga; in the 11th and 12th the Turcomans took possession of their present quarters south of Caucasus; in the 13th the Osmanli made their first appearance in Western Asia; about the middle of the 14th they crossed from Asia Minor into Europe; and in the middle of the 15th they had established themselves at Constantinople. The Finnish race is supposed to have been originally settled about the Ural range, and thence to have migrated westward to the shores of the Baltic, which they had reached at a period anterior to the Christian era; in the 7th century a branch pressed southward to the Danube, and founded the kingdom of Bulgaria, where, however, they have long ceased to have any national existence. The Ugrian tribes, who are the early representatives of the Hungarian Magyars, approached Europe from Asia in the 5th and settled in Hungary in the 9th century of our era. The central point from which the various branches of the Turanian family radiated would appear to be about Lake Baikal. With regard to the ethnology of Oceania and America we can say but little. The languages of the former are generally supposed to be connected with the Malay class (Bunsen, *Philippians of Hist.* 2, 114); but the relations, both linguistic and ethnological, existing between the Malay and the black or Negrito, population, which is found on many of the groups of islands, are not well defined. The approximation in language is far greater than in physiology (Latham, *Essays*, p. 213, 218; Garnett, *Essays*, p. 310), and in certain cases amounts to identity (Kennedy, *Essays*, p. 85); but the whole subject is at present involved in obscurity.: The polysynthetic languages of North America are regarded as emanating from the Mongolian stock (Bunsen, *Philippians of Hist.* 2, 111),

and a close affinity is said to exist between the North American and the Kamtchadale and Corean languages on the opposite coast of Asia (Latham, *Man and his Migrat.* p. 185). The conclusion drawn from this would be that the population of America entered by way of Behring's Strait. Other theories have, however, been broached on this subject. It has been conjectured that the chain of islands which stretches across the Pacific may have conducted a Malay population to South America; and, again, an African origin has been claimed for the Caribs of Central America (Kennedy-, *Essays*, p. 100-123). In conclusion, we may safely assert the tendency of all ethnological and linguistic researches to discover the elements of unity amid the most striking external varieties. Already the myriads of the human race are massed together into a few large groups. Whether it will ever be possible to go beyond this, and to show the historical unity of these groups, is more than we can undertake to say. But we entertain the firm persuasion that in their broad results these sciences will yield an increasing testimony to the truth of the Bible.

III. The authorities referred to in the foregoing article are, Miller, *Lectures on the Science of Language* (1862); Bunsen, *Philosophy of History* (1854, 2 vols.); Renan, *Histoire Généralé des Langues Semitiques* (3rd ed. 1863); Knobel, *Volkertafel der Genesis* (1850); Humboldt [W. von], *Ueber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen SpTachba.ues* (1836); Delitzsch, *Jeshurun* (1858); *Transactions of the Philological Society*; Rawlinson, *Ierodotus* (1858, 4 vols.); Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen* (1833); Garnett, *Essays* (1859); Schleicher, *Compendium der vergleichenden Grammatik* (i861); Diefenbach, *Origines Europae* (eod.); Ewald, *Sprachwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen* (1862). **SEE ETHNOLOGY.**

Tongues Of Fire.

In the account of the first descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles, it is stated (~~4HB~~ Acts 2:3) that "there appeared unto them *cloven tongues as of fire* (διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πῦρός), and it sat upon each of them." They were appearances of tongues, which were luminous but did not burn; not confluent into one, but distributing themselves on the assembled. As only *similar* to fire, they bore an analogy to *electric* phenomena; their tongue like shape referred as a sign to that miraculous speaking which ensued immediately after, and the fire-like form to the divine presence (comp. ~~4HB~~ Ezekiel 3:2), which was here operative in a

manner so entirely peculiar. The whole phenomenon is here to be understood as a miraculous operation of God manifesting himself in the Spirit, by which, as by a preceding sound from heaven, the effusion of the Spirit was made known as *divine*, and his efficacy in the minds of those who were to receive him was enhanced” (Meyer, *ad loc.*). See. Thilo, *De Linguis qgnitis* (Viteb. 1675). *SEE FIRE*; *SEE TONGUE*.

Tongues, Gift Of.

This was an endowment first imparted to the apostles, *anti* apparently to all the assembled disciples, on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards continued to the Christians during the apostolic age. John the Baptist, himself a burning and a shining light. had testified of Christ, “He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” After Jesus had been crucified, and before he ascended, he breathed on his disciples and said, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” The influence so communicated must have been precious, but it was only the earnest of the inheritance, and not the entire fulfillment of John’s prediction. By their secular views of the Messiah’s sovereignty the disciples showed that they had not yet been favored with the full baptism of the Spirit. “When they were come together, they asked of him, saying, Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” This question implied entire confidence in the power of Christ, but it evinced no clear conceptions of the spirituality of his reign. Fifty days after the crucifixion the promise of the Father had its accomplishment, and the disciples received a special power when the Holy Ghost came upon them. Why was hope so long deferred? There was wisdom in this delay, as indicating divine presidency and direction in the ordering of the event. If the apostles were to be excited and bestirred merely by the dire experience they had passed through, the effect on natural principles should have been speedily consequent on the cause. Procrastination was calculated to sober tumultuous passion, and to restrain imperiling enterprise. In this view the descent of the Spirit received confirmation from occurring after a considerable interval of tranquility and inaction. The specific day had also its significance. Pentecost was the feast of first-fruits, the commencement and the consecration of the harvest: and it formed, therefore, the fitting moment for the formal introduction of that work of the Spirit by which was to be secured the spiritual harvest of Christ’s finished work. It had also come to be regarded as commemorative of the giving of the law from

Sinai—the magnificent initiation of the Mosaic economy — and the period of the latter event must certainly have coincided very nearly, if not absolutely, with that of the other (^{<291>}Exodus 19:11). Then God spake, and the mountain burned with fire. The season so regarded was suitable for the introduction of another and related era, the inauguration of the Gospel economy and anew God reveals himself by analogous manifestations. “Suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.” This sound resembled the roar of the tempest; but instead of proceeding from any point of the compass, it descended from heaven. Here, as in the wilderness, was the voice of God, a voice full of majesty. “And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.” Here we have the fiery attribute of Sinai. But now it takes the form of tongues, to denote that God while speaking was endowing with speech, and that his voice like echoing thunder would multiply itself through the reverberating media on which it fell. The tongues were cloven, but into what number of divisions we are not informed. As happens with the variable flames of a furnace, the gleaming points may have been unequally numerous. No one had all tongues in his gift; perhaps no two the same tongues, but in every case there was a plurality. The general subject has already been considered under *SEE HOLY SPIRIT, BAPTISM OF*, and certain aspects of it under the foregoing heading, and under *SEE SPIRITUAL GIFTS*. We here give (in addition to particulars elsewhere treated) a more detailed view of the linguistic phenomenon involved.

I. *Philological Interpretations of the Term.* — Γλῶττα, or γλῶσσα, the word employed throughout the, New Test. for the gift now under consideration, is used in three senses, *SEE TONGUE*, each of which might be the starting-point for the application of the word to the gift of tongues, and each accordingly has found those who have maintained that it is so.

1. It primarily and literally signifies the bodily organ of speech. Eichhorn and Bardili (cited by Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 8 sq.), and to some extent Bunsen (*Hyppolytus*, 1, 9), starting from this signification, see in the so-called gift an inarticulate utterance, the cry as of a brute creature, in which the tongue moves while the lips refuse their office in making the sounds definite and distinct.

This interpretation, it is believed, does not meet the condition of answering any of the facts of the New Test., and errs in ignoring the more prominent meaning of the word in later Greek.

2. The term **γλωσσα** may stand for the use of foreign words, imported and half naturalized in Greek (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3, 2, 14), a meaning which the words “gloss” and “glossary” preserve for us. Bleek himself (*ut sup.* p. 33) adopts this second meaning, and gives an interesting collection of passages to prove that it was, in the time of the New Test., the received sense. He infers from this that to speak in tongues was to use unusual, poetic language; that the speakers were in a high-wrought excitement which showed itself in mystic, figurative terms.: In this view he had been preceded by Ernesti (*Opusc. Theolog.*; see *Morning Watch*, 4:101) and Herdelr (*Die Gabe der Spirache*, p. 47, 70), the latter of whom extends the meaning to special mystical interpretations-of the Old Test.

This interpretation, however, though true in some of its conclusions, and able, so far as they are concerned, to support itself by the authority of Augustine (comp. *De Genesis ad lit.* 12:8, “Linguam esse cum quis loquatur obscuras et mysticas significationes”) appears faulty, as failing (1) to recognize the fact that the sense of the word in the New Test. was more likely to be determined by that which it bore in the Sept. than by its meaning in Greek historians or rhetoricians and (2) to meet the phenomena of Acts 2.

3. The word **γλωσσα**, in Hellenistic Greek, after the pattern of the corresponding Hebrew word (**לשון**), stands for “speech” or “language” (¹⁰¹⁰⁵Genesis 10:5; ²⁰¹⁰⁴Daniel 1:4, etc.). The received traditional view starts from this meaning, and sees in the gift of tongues a distinctly linguistic power. It commends itself, as in this respect starting at least from the right point, and likely to lead us to the truth (comp. Olshausen, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 538). Variations as well as objections and difficulties arising from this interpretation will be considered below.

II. History and Explanation of the Biblical Occurrences. —The principal passages from which we have to draw our conclusion as to the nature and purpose of the gift in question are (1) ¹¹⁶¹⁷Mark 16:17; (2) ⁴¹⁰¹Acts 2:1-13; 10:46; 19:6; (3) ⁶¹²⁴1 Corinthians 12:14. Besides these, we may derive some light from later allusions incidentally made to these phenomena. We

here consider them in their chronological order, with such inferences as are suggested by them.

1. The promise of a new power coming from the Divine Spirit, giving not only comfort and insight into truth, but fresh powers of utterance of some kind, appears once and again in our Lord's teaching. The disciples are to take no thought what they shall speak, for the Spirit of their Father shall speak in them (^{<4009>}Matthew 10:19, 20; ^{<4131>}Mark 13:11). The lips of Galilaean peasants are to speak freely and boldly before kings. The only condition is that they are "not to premeditate" to yield themselves altogether to the power that works on them. Thus they shall have given to them "a mouth and wisdom" which no adversary shall be able "to gainsay or resist." In ^{<4167>}Mark 16:17 we have a more definite term employed: "They shall speak with new tongues" (**καιναῖς γλώσσαις**). It can hardly be questioned that the obvious meaning of the promise, is that the disciples should speak in new languages which they had not learned as other men learn them. The promise itself, however, determines little definite as to the nature of the gift or the purpose for which it was to be employed. It was to be a "sign." It was not to belong to a chosen few only — to apostles and evangelists. It was to "follow them that believed" to be among the fruits of the living intense faith which raised men above the common level of their lives, and brought them within the kingdom of God.

2. The wonder of the day of Pentecost (^{<4400>}Acts 2:1-13) is, in its broad features, familiar enough to us. The days since the ascension had been spent as in a ceaseless ecstasy of worship (^{<4263>}Luke 24:53). The one hundred and twenty disciples were gathered together, waiting with eager expectation for the coming of power from on high of the Spirit that was to give them new gifts of utterance. The day of Pentecost had come, which they, like all other Israelites, looked upon as the witness of the revelation of the Divine Will given on Sinai. Suddenly there swept over them "the sound as of a rushing mighty wind," such as Ezekiel had heard in the visions of God by Chebar (^{<3024>}Ezekiel 1:24; 43:2), at all times the recognized symbol of a spiritual creative power (comp. 37:1-14; ^{<4002>}Genesis 1:2; ^{<4191>}1 Kings 19:11; ^{<4454>}2 Chronicles 5:14; ^{<3940>}Psalms 104:3, 4). With this there was another sign associated even more closely with their thoughts of the day of Pentecost. There appeared unto them "tongues like as of fire." Of old the brightness had been seen gleaming through the "thick cloud" (^{<4298>}Exodus 19:18) or "enfolding" the divine glory (^{<3004>}Ezekiel 1:4). Now the tongues were distributed (**διαμεριζομεναι**), lighting upon each

of them. The outward symbol was accompanied by an inward change. They were “filled with the Holy Spirit,” as the Baptist and their Lord had been (⁴⁰¹⁵Luke 1:15; 4:1), though they themselves had as yet no experience of a like kind. “They began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.” The narrative that follows leaves hardly any room for doubt that the writer meant to convey the impression that the disciples were heard to speak in languages of which they had no colloquial knowledge previously. The direct statement, “They heard them speaking, each man in his own dialect,” the long list of nations, the words put into the lips of the hearers these *can* scarcely reconciled with the theories of Bleek, Herder, and Bunsen without a willful distortion of the evidence.

Having thus recited the facts in this case, we inquire, What view are we to take of a phenomenon so marvelous and exceptional? Let us first consider what views men have actually taken.

(1.) The prevalent belief of the Church has been that in the Pentecostal gift the disciples received a supernatural knowledge of all such languages, as they needed for their work as evangelists. The knowledge was permanent, and could be used at their own will, as if it had been acquired in the common order of things. With this they went forth to preach to the nations. Differences of opinion are found as to special points. Augustine thought that each disciple spoke in all languages (*De Verb. Apost.* 175, 3); Chrysostom that each had a special language assigned to him, and that this was the indication of the country which he was called to evangelize (*Hom. in Act.* 2). Some thought that the number of languages spoken was seventy or seventy-five, after the number of the sons of Noah (Genesis 10) or the sons of Jacob (ch. 46), or one hundred and twenty, after that of the disciples (comp. Baronius, *Annul.* 1, 97). Most were agreed in seeing in the Pentecostal gift the antithesis to the confusion of tongues at Babel, the witness of a restored unity. “Poena linguarum dispersit homines, donum linguarum dispersos in unum populum collegit” (Grotius, *ad loc.*).

We notice incidentally that parallels have been sought in Israelitic history. For example, there had been, it was said, tongues of fire on the original Pentecost (Schneckenburger, *Beitrag*, p. 8, referring to Buxtorf, *De Synag.*, and Philo, *De Decal.*). The later rabbis were not without their legends of a like “baptism of fire.” Nicodemus ben-Gorion and Jochanan benZachai, men of great holiness and wisdom, went into an upper chamber

to expound the law, and the house began to be full of fire (Lightfoot, *flari.* 3, 14; Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb. in Act. 2*). Again, with regard to the more important phenomenon, it deserves notice that there are analogies in Jewish belief. Every word that went forth from the mouth of God on Sinai was said to have been divided into the seventy languages of the sons of men (Wettstein, *On Acts 2*); and *the bath-kol*, the echo of the voice of God, was heard by every man in his own tongue (Schneckenburger, *Beitribe*). So, as regards the power of speaking, there was a tradition that the great rabbins of the Sanhedrim could speak all the seventy languages of the world.

The following are some of the direct arguments urged in favor of a literal view of the Pentecostal endowment:

(a) The power in question was virtually promised to the apostles by the very duty assigned them. They were enjoined to ‘go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. They were to be witnesses for Christ in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth.’ But how could they instruct remote tribes whose phraseology was a Babel to them, unless they were divinely qualified for the work?

(b) This power was in keeping with the occasion., The old economy was characteristically ritualistic. It addressed the eye, and made an impression by its superb ceremonial. The Christian dispensation was to be simple, and its strength would lie in the preaching of the word. To speak with other tongues was indeed a new thing on the earth, but so was the exigency, which rendered it appropriate. Judaism was local made purposely restrictive to preclude amalgamation with the heathen. Now there was to be catholicity, and what could better symbolize it in Christian agency than a competence to instruct the whole world, to be mouth and wisdom to all its inhabitants?

(c) We never read of foreign tongues creating any impediment to the spread of the Gospel, or requiring laborious application for the acquisition of them. If we look into modern missionary reports, we meet with a great deal about learning the languages of natives. Why is there nothing of the kind in the New Test., unless because they were acquired supernaturally?

(d) The account in Acts 2 is explicit, and allows of no uncertainty or evasion. The speakers were Galileans, capable at most of expressing themselves in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew; and a multitude of foreigners

from a great many regions heard themselves accosted as in the land of their birth. If the apostles spoke just as they might have been expected to speak, and with no more compass of expression than suited their-condition and history, why should any astonishment have been produced by their attainments? But the multitudes were confounded, and they were all amazed and marveled, not merely at the doctrines propounded, but, specifically, because every man heard them speak in his own language. How came Galileans, they asked, to be such linguists? to be so familiar with languages alien to their annals? There is here an obviousness of meaning which no subtlety or sophistry can ever explain away.”

Widely diffused as this view of the Pentecostal gift has been, it has been thought-by some, in some points at least, that it goes beyond the data with which the New Test. supplies us. Each instance of the gift recorded in the Acts connects it, not so much with the work of teaching as with that of praise and adoration; not with the normal order of men’s lives, but with exceptional epochs in them. (In the first instance, however, the gift certainly was largely instrumental in the conversion of hearers; and even among the Corinthians [⁴¹⁶1 Corinthians 14:16, 17] the utterance, when properly interpreted, was a means of general edification.) It came and went as the Spirit gave men the power of utterance in this respect analogous to the other gift of prophecy with which it was so often associated (⁴²⁶Acts 2:16, 17; 19:6) and was not possessed by them as a thing to be used this way or that, according as they chose. (It appears, however, that even the prophetic afflatus was amenable to the subject’s will [⁴³²1 Corinthians 14:32], and the gift in question was to be voluntarily exercised or forborne [ver. 28-30].) The speech of Peter which follows, like most other speeches addressed to a Jerusalem audience, was spoken apparently in Aramraic. (But this does not prove that Peter always spoke in that language.) When Paul, who “spake with tongues more than all,” was at Lystra, there is no ‘mention made of his using the language of Lycaonia. It is implied, however, that either he or Luke understood it (⁴⁴¹Acts 14:11). It is rarely implied in the discussion of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 12-14 that the gift was of this nature, or given for this purpose. The objection that if it had been, the apostle would surely have told those who possessed it to go and preach to the outlying nations of the heathen world, instead of disturbing the Church by what, on this hypothesis, would have been a needless and offensive ostentation (comp. Stanley, *Corinthians* [2nd ed.], p. 261), may readily be met by the consideration that Corinth, as a seaport,

was almost as much a polyglot community as Jerusalem. Without laying much stress on the tradition that Peter was followed in his work by Mark as an interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής) (Papias, in Eusebius, *II. E.* 3, 30), that even Paul was accompanied by Titus in the same character “Quia non potuit divinatorum sensuum majestatem digno Graeci eloquii sermone explicare” (Jerome, quoted by Estius on *2 Corinthians* 2) they must at least be received as testimonies that the age which was nearest to the phenomena did not take the same view of them as those have done who lived at a greater distance. The testimony of Irenaeus (*Adv. alcer.* 6:6), sometimes urged in support of the common view, in reality decides nothing, and, so far as it goes, tends against it (*infra*). It is also affirmed that within the limits assigned by the providence of God to the working of the apostolic Church such a gift was unnecessary. Aramaic, Greek, Latin, the three languages of the inscription on the cross, were media of intercourse throughout the empire. Greek alone sufficed, as the New Test. shows us, for the churches of the West, for Macedonia and Achaia, for Pontus, Asia, Phrygia. The conquests of Alexander and of Rome had made men *diglottic* to an extent, which has no parallel in history. But it is one thing to speak in a language imperfectly acquired by speaker and hearer, yet foreign to them both, and a very different thing and one, we may add, highly important for the *personal* influence requisite to Gospel conviction to be able to converse fluently in the native tongue of the congregation. The objection that we have no evidence of any actual use of the voluntary power of foreign languages by the apostles in propagating the Gospel is merely negative, and cannot stand in the light of the facts recorded in the case under consideration. Equally inconclusive is the objection against the *psychological* character of the miracle of a sudden importation of a language not learned; for it lies with quite as much force against the communication of the knowledge of a future event, and indeed it would forbid not only all prophecy, but all inspiration itself. It is a suspicious circumstance connected with all this class of objections that their essence seems to lie in a crypto-rationalistic spirit, which really opposes the miraculous altogether, and seeks on every occasion to explain Scripture prodigies by natural causes. **SEE MIRACLE.**

(2.) Accordingly, some interpreters have advanced another solution of the difficulty by changing the character of the miracle. It lay not in any new power bestowed on the speakers, but in the impression produced on the hearers. Words which the Galilean disciples uttered in their own tongue

were heard by those who listened as in their native speech. This view we find adopted by Gregory of Nyssa (*De Spir. Sanct.*), discussed, but not accepted, by Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat. c. 44*), and reproduced by Erasmus (*ad loc.*). A modification of the same theory is presented by Schneckenburger (*Beitrage*), and in part adopted by Olshausen (*loc. cit.*) and Neander (*Pflanz. u. Leit. 1, 15*). The phenomena of somnambulism, of the so-called mesmeric state, are referred to as analogous. The speaker was en *rapport* with his hearers; the latter shared the thoughts of the former, and so heard them, or seemed to hear them, in their own tongues.

There are weighty reasons against this hypothesis.

- (a) It is at variance with the distinct statement of ~~410~~ Acts 2:4, "They began to speak with other tongues."
 - (b) It at once multiplies the miracle and degrades its character. Not the one hundred and twenty-disciples, but the whole multitude of many thousands, are in this case the subjects of it. The gift no longer connects itself with the work of the Divine Spirit, following on intense faith and earnest prayer, but is a mere physical prodigy wrought upon men who are altogether wanting in the conditions of capacity for such a supernatural power (~~4167~~ Mark 16:17).
 - (c) It involves an element of falsehood. The miracle, on this view, was wrought to make men believe what was not actually the fact.
 - (d) It is altogether inapplicable to the phenomena of Corinthians 14.
- (3.) Critics of a negative school have, as might be expected, adopted the easier course of rejecting the narrative either altogether or in part. The statements do not come from an eye-witness, and may be an exaggerated report of what actually took place a legend with or without a historical foundation. Those who recognize such a groundwork see in "the rushing mighty wind," the hurricane of a thunder-storm, the fresh breeze of morning; in the "tongues like as of fire," the flashings of the electric fluid; in the "speaking with tongues," the loud screams of men, not all Galileans, but coming from many lands, overpowered by strong excitement, speaking in mystical, figurative, abrupt exclamations. They see in this "the cry of the new-born Christendom" (Büsen, *Hippolytus*, 2, 12; Ewald, *Gesch. Is.* 6:110; Bleek, *loc. cit.*; Herder, *loc. cit.*). From the position occupied by these writers such a view was perhaps natural enough. It is out of place

here to discuss in detail a theory, which postulates the incredibility of any fact beyond the phenomenal laws of nature and the falsehood of Luke as a narrator.

(4.) What, then, we finally inquire under the case in question, are the facts actually brought before us? What inferences may be legitimately drawn from them?

(a) The utterance of words by the disciples in other languages than their own Galilean Aramaic is, as has been said, distinctly asserted.

(b) The words spoken appear to have been primarily determined, not by the will of the speakers, but by the Spirit, which “gave them utterance.” The outward tongue of flame was the symbol of the “burning fire” within, which, as in the case of the older prophets could not without internal violence be repressed (^{<240>}Jeremiah 20:9).

(c) The word used, ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, not merely λαλεῖν, has in the Sept. a special, though not an exclusive association with the oracular speech of true or false prophets, and appears to imply some peculiar and probably impassioned style (comp. ^{<137>}1 Chronicles 25:1; ^{<219>}Ezekiel 13:9; Trommii *Concordant. s.v.*; Grotius and Wettstein, *ad loc.*; Andrews, *Whitsunday Sermons*, vol. 1).

(d) The “tongues” were used as an instrument, not simply of teaching, but also of praise. At first, indeed, there were none present to be taught. The disciples were by themselves, all sharing equally in the Spirit’s gifts. When they were heard by others, it was chiefly as proclaiming the praise, the mighty and great works of God (μεγαλεῖα). What they uttered was not so much a warning or reproof or exhortation as a doxology (Stanley, *loc. cit.*; Baumgarten, *Apostelgesch.* § 3). The assumption, however, appears unwarranted that when the work of teaching began it was in the language of the Jews, and that the utterance of tongues then ceased.

(e) Those who spoke them seemed to others to be under the influence of some strong excitement, “full of new wine.” They were not as other men, or as they themselves had been before. Some recognized, indeed, that they were in a higher state, but it was one, which, in some of its outward features, had a counterfeit likeness in the lower. When Paul uses in ^{<478>}Ephesians 5:18, 19 (πληροῦσθε πνεύματος) the all but self-same word which Luke uses here to describe the state of the disciples

(ἐπλήσθησαν πνεύματος ἁγίου) it is to contrast it with “being drunk with wine,” to associate it with “psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs.”

(f) Questions as to the mode of operation of a power above the common laws of bodily or mental life lead us to a region where our words should be “wary and few.” There is a risk of seeming to reduce to the known order of nature that which is by confession above and beyond it. In this and in other cases, however, it may be possible, without irreverence or doubt following the guidance which Scripture itself gives us to trace in what way the new power did its work, and brought about such wonderful results. It must be remembered, then, that in all likelihood similar words to those which they then uttered had been heard by the disciples before. At every feast which they had ever attended from their youth up, they must have been brought into contact with a crowd as varied as that which was present on the day of Pentecost, the pilgrims of each nation uttering their praises and doxologies. The difference was that, before, the Galilean peasants had stood in that crowd neither heeding nor understanding nor remembering what they heard, still less able to reproduce it; now, they had the power of speaking it clearly and freely.

(g) The gift of tongues, the ecstatic burst of praise, is definitely asserted to be a fulfillment of the prediction of ^{<2128>} Joel 2:28. The twice-repeated burden of that prediction is, “I will pour out my Spirit,” and the effect on those who receive it is that “they *shall* prophesy.” We may see, therefore, in this special gift that which is analogous to one element at least of the προφητεία of the Old Test.; but the element of teaching is, *as* we have seen, not prominent. In 1 Corinthians 14 the gift of tongues and προφητεία (in this the New-Test. sense of the word) are placed in direct contrast. We are led, therefore, to look for that which more peculiarly answers to the gift of tongues in the other element of prophecy which is included in the Old-Test. use of the word; and this is found in the ecstatic praise, the burst of song, which appears under that name in the two histories of Saul (^{<9105>} 1 Samuel 10:5-13; 19:20-24), and in the services of the Temple (^{<1328>} 1 Chronicles 25:3).

(h) The other instances in the Acts offer essentially the same phenomena. By implication in ^{<4145>} Acts 14:15-19, by express statement in ^{<4107>} Acts 10:47; 11:15, 17; 19:6, it belongs to special critical epochs, at which faith is at its highest, and the imposition of the apostles hands brought men into the same state, imparted to them the same gift, as they had themselves

experienced. In this case, too, the exercise of the gift is at once connected with, and distinguished from, “prophecy” in its New Test. sense.

3. The first epistle to the Corinthians supplies fuller data. The spiritual gifts are classified and compared, arranged, apparently, according to their worth, placed under *regulation*. This fact is in itself significant. Though recognized as coming from the one Divine Spirit, they are not therefore exempted from the control of man’s reason and conscience. The Spirit acts through the calm judgment of the apostle or the Church, not less, but more, authoritatively than in the most rapturous and wonderful utterances. The facts which may be gathered in this case are briefly these:

(1.) The phenomena of the gift of tongues were not confined to one Church or section of a Church. If we find them at Jerusalem, Ephesus, Corinth, by implication at Thessalonica also (^{<5759>}1 Thessalonians 5:19), we may well believe that they were frequently recurring wherever the spirits of men were passing through the same stages of experience.

(2.) The comparison of gifts in both the lists given by Paul (^{<6128>}1 Corinthians 12:8-10, 28-30) places that of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues, lowest in the scale. They are not among the greater gifts, which men are to “covet earnestly” (ver. 31; 14:5). As signs of a life quickened into expression where before it had been dead and dumb, the apostle could wish *that* “they all spake with tongues” (ibid.), could rejoice that, he himself “spake with tongues more than they all” (ver. 18). It was good to have known the working of a power raising them above the common level of their consciousness. They belonged, however, to the childhood of the Christian life, not to its maturity (ver. 20). They brought with them the risk of disturbance (ver. 23). The only safe rule for the Church was not to “forbid them” (ver. 39) not to “quench them” (Thessalonians 5:19), lest in so doing the spiritual life of which this was the first utterance should be crushed and extinguished too; but not in any way to covet or excite them.

(3.) The main characteristic of the “tongue” (now used, as it were, technically, without the epithet “new” or “other”) is that it is unintelligible unless “interpreted” (**διερμηνεύομαι** *to translate* in course). The man “speaks mysteries,” prays, blesses, gives thanks, in the tongue (**ἐν πνεύματι** as equivalent to **ἐν γλώσση**, ^{<6145>}1 Corinthians 14:15, 16), but no one understands him (**ἀκούει**). He can hardly be said indeed, to understand himself. The **πνεῦμα** in him is acting without the co-operation

of the **νοῦς** (ver. 14). He speaks not to men, but to himself and to God (comp. *Chrysost. Hom. 35, in 1 Col.*). In spite of this, however the gift might, and did, contribute to the building-up of a man's own life (~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 14:4). This might be the only way in which some natures could be roused out of the apathy of a sensual life or the dullness of a formal ritual. The ecstasy of adoration which seemed to men madness might be a refreshment unspeakable to one who was weary with the subtle questionings of the intellect, to whom all familiar and intelligible words were fraught with recollections of controversial bitterness or the wanderings of doubt (comp. a passage of wonderful power as to this use of the gift by *Irving Morning Watch, 5, 78*).

(4.) The peculiar nature of the gift leads the apostle into what appears at first a contradiction. "Tongues are for a *sign*," not to believers, but to those who do not believe; yet the effect on unbelievers is not that of attracting, but repelling. A meeting in which the gift of tongues was exercised without restraint would seem to a heathen visitor, or even to the plain common-sense Christian (the **ἰδιώτης**, the man. without a **χάρισμα**), to be an assembly of madmen. The history of the day of Pentecost may help us to explain the paradox. The tongues *are* a sign. They witness that the daily experience of men is not the limit of their spiritual powers. They disturb, startle, awaken, are given **εἰς τὸ ἐκπλήττεσθαι** (*Chrysost. Hom. 36, in 1 Cor.*), but they are not, and cannot be, the grounds of conviction and belief (so *Const. Apost. 8*). They involve of necessity a disturbance of the equilibrium between the understanding and the feelings. Therefore it is that, for those who believe already, prophecy is the greater gift. Five clear words spoken from the mind of one man to the mind and conscience of another are better than ten thousand of these more startling and wonderful phenomena.

(5.) There remains the question whether these also were "tongues" in the sense of being languages, of which the speakers had little or no previous knowledge, or whether we are to admit here, though not in Acts 2, the theories which see in them only unusual forms of speech (Bleek), or inarticulate cries (Bunsen), or all but inaudible whisperings (Wiieseler, in, Olshausen, *ad loc.*). The question is not one for a dogmatic assertion but it is believed that there *is* a preponderance of evidence leading *us* to look on the phenomena of Pentecost as representative. It must have been from them *that* the word *tongue* derived its new and special meaning. The

companion of Paul and Pami; himself were likely to use the same word in the same sense. In the absence of a distinct notice to the contrary, it is probable that the gift would manifest itself in the same form at Corinth as at Jerusalem. The “divers kind of tongues” (^{<4628>}1 Corinthians 12:28), the “*tongues* of men” (^{<4630>}1 Corinthians 13:1), point to differences of some kind, and it is at least easier to conceive of these as differences of language than as belonging to utterances all equally wild and inarticulate. The position maintained by Lightfoot (*Harm. of Gosp. on Acts 2*), that the gift of tongues *consisted* in the power of speaking and understanding the true Hebrew of the Old Test., may appear somewhat extravagant, but there seems ground for believing that Hebrew and Aramaic words had over the minds of Greek converts at Corinth a power which they failed to exercise when translated, and that there the utterances of the tongues were probably, in whole or in part, in that language. Thus the “Maranatha” of ^{<4662>}1 Corinthians 16:22, compared with 12:3, leads to the inference that the word had been spoken under a real or counterfeit inspiration, “It was the Spirit that led men to cry *Abba* as their recognition of the fatherhood of God” (^{<4685>}Romans 8:15; ^{<4606>}Galatians 4:6). If we are to attach any definite meaning to the tongues of angels” in ^{<4630>}1 Corinthians 13:1, it must be by connecting it with the words surpassing human utterance which Paul heard as in Paradise (^{<4724>}2 Corinthians 12:4), and these, again, with the great Hallelujah hymns of which we read in the Apocalypse (^{<4606>}Revelation 19:1 6; Stanley, *loc. cit.*; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 6:117). The retention of other words like Hosanna and Sabaoth in the worship of the Church, of the Greek formula of the Kyrie Eleison in that of the nations of the West, is an exemplification of the same feeling operating in other ways after the special power had ceased.

(6.) Here also as in Acts 2, we have to think of some peculiar style of enunciation as frequently characterizing the exercise of the “tongues.” The analogies which suggest themselves to Paul’s mind are those of the pipe, the harp the trumpet (^{<4640>}1 Corinthians 14:7, 8). In the case of one “singing in the spirit” (ver. 15), but not with the understanding also, the strain of ecstatic melody must have been all that the listeners could perceive. To “sing and make melody” is especially characteristic of those who are filled with the Spirit (^{<4659>}Ephesians 5:19). Other forms of utterance less distinctly musical, yet not less mighty to stir the minds of men, we may trace in the “cry” (^{<4685>}Romans 8:15; ^{<4606>}Galatians 4:6) and the “ineffable groanings” (^{<4685>}Romans 8:26), which are distinctly ascribed to the work of the Divine

Spirit. To those who know the wonderful power of man's voice, as the organ of his spirit, the strange, unearthly charm which belongs to some of its less normal states, the influence even of individual words thus uttered, especially of words belonging to a language which is not that of our common life (comp. Hilar. Diac. *Comm. in 1 Corinthians 14*), it will not seem strange that, even in the absence of a distinct intellectual consciousness, the gift should take its place among the means by which a man "built up" his own life, and might contribute, if one were present: to expound his utterances, to "edify" others also. Neander (*Pflanz. u. Leit. 1, 15*) refers to the 'effect produced by the preaching of St. Bernard upon hearers who did not understand one word of the Latin in which he preached (*Opp. 2, 119*, ed. Mabillon) as an instance of this.' Like phenomena are related of St. Anthony of Padua and St. Vincent Ferrer (*Acta Sanctorum*, June 24 and April 5), of which this is probably the explanation. (Comp. also Wolff, *Curie Philolog. in Nov. Test., Acts 2.*)

(7.) Connected with the "tongues," there was, as the words just used remind us, the corresponding power of interpretation. "It might belong to any listener (~~41-42~~ 1 Corinthians 14:27). It might belong' to the speaker himself when he returned to the ordinary level of conscious thought (ver. 13). Its function, according to the view that has been 'here taken, must have been twofold. The interpreter had first to catch the foreign words, Aramaic or others, which had mingled, more or less largely; with what was uttered, and then to find a meaning and an order in what seemed at 'first to be without either; to follow the loftiest flights and most intricate windings of the enraptured spirit; to trace the subtle associations Which linked together words and thoughts that seemed at first to have no point of contact. Under the action of one with this insight, the wild utterances of the "tongues" might become a treasure house of deep truths. Sometimes, it would appear, not even this was possible. The power might be simply that of sound. As the pipe or harp, played boldly, the hand struck at random over the strings, but with no *διαστολή*, *no* musical interval, wanted the condition of distinguishable melody, so the "tongues," in their extremest form, passed beyond the limits of interpretation. There might be a strange awfulness, of a strange sweetness as of "the tongues of angels;" but what" it meant was known only to God (ver. 7 11).

(8.) It is probable that, at this later period, and in the Corinthian Church (which appears, from other indications to have been a decidedly sensuous one), the gift in question had somewhat degenerated from its Pentecostal

purity into a demonstrative form, in which the human fancy and nervous susceptibility had given a looser rein to the external manifestations of what was essentially and truly a divine impulse. The history of modern religious excitements affords abundant illustration of this tendency.

4. As to other indications in early times we may remark:

(1.) Traces of the gift are found, as has been said, in the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, the Ephesians. From the Pastoral Epistles, from those of Peter and John, they are altogether absent, and this is in itself significant. The life of the apostle and of the Church has passed into a calmer, more normal state. Wide truths, abiding graces, these, are what he himself lives in and exhorts others to rest on, rather than exceptional **χαρίσματα**, however marvelous, the “tongues” are already “ceasing” (~~413B~~ 1 Corinthians 13:8), as a thing belonging to the past. Love, which even when “tongues” were mightiest, he had seen to be above all gifts, has become more and more, all in all, to him.

(2.) It is probable, however, that the disappearance of the “tongues” was gradual. As it would have been impossible to draw the precise line of demarcation when the **προφητεία** of the apostolic age passed into the **διδασκαλία** that remained permanently in the Church, so there must have been a time when “tongues” were still heard, though less frequently, and with less striking results. The testimony of Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 5, 6) that there were brethren in his time “who had prophetic gifts, and spoke through the Spirit in all kinds of tongues,” though it does not prove, what it has sometimes been alleged to prove, the permanence of the gift in the individual, or its use in the work of evangelizing (Wordsworth, *On Acts* 2), must be admitted as evidence of the existence of phenomena like those which we have met with in the Church of Corinth. For the most part, however, the part which they had filled in the worship of the Church was supplied by the “hymns and spiritual songs” of the succeeding age. In the earliest of these, distinct in character from either the Hebrew psalms or the later hymns of the Church, marked by a strange mixture of mystic names and half coherent thoughts (such, e.g., as the hymn with which Clement of Alexandria ends his **Παιδαγωγός**, and the earliest Sibylline verses), some have seen the influence of the ecstatic utterances in which the strong feelings of adoration had originally shown themselves (Nitzsch, *Christl. Lehre*, 2, 268).

After this, within the Church we lose nearly all traces of them. 'The mention of them by Eusebius (*Comm. in Psalm 46*) is vague and uncertain. The tone in which Chrysostom speaks of them (*Comm. in 1 Corinthians 14*) is that of one who feels the whole subject to be obscure, because there are no phenomena within his own experience at all answering to it. The whole tendency of the Church was to maintain reverence and order, and to repress all approaches to the ecstatic state. Those who yielded to it took refuge, as in the case of Tertullian (*infra*) insects outside the Church. Symptoms of what was then looked upon as an evil showed themselves in the 4th century at Constantinople wild, inarticulate cries, words passionate but of little meaning, almost convulsive gestures and were met by Chrysostom with the sternest possible reproof (*Hom. in ^{²¹⁰²Isaiah 6:2}* [ed. Migne, 6:100]).

It thus appears that the miraculous gifts of the first days bestowed upon the Church for a definite purpose were gradually but quickly withdrawn from men when the apostles and those who had learned Christ from their lips had fallen asleep. Among these supernatural powers we can well believe that the earliest withdrawn were those new tongues first heard in their strange sweetness on that Pentecostal "morning, needing then no interpreter; those tongues which during the birth throes of Christianity gave utterance to the rapturous joy and thankfulness of the first believers. They were a power, however, which, if misused might lead men as history has subsequently shown into confusion, feverish dreams, and morbid imaginings, a condition of thought which would utterly unfit men and women for the stern and earnest duties of their several callings in a word, a life unreal and unhealthy. Therefore that chapter of sacred history which tells of these communings of men with the unseen, that beautified with unearthly glory the lives of the brave witnesses who first gave up all for Christ, was closed up forever when the "tongues" had done their work (see De Wette, *Apostelgesch.* p. 23, 26).

III. Ancient and Modern Quasi Parallels. A wider question of deep interest presents itself. Can we find in the religious history of mankind any facts analogous to the manifestation of the "tongues?" Recognizing, as we do, the great gap which separates the work of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost from all others, both in its origin and its fruits, there is, it is believed, no reason for rejecting the thought that there might be like phenomena standing to it in the relation of foreshadowings,

approximations, counterfeits. Other **χαρίσματα** of the Spirit, wisdom, prophecy helps, governments, had, or have, analogies, in special states of men's spiritual life, at other times and under other conditions, and so may these. The three characteristic phenomena are, especially in its Corinthian phase, as has been seen (a) an ecstatic state of partial or entire unconsciousness, the human will being, as it were, swayed by a power above itself; (b) the utterance of words in tones startling and impressive, but often conveying no distinct meaning; (c) the use of languages which the speaker was of himself unable to converse in.

1. The history of the Old Test. presents us with some instances in which the gift of prophecy has accompaniments of this nature. The word includes something more than the utterance, of a distinct message of God. Saul and his messengers come under the power of the Spirit, and he lies on the ground all night, stripped of his kingly armor, and joining in the wild chant of the company of prophets, or pouring out his own utterances to the sound of their music (^{<0902>}1 Samuel 19:24; comp. Stanley, *loc. cit.*).

2. We cannot exclude the false prophets and diviners of Israel from the range of our inquiry. As they, in their work, dress, pretensions, were counterfeits of those who truly bore the name, so we may venture to trace in other things that which resembled, more or, less closely, what had accompanied the exercise of the divine gift. And here we have distinct records of strange, mysterious intonations. The ventriloquist wizards (**οἱ ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, ο ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν**) “peep and mutter” (^{<2389>}Isaiah 8:19). The “voice of one who has a familiar spirit” comes low out of the ground (^{<2304>}Isaiah 29:4. The false prophets simulate with their tongues (Sept. **ἐκβάλλοντας προφητείας γλώσσης**) the low voice with which the true prophets announced that the Lord had spoken (^{<2031>}Jeremiah 23:31; comp. Gesenius, *Thesaur s.v. an*).

3. The quotation by Paul (^{<4421>}1 Corinthians 14:21) from ^{<2381>}Isaiah 28:11 (“With *men* of other tongues [**ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις**] and other lips will I speak unto this people”) has a significance of which we ought not to lose sight. The common interpretation sees in that passage only a declaration that, those who had refused to listen to the prophets should be taught a sharp lesson by the lips of alien conquerors. Ewald (*Prophet. ad loc.*), dissatisfied with this, sees in the new teaching the voice of thunder striking terror into men's minds. Paul, with the phenomena of the “tongues” present to his mind, saw in them the fulfillment of the prophet's words.

Those who turned aside from the true prophetic message should be left to the darker, “stammering,” more mysterious utterances, which were in the older what the “tongues” were in the later Ecclesia. A remarkable parallel to the text thus interpreted is found in ^{<2807>}Hosea 9:7. There also the people are threatened with the withdrawal of the true prophetic insight, and in its stead there is to be the wild delirium, the ecstatic madness of the counterfeit (comp. especially the Sept., ὁ προφήτης ὁ παρεστηκώς, ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος).

4. The history of heathen oracles presents, it need hardly be said, examples of the orgiastic state, the condition of the μάντις as distinct from the προφήτης, in which the wisest of Greek thinkers recognized the lower type of inspiration (Plato, *Timceus*, 72 b; Bleek, *loc. cit.*). The Pythoness and the Sibyl are as if possessed by a power which they cannot resist. They labor under the afflatus of the god. The wild, unearthly sounds (“nee mortale sonans”), often hardly coherent, burst from their lips. It remained for interpreters to collect the scattered utterances, and to give them shape and meaning (Virgil, *AEn.* 6:45, 98 sq.).

5. More distinct parallels are found in the accounts of the wilder, more excited sects which have, from time to time, appeared in the history of Christendom. Tertullian (*De Ania.* c. 9), as a Montanist, claims the “revelationum charismata” as given to a sister of that sect. They came to her “inter dominica solemnia;” she was, “per ecstasin, in spiritu,” conversing with angels, and with the Lord himself, seeing and hearing mysteries (“sacramenta”), reading the hearts of men, prescribing remedies for those who needed them. The movement of the mendicant orders in the 13th century, the prophesyings of the 16th in England, the early history of the disciples of George Fox, that of the Jansenists in France, the revivals under Wesley and Whitefield, those of a later date in Sweden, America, and Ireland, have, in like manner, been fruitful in ecstatic phenomena more or less closely resembling those *which we are* now considering.

6. The history of the French prophets at the commencement of the 18th century presents some facts of special interest. The terrible sufferings caused by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes were pressing with intolerable severity on the Huguenots of the Cevennes. The persecuted flocks met together, with every feeling of faith and hope strung to its highest pitch. The accustomed order of worship was broken, and laboring men, children, and female servants spoke with rapturous eloquence as the

messengers of God.... Beginning in 1686, then crushed for a time bursting forth with fresh violence in 1700, it soon became a matter of almost European celebrity. Refugees arrived in London in 1706 claiming the character of prophets (Lacy, *Cry from the Desert*; Peyrat, *Pastors: in the Wilderness*). An Englishman, John Lacy, became first a convert and then a leader. The convulsive ecstatic utterances of the sect drew down the ridicule of Shaftesbury (*On Enthusiasm*). Calamy thought it necessary to enter the lists against their pretensions (*Caveat against the New Prophets*). They gained a distinguished proselyte in Sir R. Bulkley, a pupil of Bishop Fell's, with no inconsiderable learning, who occupied in their proceedings a position which reminds us of that of Henry Drummond among the followers of Irving (Bulkley, *Defence of the Prophets*), here, also, there was a strong contagious excitement. Nicholson, the Baxter of the sect, published a confession that he had *found* himself unable to resist it (*Falsehood of the New Prophets*), though he afterwards came to look upon his companions as "enthusiastic impostors," What is specially noticeable is that the gift of tongues was claimed by them. Sir R. Bulkley declares that he had heard Lacy repeat long sentences in Latin, and another speak Hebrew, though, when not in the Spirit, they were quite incapable of it (*Narrative*, p. 92). The characteristic thought of all the revelations was that they were the true children of God. Almost every oracle began with "My child!" as its characteristic word (Peyrat, 1, 235-313). It is remarkable that a strange revivalist movement was spreading nearly at the same time through Silesia, the chief feature of which was that boys and girls of tender age were almost the only subjects of it, and that they too spoke and prayed with a wonderful power (Lacy, *Relation*, etc., p. 31; Bulkley, *Narrative*, p. 46).

7. The so called Unknown Tongues, which manifested themselves first in the west of Scotland, and afterwards in the Caledonian Church: in Regent Square, present a more striking phenomenon, and the data for judging of its nature are more copious. Here, more than in most other cases, there were the conditions of long, eager expectation fixed brooding over one central thought, the mind strained to a preternatural tension. Suddenly, now from one, now from another, chiefly from women, devout but illiterate, mysterious sounds were heard. Voices which at other times were harsh and unpleasing became, when "singing in the Spirit," perfectly harmonious (Cardale, *Narrative, in Morning Watch*, 2, 871, 872). See the independent testimony of archdeacon Stopford. He had listened to the

“unknown tongue,” and had found it “a sound such as I never heard before, unearthly and unaccountable.” He recognized precisely the same sounds in the Irish revivals of 1859 (*Work and Counterwork*, p. 11). Those who spoke, men of known devotion and acuteness, bore witness to their inability to control themselves (Baxter, *Narrative*, p. 5, 9, 12), to their being led, they knew not how, to speak in a “triumphant chant” (*ibid.* p. 46, 81). The man over whom they exercised so strange a power has left on record his testimony, that to him they seemed to embody a more than earthly music, leading to the belief that the “tongues” of the apostolic age had been as the archetypal melody of which all the Church’s chants and hymns were but faint, poor echoes (Oliphant, *Life of Irving*, 2, 208). To those who were without, on the other hand, they seemed but an unintelligible gibberish, the yells and groans of madmen (newspapers of 1831; *passim*): Sometimes it was asserted that fragments of known languages Spanish, Italian, Greek, Hebrew were mingled together in the utterances of those who spoke in the power (Baxter, *Narrative*, p. 133,134). Sometimes it was but a jargon of mere sounds (*ibid.*). The speaker was commonly unable to interpret what he uttered; sometimes the office was undertaken by another. A clear and interesting summary of the history of the whole movement is given in Mrs. Oliphant’s *Life of Irving*, vol. 2. Those who wish to trace it through all its stages must be referred to the seven volumes of *the Morning Watch*, and especially to Irving’s series of papers on the *Gifts of the Spirit* in vols. 3, 4:and 6; Whatever other explanation may be given of the facts there exists no ground for imputing: a deliberate imposture to any of the persons who were most conspicuous in the movement.

8. In certain exceptional states of mind and body the powers of memory are known to receive a wonderful and abnormal strength. In the delirium of fever, in the ecstasy of a trance, men speak in their old age languages, which they have never heard or spoken since their earliest youth. The accent of their common speech is altered; Women, ignorant and untaught, repeat long sentences in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, which they had once heard, without in any degree understanding or intending to remember them; In all such cases the marvelous power is the accompaniment of disease, and passes away when the patient returns to his usual state, to the; *healthy* equilibrium and interdependence of the life of sensation and of thought (Abercrombie, *Intellectual Powers*, p. 140-143; Winslow, *Obscure Diseases of the Brain*, p; 337, 360, 374; Watson, *Principles and Practice*

of *Physic*, I, 128). . The medieval belief that this power of speaking in tongues belonged to those who were possessed by evil spirits rests, obviously, upon like psychological phenomena (Peter Martyr, *Loci Communes*, I, 10; Bayle, *Dict. s.v.* “Grandier”).

We refer to the above singular phenomena of modern times not as genuine samples of the scriptural *glossolalia*, but as illustrating some of the physical and mental symptoms with which they were accompanied. In many instances, no doubt, the Biblical facts have been merely imitated, and in others they have exercised unconsciously a reproductive power. See Wieseler. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, 3, 703; 1839, 2, 483; 3. 752; 1843, 3, 659 sq.; 1847, 1, 55; also the monographs cited by Volbelding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 73.

IV. This subject is not merely curious and interesting, but full of practical moment.

- 1.** It shows how well the Gospel message was accredited in its first promulgation. It fixes attention on the high consequence of preaching the Gospel; of declaring its message with a glowing, burning earnestness, anti of obtaining the live coal which is to kindle the heart from off God’s altar.
- 2.** Inasmuch as the tongues of fire appear to have rested on private Christians as well as apostles, and on women as well as men for no distinction, no exception, is made in the narrative we are admonished that all are bound in the measure of their ability to speak for God, to let no corrupt communication proceed out of their mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.
- 3.** At the same time we are warned that the tongue might be had in its integrity while the fire was wanting or feeble Paul himself; though avowing that he could speak with tongues more than they all, felt the need of being prayed for by saints, “with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, that utterance might be given him, that he might open his mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel.”
- 4.** We learn, finally, from the apostle that faith, hope, and charity were better than this physical endowment, as having a more abiding character.