

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Tonsure - Tzschirner, Heinrich Gottlieb

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

Tonsure

(Lat. *tonsura shaving*) is a name given to the distinguishing mark of the clergy of the Romish Church, formed by shaving off some of the hair. The custom is said to have been introduced at the end of the 5th century. At an earlier period it was censured as unbecoming spiritual persons, on the ground of its being among the tokens of penance. Alaspinaeus notes "It was customary to use shaving even to baldness, and sprinkling the head with ashes, as signs of sorrow and repentance; but the priests of God were not to be thus treated;" which shows that the ancients then knew nothing of this as a ceremony belonging to the ordination or life of the clergy. The ancient tonsure, therefore, was not a shaven crown, for Jerome, Ambrose, and others, equally inveigh against this as a ceremony of the priests of. Isis; it was only an obligation on the monks and clergy to wear decent and short hair, as is evident from all the canons that appoint it. The tonsure in early times was called *corona clericalis*, and the clergy *coronati*, not, however, from their shaven crowns, but from the form of the ancient tonsure, which was made in a circular figure by cutting away the hair a little from the crown of the head and leaving a circle hanging downwards. At first the lowest church servants wore their hair short as a mark of servitude, and the monks, out of humility, imitated them, and in the 6th century the clergy adopted the fashion.

The form of the tonsure varied in different churches, and the varieties of it are of some historical interest. That of the Roman Church, called the "Tonsure of Peter," consisted of shaving the crown as well as the back, of the head, so that there remained a circular ring or crown of hair. This was the form in use in Italy, Gaul, and Spain; In, the Scottish (or Irish) tonsure, which was in use in Ireland, in North Britain, and those parts of Germany in which the Irish missionaries had preached, the entire front of the head was shaved, leaving it bare as far back as the line from ear to ear. This tonsure was called "the tonsure of James," and sometimes of "Simon the Magician." The Greeks and other Orientals shaved the whole head. The supposed derivation of the Irish form of tonsure from the apostolic tires led to its being held both in Ireland and Britain, as well as other churches of Irish foundation, to be of the most vital importance, insomuch that the introduction of the Roman form was almost the occasion of a schism.

As to the *signification* of the tonsure, the catechism of the Council of Trent says that it was intended to signify that the ministers of religion are in

all things so to comport themselves as to carry about them the figure and likeness of Christ. Anthony, archbishop of Florence, says, “The shaving on the upper part of the head signifies that they ought to have a mind free for the contemplation of divine things. The tonsure over the ears denotes that they ought not to have dull senses, or be involved in worldly matters, which are designated by the hair. But the cut of the hair in form of a circle designates the royal dignity which they have and because they ought to regulate themselves and others according to the virtues.” The circle formed at the back of the head by the tonsure is enlarged as the person rises in ecclesiastical dignity. Originally the tonsure was merely a part of the ceremonial of initiation in orders, and was only performed in the act of administering the higher order but about the 7th century it came to be used as a distinct and independent ceremonial; and a question has been raised whether it is to be considered in itself as an order, and to be added to the list of what are called “minor orders.” The now received opinion of Catholic writers is that tonsure is not an order, but only a preparation for orders. Concealment had already been forbidden in Edgar’s canon, and by Anselm, in 1102; and Peckham, in 1281, complains that the clergy covered it out of sight with hair laces. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 6:ch. 4:§ 16, 17; 7:3, § 6; Walcott, *Sac. Archceöl. s. lt.* Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v.

Tooke, John Horne

an English clergyman, the son of John Horne, was born in Westminster, June 25, 1736, and was educated at Westminster and Eton schools and St. John’s College, Cambridge, graduating in 1758. He became an usher in a school at Blackheath, took orders, and served as curate in Kent. In 1760 he received priest’s orders, and for three years had charge of the chapelry of New Brentford. After going to France as traveling tutor to the son of Mr. Elwes, of Berkshire, he returned in 1767 and took an active interest in politics, laboring to secure the election of his friend Wilkes from Middlesex. He became (1769) one of the founders of the “Society for Supporting the Bill of Rights,” but quarreled with Wilkes and was attacked by Junius, but successfully defended himself. In 1773 he formally resigned his living, designing to study law; and, rendering great assistance to a Mr. Tooke of Purley, in Surrey, was made by him his heir. He changed his name to Tooke in 1782, and received £8000 from the property. He opposed the American war, and, accusing the king’s troops of barbarously murdering the Americans at Lexington, was convicted of libel, and

sentenced to one year's imprisonment and a fine of £200. When released, he applied for admission to the *bar*, but was rejected on the ground of being a clergyman. In 1790 he was defeated as a candidate for Parliament, and in 1794 was tried for high-treason, but was acquitted. Defeated again in 1796, he succeeded in 1801 in being elected to the House of Commons for the borough of Old Sarum; and retained his seat till the dissolution in 1802, the decision of Parliament (that no one in priest's orders could be a member) disqualifying him from sitting again. He retired to Wimbledon, where he died, March 18, 1812. Mr. Tooke published, *The Petition of an Englishman* (1765): — *Sermon* (before 1773): — *Letter to John Dunnaing* (1778, 8vo): — *Letter to Lord Ashburton* (1782, 8vo): — *Ἔπεα Πτερόεντα, or the Diversions of Purley* (1786, 8vo): — and other pamphlets. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Tooth

(*veshen*, ὀδοῦς). The Hebrew word is by some derived from *hnc*; “to change” or “repeat,” because the teeth are changed, or replaced by others; but it better comes from *niv*; *to sharpen*. So likewise the Greek ὀδοῦς is said to be quasi ἐδοῦς, from ἔδω, “to eat;” and the Latin *dens*, quasi *edens*, “eating.” But the three words are probably all primitives, and the latter two at least are etymologically connected with the English *tooth*.

I. In the *singular* this term occurs first with reference to the literal member itself in man, the loss of which, by violence, is specified by Moses, in illustration of his law concerning *taliones*, “tooth for tooth” (^{<1214>}Exodus 21:24). This outrage occurring between freemen (or between an Israelite and a foreigner, ^{<1212>}Leviticus 24:22) admitted, like other cases of maiming, most probably of a pecuniary compensation, and under private arrangement, unless the injured party proved exorbitant in his demand, when the case was referred to the judge, who seems addressed in ^{<1212>}Deuteronomy 19:21. The Targum of Jonathan renders the words, “the price of a tooth for a tooth,” in ^{<1214>}Exodus 21:24, ^{<1211>}Leviticus 24:20, and ^{<1212>}Deuteronomy 19:21 (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 35, and *SEE PUNISHMENT* in this *Cyclopaedia*); but if a master inflicted this irreparable damage upon a servant, i.e. slave, of either sex, he was punished by the absolute loss of the slave's services (^{<1217>}Exodus 21:27), The same law applied if the slave was a Gentile, notwithstanding the national glosses of the Jewish doctors (Selden, *De Jure Nat. et Gent.* 4 ,

1468). Our Lord's comment upon the law (^{<0158>}Matthew 5:38), which was much abused in his time (Horne, *Introd.* 2, 377, 6th ed.), prohibits no more than *retaliation* upon the *injurer* (τῷ πονηρῷ), not such a defense of our innocence as may consist in words, but *private revenge*, and especially with such a disposition as actuated the aggressor, with impetuous rage or hatred. His exhortations relate rather to those injuries which cannot be redressed by the magistrate or by course of law; these we should bear rather than resort to revenge (see Rosenmüller, Grotius, and Whitby, *ad loc.*). Indeed, the hermeneutics of our Lord's precepts in his Sermon on the Mount require much knowledge, care, and discrimination, in order to avoid a *prima facie* interpretation of them, which has often been given, at variance with his intention, subversive of the principles of natural justice, and productive of false ideas of Christian duty.

In ^{<0077>}Psalm 3:7 we have **yj bē** for the human jawbone; for that of an ass (^{<0715>}Judges 15:15-17, **σιαγόνα**, “maxillam, i.e. mandibulam;” which becomes **vTēḥi** in ver. 19, τὸν λάκκον τὸν ἐν τῇ σιαγόνι “molarem dentem in maxilla asini”) **SEE SAMSON**; and for that of leviathan (^{<1804>}Job 40:14, τὸ χεῖλος, *naxillanr*). See Jaw. A “broken (or rather bad, **h[r**; that is, decayed; Vulg. *dens putridus*) tooth” is referred to in ^{<0719>}Proverbs 25:19, as furnishing an apt similitude of “confidence in an unfaithful man in the time of trouble.” “The teeth of” beasts,” or rather “tooth” **ᾠveis** a phrase expressive of devastation by wild animals; thus, “I will send the tooth of beasts upon them” (^{<1524>}Deuteronomy 32:24), **tmbBĀ^ve** (ὀδόντας θηρίων, *dentes bestiarumz*; comp. ^{<0725>}2 Kings 17:25).

The word is sometimes used metaphorically for a sharp cliff or summit of a rock (^{<1828>}Job 39:28); thus, “The eagle dwelleth and abideth upon the tooth of the rock, [**I Ἰσᾶναι**] (ἐπ' ἐξοχῇ πέτρας, *inaccessis rupibus*). So also (^{<0144>}1 Samuel 14:4), “a sharp rock on the one side and a sharp rock on the other side, [**I Ἰσᾶν**] (ὀδοὺς πέτρας, *quasi in modum, dentium scopuli*); these eminences were named Bozez and Seneh.

II. TEETH, **μυθίνas** *shinna'yim* (ὀδόντες), is found in the dual number only, referring to the two rows, yet used for the plural (^{<0013>}1 Samuel 2:13). The word occurs first with reference to the literal organs in man (^{<0492>}Genesis 49:12), “His teeth shall be white with milk,” which the Sept. and Vulg. understand to mean “whiteness greater than milk” (ἡ γάλα, *lacte candidiores*; ^{<0113>}Numbers 11:33; ^{<0105>}Proverbs 10:26; ^{<0242>}Song of

Solomon 4:2; 6:6). Although **μυλῖνα** be the general word for teeth, yet the Hebrews had a distinct term for the molars, or jaw teeth, especially of the larger animals; thus, **τῶφ Λαῖνε** (^{<1897>}Job 29:17; ^{<1570>}Psalms 57:4; ^{<1804>}Proverbs 30:14; ^{<2906>}Joel 1:6); and by transposition **τῶφ Τῆ ἴνι** (^{<1816>}Psalms 58:6, **μούλαι**, *molce* and *linolares*). The *apparent* teeth of the leviathan (*gyrus dentium*) are, however, called **μυλῖν** (^{<1844>}Job 41:14). Ivory, “elephants teeth,” ^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:22, is simply **μυλῖνα** (Sept. omits; Vulg. *dentes elephantorum*); *dens* in Latin is sometimes so used. In ^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 9:21 the word is **μυββαῖν**, (**ὀδόντες ἑλεφάντινοι**, *ebur*), where **ν** evidently denotes a tooth; but the signification of the latter part, **μυββῆ** is unknown, and Gesenius thinks that the form of the word may be so corrupted as to disguise its original meaning. May it not be of foreign origin, imported with the material from Ophir? **SEE IVORY**.

In other passages the reference to teeth is metaphorical; thus, “a flesh-hook with three teeth,” that is, prongs (1 Samuel 2, 13). **SEE HOOK**. “The teeth of lions” is a symbol of the cruelty and rapacity of the wicked (^{<1840>}Job 4:10), “To take one’s flesh into one’s teeth” signifies to gnaw it with anguish (13, 14; comp. ^{<660>}Revelation 16:10). The skin of his teeth,” with which Job says he had “escaped” in his affliction, is understood by the Vulgate. of the lips” *derelicta sunt tantummodo labia circa dentes meos;*” but Gesenius understands it as a proverbial expression, meaning, I have scarcely a sound spot in my body. “To smite upon the jaw bone” and “to break the teeth” mean to disgrace and to disable (^{<1897>}Psalms 3:7; comp. ^{<3163>}Micah 6:13; ^{<1125>}1 Kings 20:35; ^{<2030>}Lamentations 3:30). The teeth of calumniators, etc., are compared to “spears and arrows” (^{<1570>}Psalms 57:4; comp. ^{<1024>}1 Samuel 24:9). To break the teeth of such persons means to disable them (^{<1816>}Psalms 58:6). To escape the malice of enemies is called an “escape from their teeth” (^{<1816>}Psalms 124:6; ^{<1807>}Zechariah 9:7). Oppression is compared to “jaw-teeth like swords, and grinders like knives” (^{<1814>}Proverbs 30:14). Beautiful teeth are compared to “sheep newly shorn and washed” in ^{<2042>}Song of Solomon 4:2; 6:6; but the remaining part of the comparison, “whereof every one beareth twins, and none is barren among them,” is much better rendered by Le Clerc, “all of them twins, and none hath lost his fellow.” To break the teeth with gravel stones” is a most hyperbolic metaphor for inflicting the harshest disappointment (^{<2030>}Lamentations 3:16). “Iron teeth” are the symbol of destructive power (^{<2707>}Daniel 7:7,19). A nation having the teeth of lions, and the cheek-teeth

of a great lion, denotes one which devours with irresistible force (²⁰⁰⁶ Joel 1:6; comp. ⁶⁰⁰⁸ Ecclus. 21:2; ⁶⁰⁰⁸ Revelation 9:8). “Prophets who bite with their teeth, and cry Peace,” are greedy and hypocritical prophets (³⁰⁰⁵ Micah 3:5). “To take away blood out of the mouth, and abominations from between the teeth,” means to rescue the intended victims of cruelty (³⁰⁰⁷ Zechariah 9:7). “Cleanness of teeth” is a periphrasis for hunger, famine (³⁰⁰⁶ Amos 4:6; Sept. **γομφιασμὸν ὀδόντων**, Symmachus and Theodotion, **καθαρισμὸν**). *Gnashing of teeth* means, properly, grinding the teeth with rage or despair. The Hebrew word so rendered is **qrj** ;(³⁰⁰⁹ Job 16:9; ³⁰⁰⁶ Lamentations 2:16; Psalm 35, 16; 37:12; 112:10); it is invariably rendered in the Sept. **βρύχω**, and in the Vulg. *Infremo, fremo, frendo* (see also ⁴⁰⁵⁴ Acts 7:54; Ecclus. 51, 2). In the New Test. it is said of the epileptic child (⁴⁰⁰⁸ Mark 9:18), **τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας**, *stridet dentibus*. The phrase **ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων** is in the Vulgate “stridor dentium” (⁴⁰⁸² Matthew 8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30; ⁴⁰³⁸ Luke 13:28). Suidas defines **βρυγμός: τρισμός ὀδόντων**. Galen, **ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀδόντων συγκρουομένων ψόφος** The phrase “lest thou gnash thy teeth” (Ecclus. 30:10) is **γομφιάσεις τοῦς ὀδόντας σοῦ**. “To cast in the teeth” is an old English phrase (for the Hebrew has no such idiom), signifying *to reproach*; thus “the thieves who were crucified with Jesus cast the same in his teeth,” **ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν** (⁴⁰⁷⁴ Matthew 27:44; Vulg. *improperabant ei*; compare also the Bible and Prayer book version of ³⁰²¹ Psalm 42:11). **τῶν ἔδων** a sharp threshing instrument having teeth,” literally “edges” (²⁰¹⁵ Isaiah 41:15). The action of acids on the teeth is referred to in the proverb “the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge” (³⁰⁰² Ezekiel 18:2): **ἔγομφίασαν**, *obstupuerunt* (³⁰⁰⁵ Proverbs 10:26).

Toparchy

(**τοπαρχία**, *government of a district*), a term applied in one passage of the original of the Apocrypha (1 Macc. 11:28) to indicate three districts to which elsewhere (10, 30; 11:34) the name **νομός** is given, as also in Josephus (*Ant.* 13:4, 9). In all these passages the English version employs the term “governments.” The three “toparchies” in question were Aphserima (**Ἀφαίρεμα**), Lydda and Ramiath. They had been detached from Samaria, Persea, and Galilee respectively, some time before the war between Demetrius Soter and Alexander Bala. Each of the two belligerents endeavored to win over Jonathan, the Jewish high-priest, to their side, by allowing him, among other privileges, the sovereign power over these

districts without any payment of land-tax. The situation of Lydda is doubtful; for the toparchy Lydda of which Pliny speaks (5, 14) is situated not in Persia, but on the western side of the Jordan. Aph-Eerima is considered by Grotius to denote the region about Bethel, captured by Abijah from Jeroboam (^{<443B>}2 Chronicles 13:19). Ramath is probably the famous stronghold, the desire of obtaining which led to the unfortunate expedition of the allied sovereigns Ahab and Jehoshaphat (1 Kings'22). Pliny (5, 14) mentions ten toparchies in Judaea, and so does Josephus (*War*, 3, 3, 5).

The “toparchies” seem to have been of the nature of the modern Turkish *agaliks*, and the passages in which the word **τοπάρχης** occurs all harmonize with the view of that functionary as the *aga*, whose duty would be to collect the taxes and administer justice in all cases affecting the revenue, and who, for the purpose of enforcing payment, would have the command of a small military force. He would thus be the lowest in the hierarchy of a despotic administration to whom troops would be entrusted; and hence the taunt in ^{<218B>}2 Kings 18:24, and ^{<238D>}Isaiah 36:9 (Sept.): **τῶς ἀποστρέψεις τὸ πρόσωπον (tj Pi “captain”) τοπαρχου ἐνός, τῶν δούλων τοῦ κυρίου μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων;** — “How wilt thou resist a single toparch, one of the very least of my lord’s slaves?” But the essential character of the toparch is that of a fiscal officer, and his military character is altogether subordinate to his civil. Hence the word is employed in ^{<143B>}Genesis 41:34 for the “officers over the land” (**dyqḅā** “overseer”), who were instructed’ to buy up the fifth part of the produce of the soil during the seven years of abundance. In ^{<208B>}Daniel 3:3, Theodosius uses the word in a much more extensive sense, making it equivalent to “satraps” (**aynḅḥḏv] ḅ** “wise”), and the English version renders the original by “princes;” but the original word here is not the same as in ^{<208B>}Daniel 3:2, 27, and 6:7, in every one of which cases, a subordinate functionary is contemplated.

Topaz

(**hDfPp** *pidah*’, apparently of non-Heb. etymology; Sept. **τοπάζιον**; *Vulg.* *topazius*), a gem which was the second stone in the first row of the high-priest’s breastplate (^{<12817>}Exodus 28:17; 39:10). It was one of the jewels that adorned the apparel of the king of Tyre (^{<2683>}Ezekiel 28:13); it was the bright stone that garnished the ninth foundation of the heavenly Jerusalem

(~~ῥῆμα~~ Revelation 21:20). In (~~ῥῆμα~~ Job 28:19, where wisdom is contrasted with precious articles, it is said that “the *pitdah* of Ethiopia shall not equal it.” It is, according to most ancient versions, the topaz (τοπάζιον; Josephus, τόπαζος), which most of the ancient Greek writers describe as being of a golden yellow color (Strabo, 16:770; Diod. Sic. 3, 39); while Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 37:32) states that its color is green. The topaz of the ancient Greeks and Romans is generally thought to be our chrysolite, while their chrysolite is our topaz. Chrysolite, which is also known by the name of olivine and peridot, is a silicate of magnesia and iron, it is so soft as to lose its polish unless worn with care (Mitchell and Tennant, *Minecralogy and Crystallography*; p. 512). **SEE CHRYSOLITE.** “Bellermann, however (*Die Urim und Thummim*, p. 39), contends that the topaz and the chrysolite of the ancients are identical with the stones denoted by these terms at the present day. The topaz is a precious stone having a strong glass luster. Its prevailing color is wine-yellow of every degree of shade. The dark shade of this color passes over into carnation red, and sometimes, although rarely, into lilac; the pale shade of the wine-yellow passes into grayish, and from yellowish-white into greenish-white and pale green, tincal, and celadon-green. It may thus be difficult to determine whether the *pitdah* in the high-priest’s breastplate was the yellow topaz; but that it was a topaz there is little reason to doubt. In the passage cited from Job the *pitdah* is connected with, Cush; and as the name Cush includes Southern Arabia and the Arabian Gulf, the intimation coincides with the statement of Pliny and others, that the topazes known to them came from the Topaz Island in the Red Sea (*Hist. Nat.* 37:8; comp. 11:29), whence it was probably brought by the Phoenicians (comp. ~~ῥῆμα~~ Ezekiel 28:13). **SEE ETHIOPIA.** Pliny adds, in explanation of ‘the name, that the island where these precious stones were procured was surrounded by fogs, and was, in consequence, often sought for by navigators; and that hence it received its name, the term “topazin” signifying, in the Troglodyte tongue, “to seek”’ (?).

It may be remarked that Bohlen seeks the origin of the Hebrew word’ in the Sanskrit language, in which *pita* means “yellowish,” “pale;” and, as Gesenius remarks, the Greek τοπάζιο vitself might seem to come from the Hebrew Tif’5 by transposition into hdpf (*Thesaur.* p. 1101). See Braunius, *De Vestitu*, p. 508; Hofmann, *Mineral.* 1, 337; Pareau, *Comment on Job.* p. 333; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 2, 675. **SEE GEM.**

To'phel

(Heb. **ל פֶּחַמְוֹרְתָר** Sept. **Τοφώλ**; Vulg. *Thophel*), a place mentioned in Deuteronomy 1, 1 as a boundary (? on the N. E.) of the great Sinaitic desert of Paran. It has therefore been with great probability identified with *Tufileh* (comp. Schwarz, *Palaest.* p. 210) on a wady of the same name running north of Bozra towards the north-west into the Ghor and south-east corner of the Dead Sea (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2. 570). This latter is a most fertile region, having many springs and rivulets flowing into the Ghôr, and large plantations of fruit trees, whence figs are exported. The bird *katta*, a kind of partridge, is found there in great numbers, and the steinbock pastures in herds of forty or fifty together (Burckhardt, *Holy Land.* p. 405,406). The brook Tufileh, or its immediate neighborhood, is still the recognized boundary between Edom and Moab (Tristram, *Land of Moab*, p. 57).

To'phet

(Heb. *To'pheth*, **תַּפְתֵּחַ** *Topittle*, as in ^{<1876>}Job 17:6; i.e. *abominable*, or, perhaps, *place of burning*; Jeremiah 7:32 second time]; 19:11, 12; with the art., ^{<1230>}2 Kings 23:10 [“Topheth”]; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 7:31, 32; 19:6, 13, 14; once *Tophteh'*, **הַתַּפְתֵּחַ** ^{<2313>}Isaiah 30:33; Sept. **Τοφέθ**, **Ταθέθ**, and **θοφθά**, Vulg. *Tophet*, *Topheth*), a place near Jerusalem, where the ancient Canaanites, and afterwards the apostate Israelites, made their children to pass through the fire to Moloch (comp. ^{<1968>}Psalms 106:38; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 7:31). It is first mentioned, in the order of time, by Isaiah, who alludes to it as deep and large and having an abundance of fuel (^{<2413>}Jeremiah 30:33). He here evidently calls the place where Sennacherib's army was destroyed Tophet, by a metonymy; for it was probably overthrown at a greater distance from Jerusalem, and quite on the opposite side of it, since Nob is mentioned as the last station from which the king of Assyria should threaten Jerusalem (^{<2413>}Jeremiah 10:32), where the prophet seems to have given a very exact chorographical description of his march in order to attack the city (Lowth's *Transl.* notes on 30:33). In the reformation of religion by king Josiah, he caused Topheth to be defiled in order to suppress idolatry (^{<1230>}2 Kings 23:10). The means he adopted for this purpose are not specified, whether by throwing all manner of filth into it, as well as by overthrowing the altars, etc., as the Syriac and Arabic versions seem to understand it. The prophet Jeremiah was ordered by God

to announce from this spot (¹²⁹¹⁴2 Kings 19:14) the approaching captivity, and the destruction, both by the siege of the city and by famine of so many of the people, whose carcasses should be here buried, as that it should “no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter” (¹²⁰⁸2 Kings 7:31, 32; 19:6, 11-14). In all succeeding ages blood has flowed there in streams; corpses, buried and unburied, have filled up the hollows; and it may be that underneath the modern gardens and terraces there lies not only the debris of the city, but the bones and dust of millions Romans, Persians, Jews, Greeks, Crusaders, Moslems. Once the royal music grove where Solomon’s singers, with voice and instrument, regaled the king, the court, and the city; then the Temple of Baal, the high-place of Moloch, resounding with the cries of burning infants; then (in symbol) the place where is the wailing and gnashing of teeth. Once prepared for Israel’s king as one of his choicest villas; then degraded and defiled till it becomes the place prepared for “the King,” at the sound of whose fall the nations are to shake (²⁶¹⁶Ezekiel 31:16); and as Paradise and Eden passed into Babylon, so Tophet and Ben Hinnom pass into Gehenna and the lake of fire. These scenes seem to have taken hold of Milton’s mind; for three times over, within fifty lines, he refers to “the opprobrious hill,” “the hill of scandal,” the “offensive mountain,” and speaks of Solomon making his grove in “The pleasant valley of Hinnom, Tophet thence And black Gehenna called, the type of hell.” *SEE GEHENNA.*

The name Tophet was commonly supposed to be derived from *toph*, or drum, from the drums used to drown the cries of the children when made to pass through the fire to Moloch. This was a received Jewish opinion. But there are other derivations; that, for example, of Jerome, who from the root to open ([htp](#)) ascribes to it the sense of *latitude*; of Rosenmüller, who connects it with a different root ([hpy](#)), and takes it to mean *pleasantness*; of Gesenius, who, from a Persian root, finds the sense of *inflaming, burning*; of Rödiger (in Gesen. *Thesaur.* s.v.), who takes it in the sense of *filth*, a view substantially concurred in by Böttcher, Hitzig, and Thenius, though derived in a different manner. This is, perhaps, the most probable opinion, as it seems, also, the most directly applicable to the place. See Böttcher, *De Inferis*, 1, 80,85; Panecius, *De Topheth* (Viteb. 1694).

Tophet lay somewhere east or south-east of Jerusalem, for Jeremiah went out by the sun gate, or east gate, to go to it (²⁴¹²Jeremiah 19:2). It was in

“the valley of the son of Hinnom” (^{<2475>}Jeremiah 7:31), which is “by the entry of the east gate” (^{<2492>}Jeremiah 19:2). Thus it was not identical with Hinnom, as some have written, except in the sense in which Paradise is identical with Eden, the one being part of the other. It was *in* Hinnom, and was, perhaps, one of its chief groves or gardens. It seems also to have been part of the king’s gardens, and watered by Siloam, perhaps a little to the south of the present Birket el-Hamra. The New Test. does not refer to it nor the Apocrypha, nor yet Josephus. Jerome is the first who notices it; but we can see that by his time the name had disappeared, for he discusses it very much as a modern commentator would do, only mentioning a green and fruitful spot, in Hinnom, watered by Siloam, where he assumes it was “Delubrum Baal, nemus ac lucus, Siloe fontibus irrigatus” (*in Jeremiah.7*). Eusebius, in his *nonmsticon*, under the word **θαφῆθ**, says, “In the suburbs of Ailah is still shown the place so called, to which is adjacent the fuller’s pool and the potter’s field, or the parcel of ground Acheldamach.” Many of the old travelers (see Felix Fabri, 1, 391) refer to Tophet, or *Toph*, as they call it; but they give no information as to the locality. Every vestige of Tophet, name and grove, is gone, and we can only guess at the spot; yet the references of Scripture and the present features of the locality enable us to make the guess with the same tolerable nearness as we do in the case of Gethsemane or Scopus. For an account of the modern aspect of the place, see Robinson, *Researches*. 1,202 sq.; Kitto, *Physical History of Palestine*, p. 122 sq. **SEE JERUSALEM.**

Toplady, Augustus Montague

an English clergyman, was born at Farnham, Surrey, Nov. 4,1740, and received his rudimentary education at Westminster School. It being necessary for his mother to visit Ireland to pursue some claims to an estate, he accompanied her there, and was entered at Trinity College, Dublin, from which he graduated. He received orders June 6, 1762, and, after some time, was inducted into the living of Broadhembury, Devonshire,; but on account of his health settled in London in 1775, where he officiated in the chapel of the French Calvinists, Leicester Fields. He died Aug. 11, 1778 and, agreeably to his own request, was buried in Tottenham Court Chapel. The fame of Mr. Toplady rests chiefly upon his controversial writings against the Methodists, and a few hymns. Against Wesley he may be said to have had a confirmed antipathy, and employed ridicule as *well* as argument in opposing his opinions and conduct. He published, *The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination Stated and Asserted* (Lond. 1769; N.

Y. 1773; later editions): — *Letter to Rev. John Wesley (1770)*: — *More Work for Rev. John Wesley (1772, 8vo)*: — *Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England (1774, 2 vols. 8vo)*: — *The Scheme of Christian and Philosophical Necessity Asserted (1775, 8vo)*, in opposition to John Wesley's *Tract* on that subject: — (*Collection of Hymns for Public and Private Worship (1776, 1787, 12mo)*): — *Dying Avowal (1778)*, etc. He was for some years editor of *The Gospel Magazine*. His works were published after his death by his executor (1783, 8vo), with an enlarged *Memoir (1825, 6 vols. 8vo)*. One of his most celebrated hymns is:

*“Rock of ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in thee,” etc.*

See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Tyerman, *Life and Times of John Wesley*, 3, 139, 190, 210; Belcher, *Historical Sketches of Hymns*, p. 248250; Christopher, *Hymns writers and their Hymns*, p. 46-49.

Topographical Terms

We have had continual occasion in this *Cyclopaedia* to point out the great *accuracy* with which these are used in the original languages of the Scripture, especially the Hebrew, although often obscured by the want of exactness and uniformity in the A.V. It is our purpose under the present head to present a general view of such terms, referring for details to the *respective* articles. Much has already been done in this direction by Dean Stanley in the appendix to his work on *Sinai and Palestine*. *SEE GEOGRAPHY.*

A. LAND.

I. *Tracts* (including especially depressions, levels, and barrens).

1. *Émek* (קֶמֶח, *a valley*, used in general (^{<0425>}Numbers 14:25; ^{<0183>}Joshua 8:13; 13:19, 27; ^{<0019>}Judges 1:19, 34; 5, 15; ^{<0063>}1 Samuel 6:13 [Bethshemesh]; ^{<0188>}2 Samuel 18:18 [“dale”]; ^{<1218>}1 Kings 20:28; ^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 12:15; ^{<2213>}Jeremiah 21:13; 31:40; 47, 5; 48, 5; 49, 4; ^{<3001>}Micah 1:4); or specifically “vale of Siddim” (^{<0443>}Genesis 14:3, 8, 10), “valley of Shaveh” (ver. 17), “vale of Hebron” (^{<0384>}Genesis 38:14), “valley of Achor” (^{<0124>}Joshua 7:24, 26; 15:7; ^{<2350>}Isaiah 65:10; ^{<3025>}Hosea 2:15), “valley of Ajalon” (^{<0102>}Joshua 10:12), “valley of Rephaim” (15, 8; 18:16; ^{<0182>}2 Samuel 5:18, 22; 23:13; ^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 11:15; 14:9, 13; ^{<2175>}Isaiah 17:5),

“valley; of Jezreel” (^{<06716>}Joshua 17:16; ^{<0763>}Judges 6:33; 7:1, 8,12; ^{<2806>}Hosea 1:5; probably also ^{<0807>}1 Samuel 31:7; ^{<1307>}1 Chronicles 10:7), “valley of Keziz” (^{<0820>}Joshua 18:21), “valley of Beth-rehob” (ver. 28), “valley of Elah” (^{<0170>}1 Samuel 17:2,19; 21:9), “valley of Berachah” (^{<4006>}2 Chronicles 20:26), “valley of Baca” (^{<0816>}Psalms 84:6), “valley of Succoth” (60:6; 108:7), “valley of Gibeon” (^{<2320>}Isaiah 28:21), “valley of Jehoshaphat” (Joel 3, 2, 12), “valley of Decision” (ver. 14), “Beth-emek” (^{<0697>}Joshua 19:27).

2. Gey (ayGeor yGe), a ravine (A. V. invariably “valley”), used generally (^{<0234>}Psalms 23:4; ^{<2301>}Isaiah 28:1, 4; 40, 4; ^{<2423>}Jeremiah 2:23; ^{<3008>}Ezekiel 6:3; 7:16; 31:12; 32:5; 35:8; 36:4, 6; ^{<3001>}Micah 1:6; ^{<3844>}Zechariah 14:4, 5), and specifically of Moab (^{<0220>}Numbers 21:20; ^{<0602>}Deuteronomy 3:29; 4:46; 34:6), *Hinnon* (^{<0658>}Joshua 15:8; 18:16; ^{<0230>}2 Kings 23:10; ^{<4818>}2 Chronicles 28:3; 33:6; ^{<0613>}Nehemiah 11:30; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 7:31, 32; 19:2,6; 32:35; prob. ^{<0221>}1 Samuel 22:1, 5; also “valley ate,” ^{<4009>}2 Chronicles 26:9; Nehemiah 2, 13, 15; 3, 13), Jiphthahl el (^{<0694>}Joshua 19:14, 27), Zeboim (^{<0138>}1 Samuel 13:18; comp. ^{<06134>}Nehemiah 11:34), Salt (^{<0083>}2 Samuel 8:13; ^{<0247>}2 Kings 14:7; ^{<1382>}1 Chronicles 18:12; 2 Chronicles 25,11; Psalm IX, title), Zephathah (^{<1440>}2 Chronicles 14:10), *Charashimim* (^{<1044>}1 Chronicles 4:14: “craftsmen,” ^{<0615>}Nehemiah 11:35), “passengers” (^{<2591>}Ezekiel 39:11), Hamon gag (ver. 11, 15), Ai (^{<0882>}Joshua 8:2), near the Jordan (2 Kings 2, 16), Gedor (^{<0709>}1 Chronicles 4:39).

3. Shaveh (hwe), a dale, namely, of Kirjathhaim (^{<0425>}Numbers 32:37), and the kings (^{<0147>}Genesis 14:17; in ^{<01818>}1 Samuel 18:18 this word is not used).

4. Metsullch (hLxm)] a dell (^{<3008>}Zechariah 1:8).

5. Bikah (h[qBae) a broad plain between mountains, used generally (^{<0802>}Deuteronomy 8:7; 11:11, ^{<0448>}Psalms 104:8; ^{<2418>}Isaiah 41:18; 63:14; 40:4, “plain”): specifically “valley of Jericho” (^{<0548>}Deuteronomy 34:3), “valley of Mizpeh” (^{<0108>}Joshua 11:8), “valley of Lebanon” (ver. 17; 12:7), “valley of Meniddo” (^{<4450>}2 Chronicles 35:29; ^{<3821>}Zechariah 12:11), “plain of Oinoi”, (^{<0616>}Nehemiah 6:2), “plain of Aven” (Amos 1:5), “plain of Dura” (^{<2701>}Daniel 3:1), “plain of Mesopotamia” (Ezekiel 3, 23,24; 8; 4; 37:1, 2; probably the same as “plain of Shinar,” ^{<0110>}Genesis 11:2).

6. Mishor (**rwym**), *downs* or table-land, specifically of the plateau of Moab (Deuteronomy 3:10; 4:43; ^{<6133>}Joshua 13:9,16, 17, 21; 20:8; ^{<1123>}1 Kings 20:23, 25; ^{<1060>}2 Chronicles 26:10; ^{<2213>}Jeremiah 21:13; 48, 8, 21).

7. Sharan (**wov**), *a flat*, specifically the pasture land along the Mediterranean (Joshua, 12:19; ^{<2111>}Song of Solomon 2:2; ^{<2339>}Isaiah 33:9; 35:2; 65:1), perhaps that of Gilead (^{<1166>}1 Chronicles 5:16).

8. Shephelah (**hl pvl**), *a low country*, specifically the maritime plain (“vale,” ^{<6100>}Deuteronomy 1:7; ^{<6100>}Joshua 10:40; ^{<1107>}1 Kings 10:27; 2 Chronicles 1, 15; “valley,” ^{<6101>}Joshua 9:1; 11:2, 16; 12:8; 15:33; Judges 1, 9; ^{<3344>}Jeremiah 32:44; “plain,” ^{<2476>}Jeremiah 17:26; ^{<3109>}Obadiah 1:19; ^{<3007>}Zechariah 7:7; “low plains,” ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:28; ^{<4027>}2 Chronicles 9:27; “low country,” 27:10; 28:18; “Sephela,” 1 Macc. 12:38).

9. Midbar (**rBdm**), *a wilderness* in the sense of an open tract of unoccupied common, in general a “desert” or “wilderness” (Exodus 3, 1; 5, 3; 23:31; ^{<0101>}Numbers 20:1; ^{<6330>}Deuteronomy 33:10; ^{<4330>}2 Chronicles 26:10; ^{<3245>}Job 24:5; ^{<2201>}Isaiah 21:1; ^{<2252>}Jeremiah 25:24, etc.); specifically that of *Sinai* (^{<0635>}Numbers 33:15, 16, etc.; “south,” ^{<1976>}Psalm 75:6); sometimes (with the art.) for Arabia in *general*, or for those parts of it which extend into Palestine (^{<0214>}Genesis 21:14; ^{<1885>}Joshua 8:15; ^{<0116>}Judges 1:16).

10. Arabah (**hbr**), *a desert* as such, either generally (“wilderness,” “desert,” or “plain,” ^{<3245>}Job 24:5; 39:6; ^{<2339>}Isaiah 33:9; 35:1, 6; 40, 3; 11:19; 2, 3; Jeremiah 2, 6, 5, 6; 17:6; 1, 12; 51, 43; ^{<3164>}Amos 6:14; ^{<3440>}Zechariah 14:10), or specifically (technically, with the art.) *the Arabah* (“desert,” ^{<3678>}Ezekiel 47:8; “plain,” ^{<6101>}Deuteronomy 1:1, 7; 2:5; 3:17; 4:49; ^{<6186>}Joshua 3:16; 8:14; 11:16; 12:1, 3; ^{<0234>}1 Samuel 23:24; 2 Samuel 2, 29; 4:7; ^{<1245>}2 Kings 14:25; 25:4; ^{<2494>}Jeremiah 39:4; 2, 7; “plains,” Joshua 11,2,12, S; “champaign,” ^{<6113>}Deuteronomy 11:30; “Arabah,” ^{<6888>}Joshua 18:18; “Beth-arabah,” 15:6), or (in the plur. without the art.) *the Ghor* or “the plains” (^{<1053>}2 Samuel 15:28; 17:16) of Moab (^{<0201>}Numbers 22:1; 26:3, 63; 31:12; 33:48, 49, 50; 35:1; 36:13; ^{<6340>}Deuteronomy 34:1, 8; ^{<6213>}Joshua 23:32) or Jericho (4:13; 5:10; ^{<1276>}2 Kings 25:5; ^{<2495>}Jeremiah 39:5; 52, 8).

11. Jeshimon (**wovyv**), *a waste*, either generally (especially of the “wilderness” of the wandering, ^{<6520>}Deuteronomy 32:10; ^{<1687>}Psalm 68:7; “desert,” ^{<1980>}Psalm 78:40; 106:14; Isaiah 43, 19, 20; “solitary,” ^{<1470>}Psalm

107:4), For specifically the barren tract on both sides of the Dead Sea (“Jeshimon,” ^{<0213>}Numbers 21:20; 23:2S; 33:49; ^{<0239>}1 Samuel 23:19, 24; 26:1, 3).

12. Kikkar (rkkæ) *a circle* (primarily and often, *a coin* or *loaf*), specifically (A. V. always “plain”) the floor of the valley through which the Jordan runs (^{<0823>}2 Samuel 18:23; ^{<1074>}1 Kings 7:46; ^{<4047>}2 Chronicles 4:17; Nehemiah 2, 22; 12:28), or the oasis *that* formerly existed in (the southern part of) it (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:10, 11, 12; 19:17, 25, 28, 29; ^{<0510>}Deuteronomy 31:3). Less distinctive than the above are the terms *Geliloth* (t/ l y l æ), *circles*, used in the general sense of frontiers (“borders,” ^{<0612>}Joshua 13:2; “coasts,” ^{<2004>}Joel 3:4), or the windings of the Jordan (“borders,” ^{<0620>}Joshua 22:10, 11; “country,” ^{<2678>}Ezekiel 47:8); *Carmel* (l m r B), *a park*, employed (besides its use as a proper name) in the general signification of a well-cultivated region (“fruitful field,” ^{<2908>}Isaiah 10:8; “fruitful place,” ^{<2026>}Jeremiah 4:26; “plentiful field,” ^{<2910>}Isaiah 16:10; Jeremiah 48, 33; “Carmel,” ^{<2123>}2 Kings 19:23; ^{<2372>}Isaiah 37:24); *Sadeh* (hdc;), *arable land* (“field,” country “land”); *Shedemoth* (twmdø), highly cultivated: *soil* (“fields” of Gomorrah, ^{<0622>}Deuteronomy 32:32; Kidron, ^{<2204>}2 Kings 23:4; ^{<2614>}Jeremiah 31:40; Heshbon, ^{<2918>}Isaiah 16:8; comp. ^{<3017>}Habakkuk 3:17); *Abel* (l ba), *a meadow*, employed as the name of a *place*, and usually in composition; *Maargh* (hr [m]), an *open tract* (“meadows” of Gibeah, ^{<0213>}Judges 20:33; perhaps for *hr [m]* *a cave*; by others read) *br [m]* *from the west*); *Chelkch’* (hql j), *a (smooth) plot of ground* (often in general as a “portion”), in connection with *Saddah* (“piece,” “parcel,” etc.) or without it (“field,” “piece,” “plot,” etc.); *Naphdh* hpn), *a height, only of Dor* (“borders,” ^{<0612>}Joshua 11:2; “coast,” 12:23; “region,” ^{<1041>}1 Kings 4:11), or *Napheth* (tpn), in the same connection (“countries,” ^{<0671>}Joshua 17:11); *Chibel* (l bj), *a district* (*lit.* as measured by *Ai rope*); applied as a general *topographical* division (“portion,” or “coast,” ^{<0675>}Joshua 17:5, 14; 19:9, 29; ^{<3015>}Zephaniah 2:5, 6, 7), especially to Argob (“region” or “country,” ^{<0104>}Deuteronomy 3:4,13, 14; ^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:13).

II. Elevations (considered as such, without reference to their extent of area).

1. Har (rhi), *a mountain*, employed for single summits (*as* Sinai, Gerizim, Zion, Olivet) or for ranges (*as is* Lebanon); also to the general backbone or

highland of Palestine, or of Judah, Ephraim, etc., in particular (A.V. “mountain,” “mount,” “hill”). Occasionally the cognate form *har* (**rhōw rwb**) is employed (usually with the art.), especially with reference to the well-known eminence of that name. The following are the various elevations to which *hor* is applied: Abarim, Amara (^{<2008>}Song of Solomon 4:8), Ararat, Baalah, Baal-Hermon (^{<0008>}Judges 3:3; comp. ^{<0635>}Joshua 13:5), Bethel, Bether (^{<2007>}Song of Solomon 2:7), Carmel, Ebanl, Emek (^{<0639>}Joshua 13:19), Ephron (^{<0639>}Joshua 15:9), Gesh, Gerizim, Gilboa, Gilead, Halak (^{<0617>}Joshua 11:17), Heres (^{<0005>}Judges 1:35), Hermon, Hor, Horeb, Jearim (^{<0650>}Joshua 15:10), Olivet (^{<3840>}Zechariah 14:4; the word is not used in ^{<0053>}2 Samuel 15:30), Mizar (Psalm 42, 6), Moriah, Nebo, Paran (^{<0632>}Deuteronomy 33:2), Perazim (^{<2380>}Isaiah 28:21), Samaria (^{<0164>}1 Kings 16:24), Seir, Sephar (^{<0100>}Genesis 10:30), Sinai, Sion (Sirion or Shenir, all names for Hermon, ^{<0600>}Deuteronomy 3:9; 4:48), Shapher (^{<0633>}Numbers 33:23), Tabor, Zai mon (^{<0048>}Judges 9:48), Zemaraim (^{<4404>}2 Chronicles 13:4), Zion. There are also the mountains of the Amorites, of the Amalekites (^{<0725>}Judges 12:15), of Ephraim, of Esau, of Israel, of Judah, of Naiphtali, and of Bashan (^{<0685>}Psalm 68:15).

The following subordinate terms are applied to parts or features of mountains in personification of the human frame: *Irash* (**vaō**), *head*, the top (^{<0005>}Genesis 8:5; ^{<0290>}Exodus 19:20; ^{<0540>}Deuteronomy 34:1; ^{<0182>}1 Kings 18:42); *Aznoth* (**t/nzā**), *ears*, perh. some projection on the summit (^{<0639>}Joshua 19:34); *Kathliph* (**ātē**), the *shoulder*, the brow (^{<0632>}Deuteronomy 33:12; ^{<0658>}Joshua 15:8, 10; 18:16); *Tsad* (**dx**), the *side* or hill-slope (^{<0235>}1 Samuel 23:26; ^{<0134>}2 Samuel 13:34); *Kisldth* (**tl skē**), *loins* or *flanks*, i.e. base (^{<0692>}Joshua 19:12, 18); *Tsla* (**[l kē]**), a *rib*, i.e. spur (^{<0063>}2 Samuel 16:13); *Shekm.* (**μky**), *back*, i.e. rear (Shechein); *Ammah* (**hMa**), *elbow*; bend (2, 24); *Yerekah* (**hkryē**), *thigh*, i.e. recesses (of Mount Ephraim, ^{<0700>}Judges 19:1, 18; of Lebanon, ^{<0293>}2 Kings 19:23; ^{<2380>}Isaiah 38:24).

2. Gibah (**h[b]ē**) a *hill* (as in the A.V. invariably), the Arabic *Jebel*, the common designation of less important or individual eminences; applied (besides its general use) to Zion (^{<2304>}Isaiah 31:4; ^{<2345>}Ezekiel 34:26), and to the following: the hill of the foreskins. (Joshua 5, 3), of Phinehas (24, 33), of Moreh (^{<0000>}Judges 7:1), of Hachilhh (^{<0239>}1 Samuel 23:19; 26:1), of

Ammah (^{<1024>}2 Samuel 2:24), of Gareb (^{<2613>}Jeremiah 31:39); also an element of the proper names Gibeah, Geba or Gaba, and Gibeon.

3. Tel (τῆ), a *hillock* (the Arabic *Tell*), is a diminutive mound or knoll, usually an artificial heap of rubbish (^{<6137>}Deuteronomy 13:17; ^{<1038>}Joshua 8:28; ^{<2408>}Jeremiah 30:18; 49, 2); often an element of proper names, as Tel-Abib, Tel-Ilarsha, Tel-Melah.

The two following are other appropriations of appellatives as proper names than general designations of an elevated ground:

4. Pisgah, or rather *hap-Pisgth* (for it has the art. ἡ ὄρος), *the height* (comp. Eugl. “the summit”), *was* probably the ragged edge of the table-land of Moab where it suddenly broke down into the declivity towards the Dead Sea (^{<1021>}Numbers 21:20; 23:14; ^{<6137>}Deuteronomy 3:17; 34:1).

5. Ophel (ὄφελ) a swelling mound (so of tumors, ^{<6327>}Deuteronomy 28:27; ^{<1036>}1 Samuel 5:6, etc.), is applied to Elisha’s residence near Jericho (^{<1134>}2 Kings 5:24), elsewhere (with the doubtful exception of ^{<2324>}Isaiah 32:14; ^{<3048>}Micah 4:8) and everywhere with the art., to the sloping tongue of Mount Moriah on the south (^{<1473>}2 Chronicles 27:3; 33:14; ^{<1036>}Nehemiah 3:26, 27; 11:21).

The following, likewise, are rather designations of portions or elements of hills than the elevations themselves:

6. Maaleh (ἡ ἀνάβασις), an *ascent* or rise, used (besides its common meaning, ^{<1033>}Judges 8:13) of several localities that of the Scorpions (^{<1034>}Numbers 34:4; ^{<6133>}Joshua 15:3; ^{<2403>}Jeremiah 1:36), of Adummim (^{<6137>}Joshua 15:7; 18:17), of Gur (^{<1127>}2 Kings 9:27), of Ziz (^{<1406>}2 Chronicles 20:16), of Luhith (^{<2355>}Isaiah 15:5; ^{<2405>}Jeremiah 48:5), of Bethhoron (^{<6100>}Joshua 10:10), of Olivet (1 Macc. 3:16; comp. ^{<1053>}2 Samuel 15:13) and Saul’s city [probably Bethlehem] (1 Samuel. 9:11)

7. Morád (ὁ κατήβασις), a *descent* or fall, applied (besides its general use, ^{<3001>}Micah 1:4) to the declivity of the Jordan valley (^{<6105>}Joshua 7:5), of Bethhoron (10, 10; 1 Macc. 3:24), of Horouaim (^{<2405>}Jeremiah 48:5), and Olivet (κατάβασις, ^{<1055>}Luke 19:37).

8. Shephi (ἡ σέφη), a *bare spot* on a hill (“high place,” ^{<1033>}Numbers 23:3; ^{<2418>}Isaiah 41:18; 49, 9; ^{<2418>}Jeremiah 3:2, 21; 4:11; 2:29; 12:11; 14:6).

9. *Aruts* (**Wr []**), a precipice (“cliff,” ^{<1806>}Job 30:6).

10. *Misgab* (**bḡcḡn**), a bluff or inaccessible steep, as a “refuge” (^{<1078>}2 Samuel 22:3; ^{<0180>}Psalms 18:2; ^{<2352>}Isaiah 25:12, etc.); with the art, a particular fortress of Moab (^{<2480>}Jeremiah 48:1).

11. *Kephim* (**pykḡe**), crags or rough isolated “rocks” (^{<1806>}Job 30:6; ^{<2049>}Jeremiah 4:29), hence the Syriac name *Ceihas*. There remain the two distinctive terms for a stony prominence, with their concomitants.

12. *Tsur* (**rWx**), Chald. and Arab. *Tur*, a rock or outstanding block of stone whether fixed or builder, of frequent occurrence (A.V. “rock”), both literally (^{<0502>}Deuteronomy 10:25; ^{<1163>}2 Kings 5:23, etc.) and figuratively (^{<1980>}Psalms 31:2; 62:6, etc.), and in only a few cases referring to the height of the rock (^{<0271>}Numbers 23:1; ^{<1960>}Psalms 61:2, etc.); in one case assuming the dignity of a proper name, *Tyre*. It is specifically applied to Horeb (^{<1076>}Exodus 17:6), the rock of Obel (^{<0075>}Judges 7:25; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 10:26), and is an element of the names Helkath-hazzurim (^{<1026>}2 Samuel 2:16), and Beth-sur (^{<1658>}Joshua 15:58).

In connection with *Sela* twice occurs the peculiar term *Nekrah* (**hrqjḡ**), a hole or “cleft” (^{<0332>}Exodus 33:22; ^{<2021>}Isaiah 2:21).

13. *Sela* (**[] ṡ**), a cliff or abrupt and elevated rock, especially in personification (^{<0180>}Psalms 18:2; 42:9, etc.), and as a parallel with *Tur* (Psalms 31:2, 3; 7, 8:15, 16; Isaiah 2, 21 etc.). In the A.V. it is loosely rendered “rock,” “stone,” etc. It is applied generally to the spot in Ka’desh whence Moses brought forth water (^{<1018>}Numbers 20:8, 10, 11; ^{<1095>}Nehemiah 9:15; ^{<1786>}Psalms 78:16; comp. *Tsur*, in Ezekiel 17), to the rocks of Edam, (^{<0718>}Judges 15:8, 8:11) Rimmol (20:45), and Sela-hlam-mahlekoth (^{<0238>}1 Samuel 23:28); also as a proper name to *Peta* (with the art., ^{<1247>}2 Kings 14:7; ^{<1452>}2 Chronicles 25:12; and prob. ^{<0036>}Judges 1:36; without the art., ^{<2360>}Isaiah 16:1; ^{<3008>}Obadiah 1:3).

In exclusive connection with *Sela* are found the following descriptive terms: *Chagavim* (**pywḡḡ**), chasms (Song of Solomon 2, 14; ^{<2406>}Jeremiah 49:16; ^{<3008>}Obadiah 1:3); *Seph* (**āy [ḡ]**), a cleft (^{<0718>}Judges 15:8, 11; ^{<2321>}Isaiah 2:21; 57:5); *Tsechiach* (**j jḡ ḡ**), a bald spot, as the summit (of a rock exposed to the drying sun (^{<1043>}Nehemiah 4:13; ^{<2517>}Ezekiel 24:7, 8; 26; 14);. *Nekik* (**qyqḡ**), a cranny or fissure (^{<2079>}Isaiah 7:19 ^{<2434>}Jeremiah

13:4; 16:16); and *Shen* (שֶׁן) a *tooth* or sharp edge or end of a crag (Job. 39:28; ^{<0440>}1 Samuel 14:4,5); also as a proper name (7:12).

B. WATER.

I. *Flowing* (including the valley or bed though which it courses); of these the first two are the most general and distinctively descriptive.

1. *Nahar*, (נַחַר); a perennial *river* (as almost always rendered in the A.V.), the Arab. *nahr* ; used generally in the poetical books of watercourses and of the sea (^{<0341>}Job 14:11; 20:17; 22:16; 28:1; 40:23; ^{<0242>}Psalms 24:2; 46:4; 78:16; 93:3; 98:8; 105:41; 107:33; ^{<2187>}Song of Solomon 8:7; ^{<2382>}Isaiah 18:2, 7; 33:21; 41:18; 42:15; 43:2, 19, 20; 1:2; 56:12); also a stream of fire (^{<2770>}Daniel 7:10); and specifically to some of the great rivers of Mesopotamia and Egypt (^{<0020>}Genesis 2:10, 13,14; 15:18; ^{<0179>}Exodus 7:9; 8:5; ^{<1152>}2 Kings 5:12; 17:6; 18:11.; ^{<1335>}1 Chronicles 5:26; ^{<1585>}Ezra 8:15, 21, 31, 36; ^{<2380>}Isaiah 18:1; 19:5, 6; ^{<2467>}Jeremiah 46:7, 8; ^{<3001>}Ezekiel 1:1, 3; 3:15, 23; 10:15, 20, 22; 32:2, 14; 43, 3; ^{<2704>}Daniel 10:4; ^{<3680>}Zephaniah 3:10), especially the Euphrates (^{<2372>}Isaiah 7:20; ^{<2428>}Jeremiah 2:18; ^{<3001>}Micah 6:1,12; ^{<3890>}Zechariah 9:10), or that in connection with the Tigris (Aram-Niharaim, ^{<0140>}Genesis 24:10; ^{<0574>}Deuteronomy 23:4; ^{<0702>}Judges 1:2, 8; Psalm 60 title; ^{<3976>}1 Chronicles 19:6), but never the Jordan (unless, perhaps, that or the Dead Sea be intended in ^{<1506>}Psalm 61:6; 74:15; ^{<3878>}Habakkuk 3:8, 9) and with the art. it specifically decimates the Euphrates, either alone (^{<0121>}Genesis 31:21; 36:37; ^{<0231>}Exodus 23:31; ^{<0275>}Numbers 22:5; 24:6; ^{<0642>}Joshua 24:2, 3,14, 15; ^{<0106>}2 Samuel 10:16; ^{<1021>}1 Kings 4:21, 24; 14:5; 15; ^{<1348>}1 Chronicles 1:48; 19:16; ^{<1425>}2 Chronicles 9:26; ^{<1619>}Nehemiah 2:9; 3:7; ^{<1978>}Psalm 72:8; 30:11; ^{<2187>}Isaiah 8:7; 11:15; 27:12; 48, 18; 59:19; and so is the phrase in Ezra, “beyond the river”) or with the name added (^{<0124>}Genesis 2:14; 15:18; ^{<0807>}Deuteronomy 1:7; 11:24; ^{<0604>}Joshua 1:4; ^{<1088>}2 Samuel 8:3; ^{<1202>}2 Kings 21:2, 29; 24:,7; ^{<1379>}1 Chronicles 5:9; 18:3; Jeremiah 46, 2, 6, 10); while in the plural it apparently denotes the canals or branches of the same river (^{<1825>}Psalm 89:25 137:1; ^{<2447>}Isaiah 44:27; 47:2; ^{<2510>}Ezekiel 31:4, 15; ^{<3004>}Nahum 1:4 2:6).

The following are the terms which, in the imagery of the East, are applied to the various parts of a river: *Yad* (יָד), at “hand” or *side*, either right or left (^{<0439>}Numbers 13:29; Deuteronomy 2, 37; ^{<0712>}Judges 11:26); *Saphcah* (שַׁפְּחָה), a “lip” or *brink* of a river or of the sea (^{<0227>}Genesis 22:17; 41:3, 17;

Exodus 2:3; 7:15; 14:30; Deuteronomy 2:36; 4:48; Joshua 11:4; 12,2; 13:9, 16; Judges 7:12, 22; 1 Samuel 13:5; 1 Kings 4 .29; 9:26; 2 Kings 2, 13; 2 Chronicles 8:17; Ezekiel 47:6 , 712; Daniel 12:5; and so of the molten sea, of Solomon’s Temple, 1 Kings 7:23, 26; 2 Chronicles 4:2); *Lashon* (/vl), a “tongue” or *bay* (Joshua 15:2, 5; 18:19; Isaiah 11:15); *Gedoth* (twdG), *banks* (of the Jordan, Joshua 3, 15; 4:18; 1 Chronicles 12:15; or of the Euphrates, Psalm 8:7); *Katseh* (hxq), the extreme limit or *end* (1 Samuel 14:27), whether of a river (Joshua 15:5; 18:19), of the water (3:8,15), or of: a lake (Numbers 34:3; Joshua 15:2), and so of a country (Genesis 47, 21; Exodus 13:20; Numbers 33:, 3 a mountain (Exodus 19:12; Joshua 18:16), and a town (verl.15; 1 Samuel 14:2); *Maabirs* (rb[ĩn), *Mabarah* (hrB[ĩn), a *ford* (as of the Jordan, Joshua 2:7; Judges 3:18; 12:6; the Jabbok, Genesis 32:22; or the Arunon, Isaiah 16:2), and so a *pass* between hills (at Michmash, 1 Samuel 13:23; 14:4; Isaiah 10:29; Jeremiah 2:32).

2. Nachal (l j ĩn), a *brook* or summer watercourse, the Arabic *wady*, signifying both the stream and the torrent-bed or valley (translated very variously in tie A.V., “brook,” “valley,” “river,” “stream,” etc.); it is applied to the following places: the torrent of Gerar (Genesis 26:17; 1 Samuel 15:5), of Eshcol (Numbers 13:23, 24; 32:9), of Zered (Numbers 21:12; Deuteronomy 2, 13; perhaps Isaiah 15:7; Amos 6:14), the Arnon (Numbers 21:14; Deuteronomy 2:24; 3, 8), of Jabbok (Genesis 12:23; Deuteronomy 2, 37), of Kaulah (Joshua 16:8), of Kishon: (Judges 4:7; 1 Kings 18:40; Psalm 83:9; probably Joshua 19:11), of Besor (1 Samuel 30:9), of Sorek (Judges 16:4), of Kedron (2 Samuel 15:23; 1 Kings 2:3; Jeremiah 31:40) of Gaash (2 Samuel 23:30; 1 Chronicles 11:32); of Cherith (1 Kings 17:3; perhaps 2 Samuel 24:5), of Egypt (the Wady el Arish, Numbers 34:5; Joshua 15:4; 1 Kings 3:65; Isaiah 37:12), of Shittim (Joel 3:18).

The following terms designate artificial or temporary flowings of water of greater or less extent, some of them of local use.

3. Yior (r/aya or raye), once (Ecclesiastes 24:27) *Or* (raq by abbreviation), is properly a *canal* (perhaps an Egyptian word), specifically a branch of the Nile (so in the plur., Exodus 7:19; 8:5; 2 Kings

19:24; ^{<1830>}Job 28:10; ^{<1784>}Psalms 78:44; ^{<2378>}Isaiah 7:18; 19:6, 7; 33:21; 37:25; ^{<298>}Ezekiel 29:3, 4:5, 10; 30:12; ^{<3488>}Nahum 3:8), and so the Nile itself (in the sing. ^{<140>}Genesis 41:1, 2, 3, 17; ^{<102>}Exodus 1:22; 2:3, 5; 4:9; 7:15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25; 8:3, 9, 11; 17:5; ^{<2318>}Isaiah 23:3, 10; ^{<2467>}Jeremiah 46:7; ^{<298>}Ezekiel 29:3, 9; ^{<1088>}Amos 8:8; 9:5; ^{<3801>}Zechariah 10:11), and in Daniel (^{<2716>}Daniel 12:5, 6, 7) the river Ulai, a similar alluvial stream.

4. Shichor (ר/י v), a “black” or *turbid* stream, as swollen or discolored by showers, either generally (^{<2238>}Isaiah 23:3; ^{<2418>}Jeremiah 2:18) or specifically (the Belus, ^{<1695>}Joshua 19:26; and perhaps the Arish, 13:3; ^{<3335>}1 Chronicles 13:5).

5. Peleg (גל P), a *channel*, a poetical term for the divisions of a stream (^{<1944>}Psalms 46:4), such as the gullies of Reatbeli (^{<1055>}Judges 5:15, 16), the subdivisions of an irrigating stream (^{<1903>}Psalms 1:3), contrasted with *Jubol* (^{<2318>}Isaiah 30:25), or with *Nahal* (^{<1807>}Job 20:17), or even the dew (^{<1919>}Psalms 65:9).

6. Mikal (קמל), a *rivulet* (^{<1072>}2 Samuel 17:20).

7. Tealah (חל [T]), a *conduit* or trench for water raised or poured out for irrigation, such as a ditch (^{<1182>}1 Kings 18:32, 35, 38), an aqueduct (^{<1287>}2 Kings 18:17; 20:20; ^{<2078>}Isaiah 7:3; 36:2; see also ^{<1885>}Job 38:25), or for a garden (Ezekiel: 31:4).

The following denote rainfall or its effects more or less direct.

8. Geshem (גשם), a *shower*, i.e. sudden and heavy rain as it ordinarily falls in the East.

9. Zerem (זרם), a *storm* or violent and overwhelming rain (e.g. ^{<1824>}Job 24:8; ^{<2294>}Isaiah 25:4; 28:2; ^{<1810>}Habakkuk 3:10; comp. ^{<4172>}Matthew 7:27).

10. Yubal (יבול), *Yabul* (יבוי), or *Ubal* (יבוא or יבוי), a *freshet* or overflow of streams from rain (^{<2318>}Isaiah 30:25; 44, 4; ^{<2478>}Jeremiah 17:8); hence the Ulai itself, as liable to such inundations (^{<2716>}Daniel 8:2, 3, 6).

11. Aphik (אפיק), an *outburst* or crevasse in the bank of an alluvial stream or mountain torrent, throwing the water into new and destructive channels; a poetical term for any unusual rush (^{<1865>}Job 6:15; Psalm 42, 1; ^{<2152>}Song of Solomon 5:12; ^{<2187>}Isaiah 8:7; ^{<2162>}Ezekiel 6:2 ; 31:12; ^{<2011>}Joel 1:20, etc.).

12. *Aphik* (אֶפְחִיק), a *gushing*, as tears (^{<1837>}Job 36:28; ^{<2418>}Isaiah 45:8), brooklets (^{<1916>}Psalms 78:16; ^{<1158>}Proverbs 5:18, etc.), or the sea (^{<1258>}Exodus 15:8).

13. *Shiblleth* (שִׁבְלֵת), a *full stream* (^{<1992>}Psalms 69:12, 15; ^{<2272>}Isaiah 27:12).

14. *Eshed* (אֶשֶׁד), a *rapid* (^{<1215>}Numbers 21:15; ^{<1618>}Joshua 10:50; 12:8); in the plur. especially the tumbling stream bursting forth from the roots of Pisgah (^{<1817>}Deuteronomy 3:17; 4:49; ^{<1628>}Joshua 12:3; 13:20).

15. *Sheteph* (שֶׁתֶּפֶן), a poetical word apparently for a local *inundation* (^{<1825>}Job 38:25; ^{<1916>}Psalms 32:6; ^{<1274>}Proverbs 27:4; ^{<2026>}Daniel 9:26; 11:22; ^{<3008>}Nahum 1:8).

16. *Mabbul* (מַבּוּל), a *deluge*, as of the accumulation of waters in the sky (^{<1290>}Psalms 29:10), and especially Noah's flood.

II. Sources of supply, whether living or otherwise.

1. *Ayun* (אֵינַן), lit. "an eye," hence a *spring* of natural Water open and running (A. V. usually fountain," but unfortunately "well" in ^{<1167>}Genesis 16:7; ^{<1439>}Numbers 33:9 [comp. ^{<1257>}Exodus 15:27]; ^{<1607>}Deuteronomy 7:7; 33:28; ^{<1290>}1 Samuel 29:1; ^{<1438>}2 Chronicles 32:3; ^{<1424>}Nehemiah 2:14; 40:15; 12:37; ^{<1188>}Proverbs 8:28). It is applied, in the nature of a proper name (being a marked feature of any locality) to the following places: simply *Ain*, a city of Simeon (^{<1652>}Joshua 15:32; 19:7; 7 21:16; ^{<1342>}1 Chronicles 4:32); *the Ain*, a landmark of Palestine (^{<1641>}Numbers 34:11); *the two Ains*, i.e. Enam (^{<1654>}Joshua 15:34; comp. ^{<1684>}Genesis 38:14, 21); the spring of Jezreel (^{<1290>}1 Samuel 29:1), of Harod (^{<1700>}Judges 7:1), the dragon spring (^{<1423>}Nehemiah 2:13), of Shur (^{<1167>}Genesis 16:7); also En dor, El eglaim, En gannlim, En-gedi, Eim-haddah, Enih'ak-kore, En-hazr, En-mishuah, 'En-iuimmon, En-rigel, En-shemesh, En-tappuah, and Enon.

2. *Mayan* (מַיָּן), a *fountain* consisting of a collection of springs ("fountain," ^{<1070>}Genesis 7:10; 8:2; ^{<1113>}Leviticus 11:36; ^{<1745>}Psalms 74:15; 114:8; Proverbs 5, 16; 8:24; 25; 26; ^{<2042>}Song of Solomon 4:12, 15; ^{<2605>}Isaiah 61:18; ^{<2815>}Hosea 13:15; ^{<2418>}Joel 3:18; "well," ^{<1846>}Psalms 84:6; ^{<2323>}Isaiah 12:3; "springs," ^{<1807>}Psalms 87:7; 104:10); hence (topographically) a place watered by springs ("fountain," ^{<1659>}Joshua 15:9; ^{<1186>}1 Kings 18:5; ^{<1434>}2 Chronicles 32:4; "well," ^{<1685>}Joshua 18:15; 2 Kings 3, 19, 25).

3. Motsa (axwD), a *source* or spring-head (“spring,” ^{<1121>}2 Kings 2:21; ^{<2418>}Isaiah 41:18; 58:11; “watercourse,” ^{<1420>}2 Chronicles 32:30; “water-springs,” ^{<1973>}Psalms 107:33, 35).

4. Makor (rwqm), a *well-spring* or vein of water (^{<817>}Leviticus 12:7; Jeremiah 51, 36; ^{<1819>}Psalms 36:9; ^{<1001>}Proverbs 10:11; 16:22, etc.).

5. Guillth (twbG) *boiling* or bubbling springs, used only of those given by Caleb to Achsah, (^{<659>}Joshua 15:19; ^{<7015>}Judges 1:15); and in the shorter form *Gal (l G)*, a *heap* or spring. (^{<2942>}Song of Solomon 4:12); hence billow of the sea (Psalms 43:7; 106:25; Isaiah 48, 18; ^{<3118>}Jonah 2:3, etc.).

6. Mabbua, [WBm], a *gushing* spring (“spring,” ^{<2317>}Isaiah 35:7; 49:10; “fountain,” ^{<2126>}Ecclesiastes 12:6).

The following represent (mostly artificial) collections or receptacles of water:

7. Beer (raB), a *well* (as everywhere in the A.V., except “pit” in ^{<1440>}Genesis 14:10; ^{<1852>}Psalms 55:23; 69:15; ^{<1297>}Proverbs 23:27) dug in the earth or rock and yielding a perpetual supply, three such are specially named (^{<1251>}Genesis 26:20, 21, 22), besides Jacob’s (^{<4916>}John 4:6), and one at Bahurim (^{<1078>}2 Samuel 17:18). The word stands alone as a proper name (^{<9216>}Numbers 21:16; ^{<7021>}Judges 9:21), and enters as an element into the names Beer-Tahai-roi, Beer-sheba, Beeroth-benejankasm, Beeroth, Beer-elim, Baaluth-beer, Berothah, and Berothai. Cognate with this is

8. Bor (raB or rwB), a *cistern* (A.V. usually “pit” or “well”), whether dug (^{<8111>}Deuteronomy 6:11; ^{<1213>}Exodus 21:33; ^{<1430>}2 Chronicles 26:10) or built (^{<2449>}Isaiah 14:19; ^{<1213>}Jeremiah 2:13), and whether empty (and so often used for “dungeon,” ^{<1371>}Genesis 37:20; 41:14; ^{<1223>}Exodus 12:29; ^{<9316>}1 Samuel 13:16; ^{<1231>}2 Samuel 23:20; ^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 11:22; ^{<2456>}Jeremiah 36:16; 28:6; ^{<3101>}Zechariah 9:1) or as a receptacle of spring or rain water (^{<1975>}Psalms 7:15; ^{<3115>}Isaiah 11:15; ^{<2467>}Jeremiah 6:7 [Kethib]; ^{<2651>}Ezekiel 26:20, etc.). Special cisterns of this kind are sometimes mentioned, as they are next in importance to springs in the East; thus in Sechu (^{<9921>}1 Samuel 19:22), of Sirah (^{<1035>}2 Samuel 3:26), of Bethlehem (23:15; ^{<1397>}1 Chronicles 9:17), at Mizpah (^{<2410>}Jeremiah 41:7, 9; comp. ^{<1255>}2 Kings 25:25).

9. Berekah (hkrB); a *pool* (as uniformly rendered in the A.V.), the Arab. *Birkah*, an artificial tank for surface water. Special pools of this kind are

mentioned at Gibeon (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 2:13), Hebron (4:19), Samaria (^{<1228>}1 Kings 22:3S), Heshbon (^{<2104>}Song of Solomon 7:4), and several at Jerusalem, e.g. the upper (^{<1287>}2 Kings 18:17; ^{<2103>}Isaiah 7:3; 36:3), the lower (22:9), or old (ver. 11), the king's (^{<1014>}Nehemiah 2:14; ^{<2106>}Ecclesiastes 2:6), another (^{<1016>}Nehemiah 3:16), Siloam (ver. 15; ^{<1017>}Joshua 9:7), Bethesda (5:2).

10. Mikveh (hw2aem), a *reservoir* or large receptacle for water for irrigation, etc. ("gathering together," Genesis 1; "pools," ^{<1079>}Exodus 7:19; "plenty [of water]," ^{<1015>}Leviticus 11:36; "ditch," ^{<2211>}Isaiah 21:11).

11. Agam (uga), a *pond* of stagnant water (^{<1079>}Exodus 7:19; 8:5; "standing water," ^{<10475>}Psalms 107:35; 114:8; hence "reeds," which abounded in such receptacles, ^{<2512>}Jeremiah 51:32).

12. Keroth (trk), *pits* or wells in holes dug to water sheep ("cottages," ^{<1016>}Zephaniah 2:6); and so likewise *Mikreh (hrkm)*, a pit for the same purpose ("salt," ver. 9).

13. Mashabim (uybaym), *troughs* for watering animals (^{<1051>}Judges 5:11; comp. ^{<10249>}Genesis 24:19, 20, 44, 45, etc.).

The following are not employed with topographical exactness:

14. Geb (bge) or Geb (abg), a *ditch* (^{<1101>}2 Kings 3:16; ^{<2304>}Isaiah 30:14; ^{<5711>}Ezekiel 47:11); hence Gebim, a place near Jerusalem (^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:31).

15. Pachath (tj P), a *hollow*, used as a trap ("pit," ^{<1070>}2 Samuel 17:9; 18:17; ^{<2347>}Isaiah 24:17, 18; ^{<2483>}Jeremiah 48:43; 44; "hole," ver. 27; "snare," ^{<2187>}Lamentations 3:47). Akin to this is:

16. Shachath (tj iv) or Sihtehah (hj Wv), a *pitfall*, poetically used (variously rendered in the A.V., ^{<1015>}Psalms 9:15; ^{<1077>}Proverbs 26:27; ^{<2106>}Jeremiah 2:6; 18:20, etc.).

17. Gumats (/mWG.), a deep *hole* or sunken shaft (^{<2108>}Ecclesiastes 10:8).

18. Mahamarcah (hrmh), a *gulf* or whirlpool ("deep pit," ^{<1800>}Psalms 140:10).

III. Bodies of water and their connections. For these there really is but one Heb. term.

1. Yam (יָם), sea (as always rendered in the A.V. except when used for “west”), including lakes and expanses of rivers; applied specially to the Mediterranean (with the art., ^{<0657>}Joshua 15:47; sometimes with other adjuncts, as “reat,” ^{<0406>}Numbers 34:6, 7; “hinder” or “western,” ^{<0612>}Deuteronomy 11:24; and ‘so’ sometimes when the situation is not west, as in. Egypt [^{<0209>}Exodus 10:19], Arabia, [27, 13; 38:12]), the Red Sea, that of Chinnereth, the Dead Sea (“salt sea” “sea of the desert” “eastern sea”); also (like the Arab. *Bahr*) of great rivers, as the Nile (^{<2495>}Jeremiah 19:5; ^{<3488>}Nahum 3:8; ^{<2512>}Ezekiel 32:2), the Euphrates (^{<2201>}Isaiah 27:1; ^{<2512>}Jeremiah 51:26, finally of the laver in the Temple (1 Kings 25:18 ^{<3388>}1 Chronicles 18:8). Connected with Yam are the following:

Miphrâts (רְפִיחַ) *a bay* (“breaches,” ^{<0787>}Judges 5:17). *Choph* (חֹפִי) *, a shore*, or rather perhaps *cove* (comp. “Haifa”), as a lesser form of the preceding: (“haven,” ^{<0493>}Genesis 49:13; “side,” ^{<0606>}Deuteronomy 1:7; “Coasts,” ^{<0601>}Joshua 9:1; “shore,” ^{<0781>}Judges 5:1).

Machoz (מְצוּדָה) *, a pot or “haven”* (^{<1973>}Psalms 107:30).

Iyim (יַיִם) *islands*, or the distant shores of the Mediterranean, which seemed such to the Hebrews (^{<2202>}Isaiah 21:23:2, 6 ^{<2706>}Ezekiel 27:6; ^{<2420>}Jeremiah 2:10, etc.).

Waves of the sea are represented (besides *Gal*, above) by *Dakat* (דָּכָה), literally (^{<0983>}Psalms 93:3); *Mishbar* (מִשְׁבָּר) *an overwhelming*, (metaphor “wave,” ^{<0215>}2 Samuel 22:5; Psalm 10: 3 7; “billow” ^{<3018>}Jonah 2:3); *Bamah* (בָּמָה) *, a light place*, usually on land, but put (^{<808>}Job 9:8) for a ridge of the sea.

2. Tehom (תְּהוֹם), the deep, a poetical word for ocean, corresponding to our main (^{<0002>}Genesis 7:2; ^{<8344>}Job 28:14, 33:6, 30; ^{<3027>}Proverbs 8:27, 28; ^{<2519>}Ezekiel 26:19; 31:15; ^{<3016>}Jonah 2:6; ^{<2510>}Habakkuk 3:10; fully “the great deep,” ^{<0002>}Genesis 5:2, 11; ^{<3607>}Psalms 36:7; ^{<2510>}Isaiah 51:10; Amos 1:4); more rarely any other great mass of waters (as those covering the earth at Cioetiton, ^{<0002>}Genesis 1:2; ^{<1946>}Psalms 104:6 or the subterranean waters, ^{<0425>}Genesis 49:25; ^{<0533>}Deuteronomy 33:13; also floods, Job 41, 32; Psalm 42, 7; ^{<2504>}Ezekiel 31:4). In the plural (תְּהוֹמוֹת) it designates either the surges of the sea (^{<0245>}Exodus 14:5, 8; ^{<0937>}Psalms 33:7; 77:16; 28:15; 106:9; ^{<0321>}Proverbs 3:20; 8:24; ^{<2513>}Isaiah 13:13), or its abysses (^{<1975>}Psalms 107:26;

135:6; 148:7); occasionally the [depths of the earth (^{<371D>}Psalm 71:20), as supply of streams (^{<88E>}Deuteronomy 8:7).

C. Accessories.

These are such features as to obviously affect the character of the country for purposes of occupation, but not, like the foregoing, of a permanently essential nature.

I. Internal (including natural cavities and grottos)

1. Mearah (hr[m], a cave (“hole,” ^{<21D9>}Isaiah 2:19; “den,” 32:14; ^{<471>}Jeremiah 7:11), Arab. *Megharah*, used as a proper name alone (^{<633>}Joshua 13:4), but generally with the adjunct of locality of Adnullima (^{<021>}1 Samuel 22:1; ^{<213>}2 Samuel 23:13), Makkedah (^{<606>}Joshua 10:16. etc.), Elgedi (^{<023>}1 Samuel 24:3), Obadiah (^{<1180>}1 Kings 18:4), Zoar (^{<1183>}Genesis 19:30), Machpelai, Horeb (^{<1189>}1 Kings 19:9).

2. Chor (rwḡ or rj ḡ) and Chur (rwj ḡ), ‘a hole in’ the earth or rock (^{<0411>}1 Samuel 14:11; ^{<8316>}Job 30:6), hence in the proper names Horite, Hanran, Beth-horlon, Hooronaimili Hor-bagidgad.

3. Mechillah (hLj ḡ), a fissure or cavern (^{<21D9>}Isaiah 2:19).

4. Minharcah (hrhḡ), a burrow or hiding-place (^{<070D>}Judges 6:2).

II. Superficial (including objects of natural growth, such as conspicuous and enduring vegetation).

1. Yáar (r[jy], a forest or dense growth of trees, but occasionally a thicket only (^{<2113>}Isaiah 21:13). In the historical books it is the usual name for the wooded tracts of Palestine, whether east or west of the Jordan; namely, the “forest of Hareth” (^{<0215>}1 Samuel 22:5), “the forest of Lebanon” (^{<1002>}1 Kings 7:2; 10:17, 22; ^{<4916>}2 Chronicles 9:16, 20), “the wood of Ephraim” (^{<0816>}2 Samuel 18:6, 8, 17:: see also ^{<6715>}Joshua 17:15, 18; 1 Samuel, 14:25, 26.: 2 Kings 2, 24). In the poetical parts of Scripture it often occurs, and is translated:” forest” (but “wood” in ^{<5915>}Deuteronomy 19:5; ^{<3168>}1 Chronicles 16:33; ^{<8013>}Psalm 80:13; 83:14; 96:12; 133: 6; ^{<2016>}Ecclesiastes 2:6; ^{<2118>}Song of Solomon 2:3; ^{<2302>}Isaiah 7:2; ^{<3242>}Ezekiel 24:2 ^{<3374>}Micah 7:14), It forms and element of the names Kijathjearim and Mount Jeaiim (^{<6510>}Joshua 15:10). In two passages (^{<0147>}1 Samuel 14:27; ^{<2101>}Song of Solomon 5:1) the word is applied to a *honey-comb*, which is the frequent product of forests.,

2. *Choresh* (**vrh**), a *wood*, i.e. a thick growth of vegetation, whether in a single tree or in a copse: thus in ^{<2503>}Ezekiel 31:3 it is used for the thick foliage (“shroud”) of the cedar; elsewhere for a limited piece of wood (“forests,” ^{<4204>}2 Chronicles 27:4; “bough,” ^{<2379>}Isaiah 17:9; “wood of Ziph,” ^{<0235>}1 Samuel 23:15, 16, 18, 19).

3. *Pardes* (**sDePi**), a Persian word for a *park* or plantation of timber (“forest,” ^{<4008>}Nehemiah 2:8) or fruit-trees (“orchard,” ^{<2005>}Ecclesiastes 2:5; ^{<2003>}Song of Solomon 4:13).

4. *Ets* (**/[**), a *tree* in the widest sense, whether an individual one (^{<0012>}Genesis 1:29; 2:16; ^{<0512>}Deuteronomy 12:2; ^{<0006>}Joshua 10:16 [comp. ^{<4008>}Acts 10:38]; ^{<2302>}Isaiah 7:2, etc.) or “wood” as its product (^{<0179>}Exodus 7:19; ^{<0112>}Leviticus 11:32; ^{<0064>}1 Samuel 6:14, etc.); hence “timber” (1 Kings 5, 6, etc.), or a piece (“stick,” ^{<0452>}Numbers 15:32; ^{<1170>}1 Kings 17:10); sometimes as wrought (“taff” of a spear, ^{<0007>}1 Samuel 7:7; “handle” of an axe, ^{<0095>}Deuteronomy 19:5).

The most important of generally used names of particular species of trees are the following, which (do not always seem to be used exactly or distinctively):

5. El in some of its various forms (all from **I Wa I ya**, or **I I ä**; to be *strong*), which, according to Gesenius, are used thus: *Eyl* may be either an *oak* or a *terebinth*; where *Allon* is opposed to *Elah* (as in ^{<2163>}Isaiah 6:13; ^{<3003>}Hosea 4:13), the former is the oak, the latter the terebinth; on the other hand, all the Words appear to be interchangeable, for the same tree which is *Allon* (^{<0003>}Joshua 19:33) is also in (^{<0041>}Judges 4:11), while that which is *Elon* (“plain” 9) is likewise *Elah* (^{<0004>}Genesis 35:4) and *Allah* (^{<0005>}Joshua 24:26). The following are several terms and their application:

Eyl (**I ya**), in the sing., occurs only in the combination El-parian (^{<0006>}Genesis 14:6); in the masc. plur. *Eylim* (**pyl ya** or **pyl ä**) of a collection of trees (“oaks,” ^{<2012>}Isaiah 1:29 “trees,” 61:3; ^{<0004>}Ezekiel 31:4), and the proper name Elim (from the seventy palms there, ^{<0057>}Exodus 15:27; 16:1; ^{<0009>}Numbers 33:9, 10). The fem. plur. *Eylloth* (**twbya**) or *Elyilth* (**tl ya**), as a proper name Elloth or Elath, probably refers to the palm-grove at Akabah (^{<0008>}Deuteronomy 2:8; ^{<0006>}1 Kings 9:26; ^{<1002>}2 Kings 14:22; 16:6; ^{<4007>}2 Chronicles 8:17; 26:2).

Elah (**hl a**), designated a notable tree, perhaps the terebinth (“oak,” ^{<0130>}Genesis 35:4; ^{<2013>}Isaiah 1:30; ^{<3013>}Ezekiel 6:13; “elms,” ^{<3043>}Hosea 4:13; “teil-tree,” ^{<2063>}Isaiah 6:3; with the art. ^{<0701>}Judges 6:1, 19; ^{<1089>}2 Samuel 18:9, 10, 14; ^{<1124>}1 Kings 12:14 “Elah,” ^{<0972>}1 Samuel 17:2, 19; 21:9).

Eylon (**ˆwbya**), a similar notable tree, perhaps the oak (“plain” of Moreh, ^{<0116>}Genesis 12:6; ^{<6113>}Deuteronomy 11:30; of Mamre, ^{<0138>}Genesis 13:18; 14:13; 18:1; of Zaanaim, ^{<0741>}Judges 4:11; of the pillar, 9:6; of Monenim, ver. 37; (Tabor ^{<0903>}1 Samuel 10:3), and also stands as a proper name, Elon (^{<0693>}Joshua 19:43).

Ilon (**ˆlyae**), a great tree (^{<2740>}Daniel 4:10, 11, 14, 20, 23, 26).

Alliah (**hLa**), a marked tree (“oak,” Joshua 24:6), as. a prop. name Allah-milek (“the king’s oak,” 19:26).

Allon (**ˆ/La**), the same (“oak,” ^{<0306>}Genesis 30:5; ^{<3444>}Isaiah 44:14; ^{<1019>}Amos 2:9; in connection with *Elah*, ^{<2913>}Isaiah 6:13; ^{<3043>}Hosea 4:13; of Bashall, ^{<2923>}Isaiah 2:13; ^{<3576>}Ezekiel 27:6 ch. 11:3), and in the names Allonbachuth (^{<0138>}Genesis 35:8) and Allon’zaanaim (^{<0741>}Judges 4:11), or simply Allon (^{<0693>}Joshua 19:33).

6. *Eshel* (**l va**), prob. the *tamarisk* (“tree,” ^{<0276>}1 Samuel 22:6; 31:13; “grove,” ^{<0203>}Genesis 21:3).

7. *Asheráh* (**hrva**), tendered in the A. V. “grove” was an idolatrous *image* or pillar of Astarte (^{<0765>}Judges 6:25-27), which, on account of its height, was planted in the ground, ^{<6162>}Deuteronomy 16:21; as at Samaria, ^{<1163>}1 Kings 16:32, 33; ^{<1200>}2 Kings 10:20; 17:16; at Bethel; 23:15; at Ophrah, ^{<0765>}Judges 6:25; and even at Jerusalem, ^{<1203>}2 Kings 21:37; 23:6; so in the plur. **pyræa** Baal’s *cippi*, ^{<1143>}1 Kings 14:23, etc.); and hence the goddess herself (15:13, etc.), among other species of trees that seem to have given names to localities we mention *Rimmon*, the pomegranate; *Liz*, the almond; *Tamar*, the palm; *Shittah* (in the plu. *Shittim*), the acacia; *Libneh* (or *Jibnah*), the white poplar; and *Rithem* (*Rithmah*), the Spanish broom.

III. Human *structures* (including residences or defenses), whether collective or individual, public or private.

1. Ir (ry[^ר] or Ar (r[^ר]), a *city* (as always rendered in the A.V., except “town,” in ^{<0885>}Deuteronomy 3:5; ^{<0904>}1 Samuel 16:4; 23:7 27:5; ^{<0909>}Esther 9:9; ^{<2495>}Jeremiah 19:15; “court,” in ^{<2204>}2 Kings 20:4), designates a fortified place (10:25; 17:9; 18:8; ^{<3105>}1 Chronicles 11:5, etc.), such as Jerusalem, Samaria, Jericho, etc., especially walled cities (^{<0230>}Genesis 23:10; 8; 34:20, 24; ^{<0689>}Joshua 8:29; 11:4; ^{<0762>}Judges 16:2, 3; ^{<0881>}Ruth 3:11; ^{<0237>}1 Samuel 23:7; ^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:13; 17:10; ^{<3109>}1 Chronicles 11:9; ^{<4885>}2 Chronicles 8:5, etc.), in contrast with others (^{<0829>}Leviticus 25:29, 31; ^{<0968>}1 Samuel 6:18); but in one case (^{<0885>}Deuteronomy 3:5) we have “unwalled cities.” The former of these two cognate terms occurs as part of a proper name in Ir-hat-temaritm (^{<0543>}Deuteronomy 34:3; ^{<0716>}Judges 1:16; 3, 13; ^{<4815>}2 Chronicles 28:15) Irham-melelach (^{<0652>}Joshua 15:62), Ir-shemesh (^{<0694>}Joshua 19:41), Ir-nahash (^{<0342>}1 Chronicles 4:12), Ir-ha-heres (^{<2398>}Isaiah 19:18), Rechoboth-ir (^{<0101>}Genesis 10:11); the latter as Ar (^{<0215>}Numbers 21:15; ^{<0819>}Deuteronomy 2:9, 18, 29) or Ar-Moab (^{<0228>}Numbers 21:28; 22:36; ^{<2350>}Isaiah 15:1).

2. Kiryah (hyr[^ך] a *town*, apparently the ancient (hence their mnaautish *Kirjath*) and poetical (but proverbial, ^{<0826>}Deuteronomy 2:36; 3:4; ^{<1044>}1 Kings 1:41, 45; or Slamautan, ^{<1940>}Ezra 4:10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21) word for a city (^{<0228>}Numbers 21:28; ^{<0682>}Psalms 68:2; ^{<2392>}Isaiah 25:2), especially in the proper names Kirjath, Kijnathainm, Kirjatih-arba, Kiljath-huzoth, Kirjatti-jearim, Kirj tharim, Kirjath-baal, Kirjath-sepher, Kirjth-satniah, Kerioth, anid Kiartch.

3. Perazah (hxr[^ר] only with the plur. *Perazoth*, **twør[^ר]** and the collective *Perazin*, **^wør[^ר]** or *Perazi*, **yzæ[^ר]** *unwalled town* or open village of considerable size *and* character (^{<0885>}Deuteronomy 2:5; ^{<0968>}1 Samuel 6:18; ^{<0799>}Esther 9:19; ^{<2581>}Ezekiel 38:11; ^{<3004>}Zechariah 1:4; but “villages” in ^{<0887>}Judges 5:7, 11; ^{<3814>}Habakkuk 3:14, means *chiefs*), and in the designation of the Perizzites, or inhabitants of open villages.

4. Kaphar (rpk[^כ]), a *hamlet* or small collection of houses (“village,” ^{<0968>}1 Samuel 6:18; ^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 27:25; ^{<2071>}Song of Solomon 7:11), occurs chiefly in combination as a proper name: Chehar-ha-Ammonai (^{<0634>}Joshua 18:24), Chephirah (^{<0897>}Joshua 9:17), Ciaphar-saba (1 Macc. 7:31), Caperniumin, and many Talmudic places (Caiphii), like the Arab. *Kefr*.

5. Chatser (rx[^ש]), a *village* (literally an enclosure), originally a “court” or vestibule (as of the Tabernacle, ^{<0279>}Exodus 27:9, etc.; or Temple, ^{<1026>}1

Kings 6:36; ^{<1216>}2 Kings 21:57; of a palace, 20:4; ^{<1706>}Esther 1:5; ^{<363>}Jeremiah 36:20; comp. 22; prison, ^{<1125>}Nehemiah 3:25; ^{<321>}Jeremiah 22:2, etc.; or even of a common house, ^{<1078>}2 Samuel 17:18), but topographically designating a permanent Bedawin encampment of tent-cloths spread over stone walls (^{<0256>}Genesis 25:16; ^{<3211>}Isaiah 42:11), such as *the Hazerim* dwelt in (^{<0123>}Deuteronomy 2:23). It appears especially in the proper names Hazeroth, Hazar-addar, Hazareth; Hazar-addah, Hazar-hatticon, Haza-shulal, Hazar-isth (or susim), and (in a slightly changed form, *Chatsor*, **rwøj**), Hazor.

6. Chavvâh (hwj), in the plur. (*Chavoth*, **twøi**), a *tent village* of a more temporary or frail character than the preceding, was not being surrounded by any defense (“town,” ^{<0434>}Numbers 32:41; ^{<0633>}Joshua 13:30; ^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:13; ^{<4112>}2 Chronicles 2:23; “Havoth,” ^{<0184>}Deuteronomy 3:14; ^{<0743>}Judges 4:13). The following are rather separate erections or fortification than congregated abodes but they are of a fixed character in distinction from the simple and primitive *Ohel* (**l hɑð**), or “tent.” For all these the general name is *Bayith* (**tyð**), a *house* (as almost always rendered in the A.V.), which is the common expression for a fixed habitation (very generally as *built* [from **hnB**] of substantial materials, but occasionally a frailer structure, Genesis 10-17, 15; ^{<0788>}Judges 18:31; ^{<0907>}1 Samuel 1:7; ^{<1287>}2 Kings 18:7; ^{<1014>}Job 8:14), and for a permanent dwelling (as appears from the form of the letter called from it **b** which represents the three sides of a house, the other being left open for a doorway). The main element of the former and most enduring of these erections is denoted by the word *Kr* (**ryq** cognate with *Kirch* above), a *wall* (as of a house, whether exterior or interior, ^{<0147>}Leviticus 14:37; ^{<0905>}1 Samuel 10:25; ^{<1065>}1 Kings 6:5; ^{<3234>}Ezekiel 23:14, etc.; hence the side of an altar, ^{<0105>}Leviticus 1:5; 5:9; a fence or enclosure, ^{<0225>}Numbers 22:25; and the will of a town, only 35:4; as the distinctive term for this last is *Chomah*, **hm/h**; see ^{<0125>}Joshua 2:15, where both occur together), which, itself is also used as a proper name, *Kir* (both in Moab, ^{<1950>}Psalms 15:1; comp. 2 Kings 3, 25; ^{<2367>}Isaiah 16:7, 11; ^{<2481>}Jeremiah 48:31, 36; and in Assyria, ^{<2169>}2 Kings 16:9; ^{<2216>}Isaiah 22:6; Amos 1:5; 9:7).

7. Heykal (l kyh), a *palace* or, large edifice for royalty (^{<1185>}Proverbs 30:28; ^{<2307>}Isaiah 39:7; ^{<2704>}Daniel 1:4, etc.), especially the temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem (^{<2243>}2 Kings 24:13; ^{<4187>}2 Chronicles 3:17;

^{<2818>}Jeremiah 50:28; ^{<3125>}Haggai 2:15; ^{<3064>}Zechariah 6:14, 15; elsewhere distinguished by the epithet “holy,” or denoted by “Lord’s house”); and so, of the tabernacle previously (^{<9100>}1 Samuel 1:9; 3:3; ^{<9188>}Psalms 5:8; poetically for the heavens, 11:4, etc.), specifically for the holy place (^{<1065>}1 Kings 6:5, etc.).

8. Bînrah (**hryBæ**) a *citadel* (a word of wide etymological affinities, all denoting *strength of defense* **SEE BARIS**), a term of later Hebrew (for the acropolis adjoining the Temple, ^{<4617>}Nehemiah 2:7:2; or the Temple itself, ^{<1399>}1 Chronicles 29:19) or Chaldaic use (the Persian “palace,” ^{<1502>}Ezra 6:2; ^{<4617>}Nehemiah 1:7; ^{<1702>}Esther 1:2; 2, 3; 3:15.; 8:14; 9:6, etc.; ^{<2782>}Daniel 8:2), and in the plur. (“castles,” ^{<4472>}2 Chronicles 17:12; 27:4).

9. Armon (**ʿworæi**) ounce (^{<3008>}Amos 4:3) *Harmony* (**ʿworh**), the *keep* or *harem* of a “palace,” a poetical term (^{<1168>}1 Kings 16:18; ^{<1168>}2 Kings 15, 25; ^{<4639>}2 Chronicles 36:19; ^{<9883>}Psalms 48:3, 13; ^{<2332>}Isaiah 25:2; ^{<4472>}Jeremiah 17:21; Amos 1:4; 2:2, etc.).

10. Tirah (**hryfæ**) a *Bedawin castle* (^{<0256>}Genesis 25:16; ^{<0610>}Numbers 31:10; “palace,” ^{<2574>}Ezekiel 25:4).

11. Mibtsâr (**rxbjnæ**) a *fortress*, commonly used with *Irs* (“fenced city,” ^{<0627>}Numbers 32:17, 36; ^{<1601>}Joshua 10:20; 19:35; ^{<0668>}1 Samuel 6:18; ^{<1181>}2 Kings 3:19; 10:2; 17:9; 18:8; ^{<4479>}2 Chronicles 17:19); such as Tyre (^{<1692>}Joshua 19:29; ^{<1247>}2 Samuel 24:7), frequent in the poetical books (“fortress,” or “defensed city,” ^{<1204>}Psalms 29:40; ^{<2378>}Isaiah 17:3; ^{<2008>}Jeremiah 1:8; ^{<3482>}Nahum 3:12, etc.), as well as in the historical (“stronghold,” ^{<0439>}Numbers 13:19; ^{<1282>}2 Kings 8:12). Cognate is, *Bitsaron* (“Stronghold,” ^{<3992>}Zechariah 9:12).

12. Matsor (**rwæm**) or *Metsurah* (**hrwæm**), a *fort* (A.V. “fort,” “fenced,” “stronghold,” etc.), either alone (^{<4410>}2 Chronicles 11:10), or, within (^{<1485>}2 Chronicles 8:5; 11:5; 10, 11, 23; 13:4; 14:6), to denote the fortified towns of Judah and Benjamin, once (^{<3903>}Zechariah 9:3) Tyre and (especially in the poetical books) for offensive works of a siege (“siege” “bulwarks,” or “fort,” ^{<6309>}Deuteronomy 20:19, 20; 28:5, 3; Isaiah 19; ^{<3484>}Nahum 2:4 etc.) As a proper name (^{<1294>}2 Kings 19:24; ^{<0272>}Psalms 27:25; 19:6)] Mazor seems to denote Egypt (Miz-raim).

The remaining terms are rather designations of temporary and natural protection than artificial and settled abodes.

13. Maoz (zwǫm); a stronghold, such as a “rock” (^{<0706>}Judges 6:26), elsewhere poetically as an attributive for *military strength* (“fort,” “fortress,” “stronghold,” “strength,” ^{<0270>}Psalms 27:1; such as Tyre, ^{<2374>}Isaiah 23:4, 11,14; or Egypt, 30:2,3; Zechariah 30:15).

14. Maoi (ʿ/[m]) or *Meonuah (hn/[m])*, a secure dwelling place, as of Jehovah (at Shiloh, ^{<0129>}1 Samuel 2:29, 32; at Jerusalem, ^{<1216>}Psalms 26:5; 68:5; 76:2); and so a den (of a lion, ^{<8384>}Job 38:40; ^{<1442>}Psalms 104:22; ^{<2048>}Song of Solomon 4:8; ^{<3121>}Nahum 2:11, 12; Amos 3, 4; or other beast, ^{<8376>}Job 37:5; ^{<2491>}Jeremiah 9:11; 10:22; 49:33; 51:37).

15. Metsad (dxm) or *Metsudah (hdw̄xm)*, a lair (from the idea of hunting), prop. of wild beasts and hence of birds (^{<8928>}Job 39:28; ^{<2484>}Jeremiah 48:41; ^{<2372>}Ezekiel 17:20); frequent in the poetical books (“munition,” “fortress,” “defense”) connection with *Sela* and *Tsûr*; and topographically applied to the hill forts of Judean (“hold,” ^{<0224>}1 Samuel 22:4, 5; 24:22; ^{<0234>}2 Samuel 23:14; ^{<3116>}1 Chronicles 11:16; 12; 8,16; “fort,” ^{<3327>}Ezekiel 33:27; “stronghold,” ^{<0702>}Judges 6:2; ^{<0234>}1 Samuel 23:14,19, 29), especially Zion (“hold,” ^{<0157>}2 Samuel 5:17; ^{<3116>}1 Chronicles 11:16: “fort,” ^{<0109>}2 Samuel 5:9; “castle” ^{<3116>}1 Chronicles 11:5, 7; “stronghold,” ^{<0109>}2 Samuel 5:7).

16. Sok, (Ēs) or *Sukkoh (hksu)* a booth or ‘canopy of leafy boughs as a habitation for man or beast’ (“booth,” ^{<0224>}Leviticus 22:42, 43; ^{<1684>}Nehemiah 8:14, 15,16,17; ^{<8322>}Job 31:20; ^{<3016>}Jonah 4:5; “pavilion,” ^{<8322>}Psalms 31:20; “cottage,” ^{<2518>}Isaiah 50:8; “tabernacle,” 4:6), such as Jacob constructed (^{<0117>}Genesis 21:17), and the Israelites occupied during the Festival of “Tabernacles” (^{<0234>}Leviticus 23:43, in commemoration of their first stopping-place out of Egypt, “Succoth” ^{<0130>}Exodus 13:20), and hence applied to the retreat of the lion (“den,” ^{<9009>}Psalms 10:9; “covert,” ^{<8384>}Job 38:40; ^{<2538>}Jeremiah 25:38), and to Jerusalem, Jehovah’s retreat (^{<1742>}Psalms 76:2), to military tents (“tent,” ^{<0111>}2 Samuel 11:11; “pavilion,” ^{<0102>}1 Kings 20:12, 16), and to the clouds (“tabernacle,” ^{<8322>}Job 36:29; “pavilion,” ^{<0122>}2 Samuel 22:12; ^{<0181>}Psalms 18:11).

17. Mistat (rTsjmæ) a covert or hiding-place (A.V. “secret” place, etc.), once (^{<2016>}Isaiah 4:6, “covert”) *Mistor (r/Tsmj)*, as a shelter from the elements (^{<2016>}Isaiah 4:6), or concealment (^{<2437>}Jeremiah 13:17; 23:24; 19:10), and especially the lurking-place of lions (^{<1972>}Psalms 17:12;

~~3810~~Lamentations 3:10) and of violent men (~~3905~~Psalm 10:5, 9; 64:4; ~~3814~~Hebrews 3:14).

In connection with this whole subject, we may add that we have had frequent illustrations, in the aptness with which geographical names are given in the Bible, of that nice sense of locality which a simple people, especially one of nomadic instincts, invariably exhibits. Indeed, the whole Hebrew language is an exemplification, particularly in the varied import of the nearly synonymous roots which unfortunately the lexicons generally fail accurately to distinguish, of the close observance of all physical traits. In like manner the descriptions of locality, which, to a modern Occidental, often seem vague and casual, are generally found, when carefully scanned, to be remarkably precise and graphic, a fact, which later travelers are beginning to appreciate. Instances of this abound in the dooms-day book of Joshua, and many of them we have pointed out under the art. **TRIBE** *SEE TRIBE*. A question of much practical importance has arisen respecting the lists of towns in the various tribes given in that book, whether they are arranged in geographical order. The presumption, growing out of the minute character of the delineation, evidently copied from some memorandum of survey, is in favor of such accuracy, and this is confirmed by the fact now well recognized by commentators, that the list of nations mentioned in ~~4113~~Acts 2:9-11 proceeds regularly from the East to the West. Lieut. Conder, in his papers in the *Quar. Reports* of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," bases many of his proposed identifications of places on this theory, which he elaborately defends. We are inclined, however, to doubt its trustworthiness for that purpose, as the Oriental mind is not so uniformly methodical as this view implies; and we have found very frequent reason to depart from such a rule in the indications of identification that we have pointed out under the various places named.

Tor

SEE TURTLE.

Torah

(fully *Masseketh Sepher Torah*, **rps tksm hrwj**), or *Treatise of the Law*, is a Talmudic treatise containing enactments as to the manner in which, and the material on which, the law is to be written. The five chapters of which this treatise consist are full of information, especially the first and fourth; the former containing some notices concerning the Sept.,

the latter bearing on the sacred text. As to the Sept., see, under that head, *Talmudic Notices concerning the Septuagint*, in this *Cyclop.* The fourth chapter gives the passages in which the word **μϑηλ α** denotes the Deity or has a different signification. These differences are also noticed in correct editions of the Hebrew text by the words **çdq** and **l wj**, i.e. holy or profane, thus enabling the student at once. to discern whether **μϑηλ α** should be translated *God* or *gods*, or *judges*, etc. This treatise has been edited, with six others, by Kirchheim (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1851), under the title **twnfq twtksm [bç twymł çwry**; also with the Latin title. *Septenm Libri Talmudici Parvi Hierosolymitani quos nunc primum secundut us. Bibliotheca Clarissimi Carmolii edidit.* etc. (B. P.)

Torch

Picture for Torch 1

Picture for Torch 2

is the occasional rendering in the A.V. of **dyPbæ** *lappid* (^{<3116>}Zechariah 12:6), which usually signifies (and is translated) a *lamp*; and so **λαμπάς** (^{<6118>}John 18:3). In ^{<3118>}Nahum 2:3 [Hebrews 4] it represents **hdł P]***peladdh*, which rather signifies *iron*. **SEE STEEL**. The distinction in the East between a torch and a lantern (q.v.) is not very marked as both are often but forms of flambeaus. **SEE LAMP**. A flaming torch is sometimes quoted by the prophets as the symbol of great anger and destruction (^{<3116>}Zechariah 12:6). So also Isaiah (^{<2304>}Isaiah 7:4) compares Rezin, king of Syria, and the king of Israel, two bitter enemies to Ahaz, king of Judah, to “two tails of smoking firebrands.” **SEE FIREBRAND**.

Tordesillas, Moses

a Jewish writer who flourished in 1373 at Avila, in Spain, is the author of **rz[hnwmah**, in which he critically examines 125 passages of the Old Test. regarded by the Christians as Messianic. This work originated through a controversy, which he had had with a Jewish convert at Avila; and, for the benefit of the congregations of Avila and Toledo, he collected all the material which he laid down in his **hnwma rz[**, forming the second part of a work bearing the general title **rz[h 8s** the first part of it being entitled **rz[tdh**. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 435; De' Rossi. *Dizionario*

Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 317 sq., and *Biblioth. Jud. Antichrist.* p. 26. (B.P.)

Torgau, Convention of

Among the German Reformers there was considerable difference of opinion on various subjects, which opinions were advanced and supported with great warmth. All good men friendly to the new Church were desirous of a termination of so many bitter contests, because it was manifest that the papists turned them to their own advantage. After an unsuccessful endeavor to bring about a settlement of these controversies by a conference at Altenburg, it was thought best that a formula or book should be drawn up by wise and moderate theologians, in which these controversies should be examined and decided. James Andrea, a theologian of Tübingen, was appointed to this work in 1659. This business was hastened by the conduct of Kaspar Peucer, son-in-law of Melancthon, who, with others, endeavored in 1570 to abolish throughout Saxony the doctrine of Luther respecting the Lord's supper, and introduce instead that of Calvin. In 1571 they explicitly declared their dissent from Luther respecting the doctrine of the supper and the person of Christ; and, the better to accomplish their wishes, they introduced into the schools a catechism drawn up by Pezel, and favorable to the doctrine of Calvin. Accordingly the elector Augustus summoned a convention of theologians at Torgau in 1574. Having clearly learned the views of the Crypto-Calvinists, as they were generally called, he treated them with severity, imprisoning some and banishing others. After various consultations, James Andrea especially, in a convention of many divines assembled at Torgau by order of Augustus, drew up the treatise designed to bring peace to the Reformed Church, and which received the name of the *Book of Torgau*. This book, after being examined and amended by many theologians, was again submitted to certain select divines assembled at Germany, and resulted in the famous *Formula of Concord* (q.v.). See *Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History*, 5, 3, 151 sq.

Toribio, Alfonso Mongrovejo, St.

a Spanish prelate, was born at Mayorga in 1538, and studied at Valladolid, giving himself meanwhile to the most austere form of religious life. From this he was called, in 1575, to the College of San Salvador. In 1580 he was made archbishop of Lima; he was consecrated at Seville, and immediately

departed for Peru. He entered Lima May 24, 1581. The diocese covered a large extent of territory, and the means of communication were very poor; but Toribio determined to make a tour of it in person. He sent evangelists into the remote districts, and did all in his power to elevate the Indians, who became much attached to him. His liberality was great, and crowds of poor people would wait at his door for alms. His knowledge of the language rendered access to the people easy, and his labors were incessant. But the fatigue of his long journeys and the warm climate proved fatal, and Toribio died during his third episcopal tour, March 23, 1606. He was beatified by Clement XI in 1679, and canonized in 1726. See Prescott, *Conquest of Peru*, 4:3; Pinelo, *Vida de Don Toribio, Arzobispo de Lima* (Madrid, 1653). Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale* s.v.

Tortmah

(Heb. *Tormah*’, *hmr*Ⲛ; *deceit*; Sept. ἐν κρυφῇ 5. pr. μετὰ δόρων; Vulg. *clam*) occurs only in the margin of ^{<078>}Judges 9:31, as the alternative rendering of the Hebrew word which in the text is given as “privily.” By a few commentators it has been conjectured that the word was originally the same with Arumah (q.v.) in ver. 41 one or the other having been corrupted by the copyists. This appears to have been first started by Kimchi. It is adopted by Junius and Tremellius; but there is little to be said either for or against it, and it will probably always remain a mere conjecture.

Tormentor

(βασανιστής, ^{<083>}Matthew 18:34) signifies one who examines by torture, and is derived from βασανίζω, which in its passive form means to be ‘tossed as by the waves of the sea.’ Torture, judicially applied, must be distinguished from punishment, however cruel and barbarous it may be; whether it be capital, as impalement or crucifixion; or secondary, as the putting out of the eyes, or any other kind of mutilation. For torture; was not intended to act fatally, nor was it, when so denominated, inflicted as a part of a judicial sentence. **SEE TORTURE**. It was usually employed to extort confession or evidence, as when Claudius Lysias, the chief captain, commanded Paul to be brought into the castle and “examined by scourging” (^{<022>}Acts 22:24). In the text first cited it is used as the means of obtaining payment of a debt. The “tormentors” there referred to are the jailers, who were allowed to scourge and torture the poor debtors in their care in order to get money from them for the grasping creditors, or else to

excite the compassion of friends and obtain the amount of the debt from them. In early times of Rome there were certain legal tortures, in the shape, at least, of a chain weighing fifteen pounds, and a pittance of food barely sufficient to sustain life (see Arnold, *Hist. of Rome*, 1, 136), which the creditor was allowed to apply to the debtor for the purpose of bringing him to terms; and, no doubt, they often did not stop here. The incident was one with which the hearers of our Lord's parables were, no doubt, familiar, and its introduction here shows how savage and tyrannical was the spirit of the age. It is no small mark of the mild and equitable spirit of the legislation of Moses that it did not recognize the use of torture in judicial trials. *SEE CORPORAL INFLICTIONS*. For the "torment" or *tympanism* of 2 Macc. 6,19, 28, *SEE EXECUTION*; *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

Torquemada

(Lat. *Turrecremata*), Juan de, a celebrated Spanish Dominican, was born at Valladolid in 1388. He became a friar in 1403; accompanied his superior to the Council of Constance in 1417; graduated from the University of Paris in 1424; taught theology there; was admitted doctor of the Sorbonne in 1429; and was successively chosen prior of the Dominican convents of Valladolid and Toledo. In 1431 he was sent by pope Eugenius IV to the Council of Basle, where he strenuously supported the court of Rome, and contributed to the condemnation of the doctrines of Wycliffe and Huss. He attended, in 1439, the Council of Florence as papal commissary, and was foremost in drawing up the "articles of reunion" between the Greek and Latin churches, and received from the pope the title of "defender of the faith." He was created cardinal Dec. 18, 1439; and in the year following attended, in the pope's name, the Council of Bourges, where he kept the French prelates on the side of the pope. He became bishop of Palestina in 1455, and of Sabina in 1464. His death took place at Rome, Sept. 26, 1468. His principal works are, *Meditationes Joannis de Turrecremata*, etc. (Rome, 1467, fol.; Augsburg, 1472, fol.; and many later editions): *Quaestiones Spiritualis Convivii Delicii Praeferentes super Evangeliiis* (Rome, 1477, fol.; Nuremberg, 1478); *Commentarii in Decretum Gratiani* (Lyons, 1519, 6 vols. fol.; Venice, 1578; Rome, 1726). Many other of his writings remain unpublished. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Torquemada, Tomas de

the first inquisitor general of Spain, was born in 1420, and was a monk of the Order of St. Dominic at Torquemada, Spain, and prior of the monastery of Santa Cruz at Segovia. He was appointed by Ferdinand and Isabella inquisitor-general in 1483; and confirmed in that post Oct. 17 of that year by pope Innocent VIII; who gave him the title of “confessor of sovereigns.” In the course of sixteen years he gave to the flames no less than eight thousand eight hundred victims, besides executing nearly as many in effigy, condemning ninety thousand to perpetual imprisonment and other severe punishments, and expelling from Spain above eight hundred thousand Jews. In his later years his authority was curtailed by the appointment of four colleagues by order of pope Alexander VI. He died at Avila, Sept. 16, 1498. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Torre, Lelio Della

professor in the Rabbinic College at Padua, was born in the year 1804. When sixteen years of age he was teacher in Turin, and in 1826 he was appointed preacher there. When, in 1827, the Rabbinical school was opened at Padua, he was appointed one of its professors. He died July 9, 1872. Torre wrote in German, Italian, French, and Hebrew. Of his publications we mention, *Specchio, ossia Tavola Senottica delle Conjugazioni Ebraiche secondo le Regole dell' Analogia*, etc. (Padua, 1828): — *Cinque Discorsi detti in Padova, con Annotazioni* (ibid. 1834): — *Della Socialita della Legge Mosaica* (ibid. 1836): — *Della Condizione degli Ebrei sotto l' Imperio Germanico nel Medio Evo* (ibid. 1842): — **מלך ה' 8s**, *I Salmi Volgarizzati sui Testo Massoretico, ed Illustrati con Aryomenti e Note* (Vienna, 1845): — **תבא יקרפ**, *Sentenze dei Padre. Nuovo Traduzione*, etc. (2d ed. Padua, 1862). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 435 sq.; Kayserling, *Bibliothek jüdischer Kanzelredner*, in *Homiletisches u. literarisches Beiblatt* to the second vol. (Berlin, 1872), p. 58; Servi, in *Educae tore Israelitico*, July 15, 1872. (B. P.)

Torrentius (Van Der Beken), Laevinus

a Flemish Roman Catholic divine, was born at Ghent in 1525. Educated first at Lonvain, he went thence to Bologna, in order to study civil law and antiquities. There he so distinguished himself by his skill in polite literature, especially poetry, that he became known to the literati of Europe. He took

holy orders, and was at length raised to the bishopric of Antwerp, Hence he was translated to the metropolitan church of Mechlin, where he died, in 1595. Torrentius founded a college of Jesuits at Louvain, to which he left his library, coins, etc. Besides *Latin Poems* (Antwerp, 1594; printed by Plantin), he wrote *Commentaries upon Suetonius* (1592) and *Horace* (1608, 4to).

Torrey, Joseph, D.D.

a Congregational divine, was born at Rowley, Mass., Feb. 2, 1797; and graduated at Dartmouth College in 1816. After studying theology at Andover, he became in 1819 pastor of a Congregational Church at Royalton, Vt. In 1827 he accepted the professorship of Greek and Latin in the University of Vermont, which position he retained until 1842, when he was chosen professor of intellectual and moral philosophy. This chair he occupied until his death, at Burlington, Vt., Nov. 26, 1867. He was president of the university from 1863 to 1865. Mr. Torrey was the author of a posthumous volume of *Lectures: — A Theory of Art* (1875): — editor of the *Remains of President James Marsh* (1843): — *Select Sermons of President Worthington Smith* (1861); to both of which he prefixed carefully prepared *Memoirs*: — and translator of Neander's *General History of the Christian: Religion and Church* (Boston, 1854, 5 vols.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Torrey, Reuben

a Congregational minister, was born at Weymouth, Mass., April 3, 1789, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1816. He was licensed to preach, in 1817 by the Rhode Island Congregational Consociation, and, while pursuing his theological studies, preached more or less in different places. He was ordained in May, 1820, and became pastor of the Congregational Church in Eastford, Conn., where he remained for twenty years (1820-40). On resigning, he acted as a supply of the pulpit of the Church in North Mansfield, Conn., for two years (1841-43), and for the next five-years (1843-48) was pastor of the Church in Prospect, Conn. Subsequently he was pastor for seven or eight years of the Church in North Madison, Conn., and in 1852 removed to Elmwood, a part of Providence, R. I., to take charge of a Church newly formed in that section of the city.

His pastorate with this Church continued for eight years (1852-60). The remainder of his life was spent in Providence, where he died, Sept. 22, 1870. (J. C. S.)

Torrigiano, Pietro

a celebrated Italian sculptor, was born at Florence about 1472. He studied the antiquities in the gardens of Lorenzo the Magnificent in company with Michael Angelo; but, becoming jealous of the growing distinction of the latter, he assaulted him so violently that he was obliged to leave Florence. He went to Rome, where he was employed by pope Alexander VI; but he afterwards gave up his profession, and became a soldier under the duke of Valentino, and also under Vitelli and Piero de Medici. He again returned to his profession, and, executing several bronze figures for some Florentine merchants, accompanied them to England. He was employed by Henry VIII in erecting the tomb of Henry VII in Westminster Abbey, which was completed in 1519, and, it is supposed, the tomb of Margaret, countess of Richmond, in Henry VI's Chapel. He left England finally in 1519, and visited Spain, where he executed several pieces of sculpture for convents, etc., and, among others, a group of the *Virgin and Infant*. This was so beautiful that the duke de Arcos commissioned him to make a copy of it, promising liberal payment. Disappointed in receiving a large quantity of copper coin, amounting to only thirty ducats, he seized a mallet and slivered the work into a thousand pieces. The duke accused him to the Inquisition as a sacrilegious heretic for destroying a figure of the Holy Virgin. Torrigiano was condemned, but avoided the ignominious end, which awaited him by starving himself. He died in 1522. See Spooner. *Biog., Dict. Of Fine Arts, s.v.*

Tortoise

Picture for Tortoise 1

(bx; *tsab*, so called, according to Gesenius, from *moving slowly*; *Sept. ὄφρισι.δευκτη ὁ χερσαῖος*; *Vulg. crocodilus*) occurs only in ^{<B129>}Leviticus 11:29 as the name of some unclean animal; Bochart (*Hiero.* 2, 463) with reason refers the Heb. term to the kindred Arabic *dhab*, a large kind of lizard, which, from the description of it as given by Damir, appears to be the *Psamlnmosaurus scillcus*, or *Monritor terrestris* of Cuvlier (*Rayne Anim.* 2, 26). This lizard is the *waran el-hard* of the Arabs, i.e. the land-

waran (*Yranus arenarius*), in. contradistinction from the *waran el-bahr*, i.e. the water-lizard (*Monitor Niloticus*), It is common enough in the deserts of Palestine and North Africa. It is probably the **κροκόδειλος χερσαίος** of Herodotus (4, 192) and Dioscorides (2, 71), or perhaps their **σκιγκος**, the *Scincus officinalis*. **SEE SNAIL**. The land-monitor (*Psammoscaurus scincus*) is a lizard three or four feet in length, which, living in the sandy and rocky wastes, subsists on the beetles and other small animals that are found in such arid situations. It is of a yellowish or dusky tint, with darker green spots and bands, and with yellow claws. Tristram, however, thinks the animal in question is the *Uromastix spinipes*, a large species of lizard very common in the desert and sands of North Africa and Arabia. It is also well known in the Judean wilderness, living in holes of the rocks and burrowing in the sand. It sometimes attains the length of two feet. Its most peculiar characteristic is its powerful spiny tail, broad and massive, and incrustated with close rows of stout prickly scales, This is its weapon of defense, which it uses with effect against its assailant. Its color is grass green, spotted with brown, but darker when irritated. It has a slow and awkward gait, turning its head from side to side with great caution as it walks... It rarely bites, but when it does so nothing will induce it to relinquish its grasp. It feeds chiefly on beetles, but will attack larger animals, even chickens, when in confinement. It is eaten by the Arabs” (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 255). **SEE LIZARD**.

The same Hebrew word **bx**; *tsab*, is translated “covered [wagons]” in ~~QUBS~~ Numbers 7:3, and the same idea seems to be prominent in ~~260~~ Isaiah 66:20, where our translators have rendered it “litters.” According to Gesenius, it means in both these passages a sedan or palanquin (so called from being gently borne). **SEE LITTER**.

Picture for Tortoise 2

Several kinds of tortoise inhabit Palestine and the surrounding regions. Among the land tortoises the bordered tortoise (*Testudo marginaata*), probably the **χελώνη χερσαία** of Aristotle—a little species closely resembling the common *T. Graec-replaces* this latter in Egypt and the coast of Barbary; and, a near ally, *T. Mauritanica*, extends throughout North Africa and Western Asia, from Algiers to the Caspian. Besides these, several marsh-tortoises (*Emys*, etc.) are common in the fresh waters of those regions, and are particularly troublesome to horses wading or drinking (see Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 507 sq.). **SEE ZOOLOGY**.

Tortosa, Council Of (Concilium Dertusense).

This council was held in Tortosa, a cathedral city of Catalonia, Spain, in 1429, by Peter, cardinal de Foix. All the prelates and many ecclesiastics of the kingdoms of Aragon and Valencia, and of the principality of Catalonia, attended. The king's letters, patent confirming the liberties and immunities of the Church were read, and at the end of the fourth session twenty canons were approved and published.

4. Orders that all beneficed clerks and ecclesiastics in holy orders shall keep breviaries, in order that they may say the office privately when hindered from attending in the choir.
5. Forbids the elevation of unworthy persons to holy orders.
6. Orders curates every Sunday to teach *by* catechizing some part of the things necessary to be known by Christians in order to salvation, which it declares to be as follows:
 - (1.) What they ought to *believe*, contained in the articles of the faith.
 - (2.) What they ought to *pray for*, contained in the Lord's Prayer.
 - (3.) What they ought to *keep*, contained in the ten commandments.
 - (4.) What they ought to *avoid*, viz. the seven mortal sins.
 - (5.) What they ought to *desire*, viz. *the* joys of Paradise.
 - (6.) What they ought to fear, viz. the plain of hell.
9. Orders neophytes to bring their children to church within eight days after their birth, in order that they may receive baptism is:
15. Forbids the delegates of the holy-see to go beyond their commission. See Mansi, *Concil.* 12:406; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v.

Torture

(Lat. *torquere* to twist) is pain inflicted as a judicial instrument for extracting evidence from unwilling witnesses or confessions from accused persons. The practice is an ancient one. In ancient Athens slaves were always examined by torture, and their evidence seems on this account to have been deemed more valuable than that of freemen. Any one might give up his slave to torture, or demand that of his opponent, and a refusal to do so was considered as a strong presumption against a person. No free Athenian could be examined by torture, and it was not inflicted upon

Roman freemen or citizens until the time of the emperors. Then it was sometimes inflicted upon even freemen to extract evidence of the crime of *lesa majestas*, and thus it became a part of the Code of Justinian. Hence it was adopted during the Middle Ages by all European states in which the Roman law was made the basis of legislation. It was adopted early and extensively by the Italian municipalities. In Germany elaborate apparatus for its infliction existed, not merely in the dungeons of the feudal castles, but in the vaults beneath the town halls of Nuremberg, and Katisbon, where the various implements used are yet to be seen. It continued to be practiced in the prisons of Germany until they were visited by Howard, in 1770. It ceased to be a part of the judicial system in France in 1789; and in Scotland it was still in frequent use after the Restoration, and was only abolished by Anne, c. 21, sec. 5. In Russia it was done away with in 1801. In the United States it has never been reckoned an adjunct of judicial examination.

The first instance we have of its used in England is in 1310, in aid of the ecclesiastical law, during the struggle between pope Clement V and the Templars. Edward II, when requested to sanction the infliction of torture by the inquisitors in the case of certain Templars accused of heresy and apostasy, at first refused, but, on a remonstrance by Clementi he referred the matter to the council, and on the recommendation of the council the inquisitors were authorized to put the accused to torture, but without mutilation or serious injury to the person or effusion of blood. During the Tudor period, the council assumed the power of directing torture warrants to the lieutenants of the Tower and other officers against state-prisoners and occasionally also against persons accused of other serious crimes. Under James I and Charles I torture was less resorted to, and only in state trials. It was inflicted for the last time in May, 1640. The worst application of torture was found in the hands of the Inquisition. In 1282 pope Innocent IV called on the secular powers to put to the torture persons accused of heresy in order to extract confessions against themselves and others. The necessity of secrecy in the proceedings led to its extensive adoption, and to refinements of cruelty in its use before unknown. *SEE INQUISITION.*

The instruments of torture have been many and various. The scourge was the usual instrument of torture among the Romans, who also made use of the *equleus*, a sort of upright rack, with pincers added to tear the flesh, etc. The most celebrated instrument was the "rack," known in the south of Europe as early as the 2nd century, but introduced into the Tower by the

duke of Exeter, constable of the Tower. The “boot” was the favorite French instrument of torture. In this, rings of iron were passed around the legs, and wooden wedges driven between them and the flesh until the muscles were reduced to jelly. Among other means of torture were the “thumb-screw,” “iron gauntlets;” the “little ease,” a narrow cell in which the prisoner was confined for several days, and in which the only position possible was one which cramped every muscle; the “scavenger’s (properly Skevington’s) daughter,” the invention of Sir William Skevington, an instrument which compressed the body so as to start the blood from the nostrils and often from the hands. The torture by water, crucifixion, the fastening of limbs to trees which were forced into proximity to each other and then suffered to fly apart, and pouring melted lead into the ears, are a few of the means by which punishment has been inflicted.

See Barnum, *Romanism as It Is* (index); Jardine, *On the Use of Torture in the Criminal Law of England* (Lond. 1889, 8vo); Maclaurin, *Introduction to Criminal Trials*; Nicolas, *Si la Torture est un Moyen Surr a vierfier les Crimes Secrets* (1681, 12mo); Reitemaier, *Sur la Questions chez les Grecs et les Romuains*; Mittermaier, *Das deutsche Strafverfahhren*, vol. 1. **SEE** **TORMENTOR**.

Torwood Excommunication

After the skirmish at Airmoss and the execution of Cameron, Cargill, during a field-preaching at Torwood, near Stirling, publicly excommunicated the king, the duke of York, the duke of Monmouth, the duke of Luderdale, the duke of Rothes, General Dalziel, and Sir George Mackenzie. According to tradition, Rothes, during a dangerous sickness the following year, sent for some of the Presbyterian ministers, and in a fit of remorse confessed the justice of the sentence. The duke of Hamilton added, “We banish these men and yet when dying we send for them.”

Tosaphoth

(**twpswt**) denotes those *additions* or *supplementary glosses* to Rashi’s (q.v.)’ commentary-on the Talmud which are found along with the latter in every edition of the Talmud. The disciples of Rashi, when they found that their master’s expositions could be extended and improved, set about this work of exposition immediately after his death, filling up every gap, and using up every scrap which their searcher had left. Out of reverence for him, they would not put down their opinions in an independent manner, but

denominated them **twpswt**, *additions*, and hence they were called *Tosaphists*. The first Tosaphists were his two sons-in-law, R. Meier ben-Samuel and Jehudah benNathan, the latter called by way of abbreviation *Rib* (\hat{c} byr = \hat{c} tn \hat{b} hdwhy ybr; his three grandsons, R. Isaac, R. Samuel, and R. Jacob Tam, sons of R. Meier, who are respectively called from their initials *Ribam*, μ byr =, **ryam \hat{b} qj xy r**, *Raskban* (q.v.), and *R. Tam* (q.v.); and, lastly, R. Isaac ben-Asher of Spires, called *Riba*, **abyr** =- **rça \hat{b} qj xy ybr**, also a-relative of Rashi. The latter is called **twpswth** | [**b**, or the Tosaphist **κατ' ἐξοχήν**. Besides these, we mention Joseph Porat, son of Samuel ben-Meier; Isaac ben-Samuel of Dompaire, also called Isaac the Elder, a nephew of R. Tam; Samuel ben-Natronai, called *Rashbate*, **fbçr**; Isaac ben-Mordecai, of Augsburg; Isaac Halaban ben-Jacob of Prague, etc. They are enumerated by Zunz in his *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* (Berlin, 1845, p. 29.sq), where the student will-find all necessary information. (B. P.)

Tosi, Joseph

a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in the year 1824 at Witschein, in Stria. In 1846, he received holy orders, and in 1853 he as promoted at Vienna as doctor of theology. In the same year he was called as professor of dogmatics to Gratz, where he remained until the year 1868. He then went to Vienna and lectured until the year 1871, when he was appointed canon of St. Stephen's, and died May 14,1875. He published, *Lectures on the Syllabus Erroruum of the Papal Encycl. dated Dec. 8, 1864* (Vienna, 1865): — *Ueber Religionslosigkeit und Wissenschaft, Darwinismus und den Ursprung des Menschen* (Gratz, 1865). Comp. *Lifterarischer Handweiserfir das kathol. Deutschland*, 1866, p, 59, 1g3; 1875, p. 252. (B. P.)

Tostado, Alonso

a Spanish prelate, was born at Madrigal in 1400. He studied at Salamanca, and at the age of twenty-two received his degree. He was elected to the chair of theology, and soon gained a wide reputation. In 1431 hew as sent to the Council of Basle, and by some of his utterances attracted the attention and condemnation of the holy see. In 1443 he was ordered to appear before an assembly of theologians at Sienna, and was convicted of unsound doctrine. On his return to Spain, through the intercession of the

king, he received the bishopric of Avila, and was also member of the Council of Castile. He died near Avila Sept. 3, 1455. His works are numerous, and a large number were published at Venice, 1547, 24 vols. fol.; they consist of mystical commentaries on the lives of the Bible and on Matthew. Besides these are *Comentario sobre Eiusebio* (Salamanca, 1506): — *Confesionario* (Logrofo, 1520). See Viera Clavio, *Elogio de Alonso Tostado*; Antonio, *Bibl. Hist. Vetus*. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Total Abstinence

SEE TEMPERANCE.

Toü

(~~1389~~ 1 Chronicles 18:9, 10). *SEE TOI.*

Toule, Council of

SEE TOUSI, COUNCIL OF.

Toulmin, Joshua, D.D.

an English Unitarian minister, was born in London May 11, 1740. Educated at a Dissenting academy, he became minister of a Dissenting congregation in Colyton, Devonshire, and in 1765 of a Baptist congregation in Taunton. Afterwards he adopted Unitarian views from Harvard College in 1794, and in 1804 was chosen one of the ministers of the Unitarian congregation at Birmingham, formerly presided over by Dr. Priestley. Here Dr. Toulmin continued to labor until his death, July 23, 1815. He was an able preacher and an industrious writer. He wrote, *Sermons to Youth*, etc. (Honiton, 1770, 12mo; 2d ed. Taunton, 1789, 8vo): *Memoirs of F. Sotinus* (Lond. 1777, 8vo): — *Dissertations on the Evidences of Christianity* (1785, 8vo): — *Review of the Life of John Biddle* (1789, 8vo; 1791, 8vo): *History of the Town of Taunton* (1791, 4to): — *Sermons* (1810, 8vo): — *Historical View of the Protestant Dissenters in England under King, William*, (1814, 8vo): — besides single sermons, works, on baptism, etc. See Allibone; *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.

Toulououse, Councils Of (Concilium Tolosanum)

These councils were held in Toulouse, a city of France, capital of the department of Haute-Garonne, arid situated on the Garonne. It has in it the very remarkable Church of St. Sernin, a masterpiece of Romanesque architecture, recently restored by Viollet Leduc. The Church of the Cordeliers was erected in the 13th century, and destroyed by fire in 1871.

I. The first Council of Toulouse was held Sept. 13. 1056, eighteen bishops being present. Rambaldus, archbishop of Arles, and Pontius, archbishop of Aix, presided. Thirteen canons were-published.

- 1.** Forbids simony.
- 3.** Forbids any fees for consecrating a Church.
- 4.** Forbids all buying and selling of Church prefeirment.
- 5.** Enacts that, if a clerk have entered upon the monistic state in order to, obtain an abbacy, he shall be compelled to continue the religious life, but shall be entirely excluded from the honor he coveted.
- 6.** Orders abbots to see that their monks follow the rule of. St. Benedict in their manner of life, food, dress, etc. Any abbot or monk altering (*corrigenes*) these institutions to be corrected, by his own bishop.
- 7.** Enjoins celibacy upon priests, deacons, and other clerks holding ecclesiastical dignities; offenders to be deprived.
- 8.** Forbids, under pain of excommunication, lay persons to apply Church property At their own use.
- 9.** Forbids the laity to plunder the effects of dead persons.
- 10 and 11.** Relate to the payment of Church dues and tithes.
- 13.** Forbids, under pain of excommunication, all intercourse with heretics and excommunicated persons, unless for the purpose of converting them and bringing them back from their evil Ways.

In this council Berenger, viscount of Narbonne, made complaint of the conduct of archbishop Guifroi, accusing him of giving away the lands appertaining to the Church of Narbonne to those who had borne arms for him. The event of his complaint is unknown. S See Mansi, Coiciltix, 1084.

II. The second council was held July 15, 1119, pope Calixtus II presiding, assisted by his cardinals; and the bishops and abbots of Languedoc, Gascony, and part of Spain. Ten canons were published.

1. Is directed against the buying and selling of holy orders or livings

3. Is directed against, the followers of Peter de Bruis, a sect of Manichaeans, ordering that the secular authorities shall repress those who affect an extreme piety, condemn the holy sacrament of Christ's body and blood, infant baptism, the priesthood, and other ecclesiastical orders, and lawful matrimony; directs that they shall be driven out of the Church as heretics.

5. Forbids to make slaves of free persons.

10. Excommunicates monks, canons, and other clerks who quit their profession, or who allow their beard and hair to grow after the fashion of the people of the world. See Mansi, 10, -856.

III. Held in 1161, convoked by the kings of France and England, who were present. One hundred bishops and abbots of the two kingdoms attended, and solemnly recognized Alexander III as pope, to the exclusion of Victor II. See Mansi, 10:1406.

IV. The Fourth Council of Toulouse was held in September, 1229. The archbishops of Narbonne, Bordeaux, and Auch were present, with many other bishops and abbots. Raymond, count of Toulouse, with several lords, attended; also the seneschal of Carcassonne, and the two consuls of Toulouse. Forty-five canons were published for the extinction of heresy and the re-establishment of peace.

The first five enact that the archbishops, bishops, and exempted abbots shall appoint in every parish a priest and two or three laymen of good character, who shall take an oath constantly and minutely to search for heretics in houses, caves, and every place in which they may be hidden; and, having taken precautions that those whom they have discovered shall not escape, to report the fact to the bishop, the lord of the place, or his bailiff.

6. Orders that the house in which, any heretic shall be discovered be destroyed.

- 8.** Forbids to punish any one as a heretic before the bishop has given his sentence.
- 10.** Orders that heretics who have of their own accord recanted shall not be suffered to remain in their own villages, but shall be carried to some place free from all suspicion *of heresy*; orders them, to wear two crosses upon their dress; forbids to entrust them with any public office, etc.
- 11.** Orders that such as pretend to *he* converted through fear of death, or from any other motive, shall be shut up, in order, that they may *never again* corrupt others.
- 12.** Orders every man *above* fourteen years of, age, and every ,woman above twelve, to abjure heresy, to make open profession of the Romish faith, and to swear to hunt out the heretics. This to be repeated every two years. Recusants to be looked upon as heretics.
- 13.** Requires all persons arrived at years of discretion to confess to their own priest three times a year, and to receive the holy communion at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunmide; those who neglect to do so to be considered as heretics.
- 14.** Forbids the laity to have in their possession any *copy* of the books of the Old and New Test. except the Psalter and such portions of them as: are contained in the Breviary: or the Hours of the Blessed Virgin; *most* strictly forbids these works in the vulgar tongue.
- 16.** Declares all wills to behold which are not made in the presence of the priest or his vicar.
- 25.** Forbids to absent, one's self from church on Sunday.
- 26.** Declares the, following *to* be festival days, viz. all Sundays; Christmas-day; feasts of St. Stephen, St, John the Evangelist, the Holy Innocents, St. Sylvester, the Circumcision, the Epiphany; feasts *of* the Purification, *the* Annunciation, the Assumption, and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary; Easter; the two days after Easter; the three Rogation days; Whit-Sunday; the two days after Whit-Sunday; feasts of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, and the Invention and Exaltation of the Holy. Cross; the. feasts, of the twelve apostles; feasts...of St. *Mary* Magdalene. St. Lawrence, St. Martini, St. Nicholas, and the: Dedication of St. Michael;

and the feasts of the dedications of every church and of all saints to whose honor-churches have been built.

42. Forbids women possessed of castles and other fortified places to marry men who are enemies to the faith and to peace.

43. Forbids judges to receive bribes. **44.** Orders that counsel be provided gratis for the poor. See Mansi, 11:425.

V. This council was held in May, 1590, by the cardinal de Joyeuse, archbishop of *Toulouse*, assisted by the bishops of St. Papoul, Rieux, and Lavaur, and the deputies of the bishops of Lombez, Pamiers, Mirepoix, and Montauban. Various regulations were made relating to the duties of bishops, chapters, beneficed clerks, priests, and others; they also embrace the following subjects: the holy sacraments, relics, indulgences, festivals, vows, seminaries, *hospitals*, *excommunications*, residence, etc. Mansi; 15:1378. See *Landon, Manual of Councils*, s.v.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1, 143.

Toup, Jonathan

an English clergyman and eminent critic, was born at St. Ives in December, 1713; and, after a preparatory education in that town and at the school of Mr. Guruey, of St. Merryn, removed to Exeter College, Oxford, where he took his-degree of A.B. His A.M. was received at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in 1756. In 1760 he was appointed to the rectory of St. Martin's, and in 1774 he was installed prebendary of Exeter. In 1776 he was instituted to the vicarage of St. Merryn's. He died Jan. 19, 1785. His classical publications occupy the first rank. *Emendationes in Suidam*, etc. (Lond. 1760. 8vo; pt. 2, 1764 8vo; pt. 3, 1766, 8vo). *Epistola Critica and Celeberimum Virum Gulielmum Episcopum Gllocestriensem* (*ibid.* 1767, 8vo): — *Cuae Posteriores, Sive Appendicula Notarum afeque Emendationum in Theocritumi, ooni-uztperrie publEicatum* (*ibid.* 1772, 4to): — *D. Longini Omnia quae extaint Get Lt. recensuit*, etc. (Oxoin. 1778, 8v, 8 with later editions). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors* s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Tournely, Honoré

a French Roman Catholic divine, was born Aug. 28, 1658, at *Antibes*. He received his early education from his uncle, and he duly prepared he'

entered the University of Paris. In 1686 he was made doctor of the Sorbonne, in 1688 professor at Douay, in 1692 professor at the Sorbonne, but retired in 1716, devoting himself entirely to literary pursuits, and died Dec. 26, 1729. He published, *Praelectiones Theologicae de Mysteriorum Trinitatis* (Paris, 1726): — *Praelectiones Theol. de Ecclesiastes Christi* (ibid. eod.): — *Praelectiones Theol. de Sacramentis in Généralé* (ibid. eod.): — *Praelectiones Theol. de Sacramentis Baptismi et Confirmationis* (ibid. 1727): — *Praelectiones Theol. de Agust. Eucharistiae Sacramentis* (ibid. 1729): *Praelectiones Theol. de Sacramentis Paenitentiae et Extremae Unctionis* (ibid. 1728). See Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*. 1, 420, 449, 450, 453, 457, 460, 461; — *Theologisches Universal-Lex s.v.*; Zedleri *Universal-Lex*. s.v. (B. P.)

Tournemine, René Joseph

a French Jesuit, was born April 26, 1661, at Rennes, of a noble family. In 1680 he entered the Order of the Jesuits, became a monk in 1695, and lectured on philosophy and theology till he was called to Paris, in 1701, to edit the so-called *Matzoiraes de Trevoux*. In 1718 he was appointed librarian, and died May 16, 1739. His numerous writings are contained, for the most part, in the *Memoires*. He also edited *I. S. Menochii: Brevis Expositio Senisus Literalis Totius Scripturae, ex Optimis Auctoribus per Epitomen collecta*. (Paris, 1719, 2 vols. fol.). See Nicdron, *Memoires*, 42; *Chauffepie, Diction*. s.v.; *Biog. Universal-Lex*. s.v.; *Theolog. Universal-Lex*. s.v.; — Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*. 1, 188. (B. P.)

Tourieux, Nicolas Le

a French divine, was born at Rouen, April 30, 1640, and was sent to the Jesuits College at Paris. He completed his philosophical studies at the College de Grassius, and was appointed vicar of St. Itienille des Tormesent at Rouen. In 1675 he gained the prize given by the French Academy; and, reflecting upon the inconsiderate manner in which he had engaged in all the duties of the priesthood, he renounced it, but was afterwards persuaded to resume the sacred functions by M. de Sacy. His talents procured him a benefice in the holy chapel and the priory of Villers, which the archbishop of Rouen gave him. He spent his last years at his priory of Villersur Frere in Tardenois, in the diocese of Soissons. His death occurred suddenly at Paris, Nov. 28, 1686. The principal among his numerous works are, *La Vie de Jesus Christ. Meilleure Maniere d'Entendre la Messe, Année*

Chretienne (Paris, 1685, 13 vols. 12mo) a French translation of the *Romnac Breviary* (4 vols. 8vo). An *Abridgment of the Principal Theological, Treatises* (4to) is also ascribed to Tourneux.

Tournon, Charles-Thomas Maillard De

an Italian cardinal, was born at Turin Dec. 21. 1668. He received his education at the Propaganda at Rome, where he, subsequently taught. He was made chamberlain of honor, and in-1701 was raised to the dignity of patriarch of Antioch, and confided with the difficult mission of regulating the affairs of the Church in China and, the Indies. In 1702 he departed on his enterprise, touched at Madagascar, and the following year reached Pondicherry. When he reached Canton, he collected the missionaries, told the object of his coming; and ordered that all traces of the heathen worship should be removed from the churches and houses of the native Christians. The emperor was highly incensed. He joined the missionaries against Tournon, and sent him to Macao, where *he* was imprisoned in the *Convent* of the Jesuits. He died June 8, 1710. See Passionei, *Memorsie Storiche*. Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Tournon, Francois De, Cardinal d'Ostia

was born at Tournon in 1489. At the age of twelve he took the habit of the regular canons of St. Augustine at the Abbey of St. Anthony in Dauphny. Francis I gave *him* the Abbey of Chaise-Dieu, and in 1517 made him archbishop of Embrnn. In 1525 he became archbishop of Bourges, *and from* that time his honors increased with every year. Francis I loaded him with benefices and offices, and employed him in political and ecclesiastical intrigues. In 1530, he was created cardinal, and soon after rose to the dignity of dean of the College of Cardinals. He was one of the principal negotiators of the Treaty of Madrid in 1526, and was actively engaged in bringing about the Peace of Cambria. During the quarrel between Henry VIII of England and the holy see. Tournon proposed concessions to Clement VII, which, if they had been complied with, would have prevented the whole Reformation in England. When Charles V invaded Provence, Tournon was made lieutenant-general of the French army, and directed the operations of the war. He represented France at the Conference of Nice, and in 1538 signed the treaty, which gave France ten years of peace. Tournon was a bitter enemy of reform in whatever shape it might come, and stained his reputation by his bloody attacks upon heresy. The terrible

persecution of the Vaudois was in great part of his instigations. At the death of Francis I he fell out of favor, and under Henry II was obliged to return to Rome. In his new diocese of Lyons he carried on a fearful persecution against the Calvinists. At the death of Henry II he returned to France, and was called to the councils of the queen mother. His appearance was the signal for new rigors, and he endeavored to obtain the return of the Jesuits, to whom he gave his college of Tournon. He had great influence over Charles IX, and what terrors may not be due to this fact? Tournon died at the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés April 22, 1562. He had little time, among his political affairs, to attend to letters, and left no works behind him. See Fleury-Ternal, *Hist. du Cardinal de Tournon*; La Thaumassibre, *Hist. du Berry*; De Thou, *Hist. sui Temp.* Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Tours, Councils Of (Concilium Turonense).

These councils were held in Tours, department of Indre-et Loire, France. It is the seat of an archbishopric, and the archbishop resides here in a palace of uncommon beauty. It formerly contained the celebrated cathedral of St. Martin of Tours, which was destroyed in 1793, and of which only two towers remain.

I. The first council was held Nov. 18, 461, b St. Perpetuus, archbishop of Tours, assisted by nine bishops. Thirteen canons were made for the restoration of the ancient discipline.

1 and 2. Enjoin celibacy upon bishops, priests, and deacons.

3. Forbids them to live, or be on terms of too great familiarity, with any woman.

4. Forbids a clerk to marry a widow. **5.** Excommunicates those who renounce the ecclesiastical state.

6. Is directed against those who marry or offer violence to virgins consecrated to God.

7. Excommunicates homicides.

8. Condemns those who fall away from a state of penance after having entered upon it.

- 9.** Deprives of communion bishops who get possession of the bishopric of another, or who promote the clerks of another bishop.
 - 10.** Declares ordinations made contrary to the canons to be null.
 - 11.** Condemns ecclesiastics who leave their own Church and go to another diocese without their bishop's leave.
 - 12.** Condemns clerks who leave their dioceses to travel without letters from their bishop.
 - 13.** Condemns usury in clerks; allows other business and employments. Mansi adds to these thirteen canons six others (*Concil. 4:1049*).
- II.** Held Nov. 17, 566; convoked by order of king Charibert, and composed of nine bishops, among whom were Germanus of Paris, Praetextatus of Rouen, and Euphronius of Tours, who presided. Twenty-seven canons were published.
- 1.** Orders provincial councils twice a year.
 - 3.** Forbids to place the body of Jesus Christ upon the altar after any fashion, and orders that it shall be placed under the cross.
 - 4.** Forbids laymen to come close to the altar with the clerks during the office; but allows them, and women also, to enter the sanctuary for private prayer at other times, and also in order to receive the communion.
 - 5.** Orders each Church to maintain its own poor, that they may not be obliged to wander about.
 - 6.** Forbids clerks and lay persons to give letters commentary (*epistolium*), and allows this to bishops only.
 - 12.** Orders married bishops to live with their wives as with sisters.
 - 15.** Orders that monks who leave their monastery in order to marry shall be separated from their wives, and put to penance; and that the aid of the secular powers shall be entreated in order to effect this.
 - 17.** Orders that monks shall fast during the three Rogation days and during the whole of Whitsun week; from that time to August 1, three days in each week; during September, October, and November, also three days in each week; and during December every day till Christmas. Again, on the

first three days of January; and from Epiphany to Lent, three days in each week.

23. Allows hymns composed by an author of respectability to be used at the holy office, besides those of St. Ambrose.

27. Declares that bishops taking any fee, etc., for ordination are to be regarded not merely as guilty of sacrilege, but even as heretics. See Mansi, 5, 851.

III. Held in 813, by order of Charlemagne, for the purpose of re-establishing ecclesiastical discipline. Fifty-one canons were published.

1. Orders the people to be faithful to the emperor, and to pray for his preservation.

2. Orders bishops to give themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the gospels, and epistles of St. Paul, and to try to learn them by heart.

3. Orders them to acquaint themselves with the canons and the pastoral of St. Gregory.

4, 5, and 6. Order that they shall preach frequently; that they shall be frugal in their repasts, and entertain the poor and strangers, affording them both bodily and spiritual food.

7. Forbids priests to be present at plays and fairs and all immodest exhibitions.

9. Forbids priests to administer indiscreetly the Lord's body to boys and any chance persons, lest they be in sine and so receive the greater damnation.

15. Anathematizes those who give money in order to obtain a benefice.

16. Orders bishops to take care that the tithes of each church be divided between the priests, the poor, and the repairs, etc., of the church.

19. Warns priests not to administer the holy Eucharist inconsiderately to children.

21. Forbids priests to eat and drink in taverns.

27. and 28. Forbid to give the veil to young widows, without good evidence of their sincere love of a religious life, and to virgins under twenty-five years of age.

37. Orders that prayer be made kneeling at all times, except on Sundays and during Easter.

38. Warns the faithful not to make a noise when entering church, not to talk when there, and to keep all bad thoughts out of their minds.

39. Forbids to hold pleadings in churches or church porches.

40. Forbids to hold pleadings or markets on Sundays.

43. Is directed against the wicked habit of swearing.

50. Orders all persons to communicate at least thrice a year, unless hindered by some great crime. See Mansi, 7:1259.

IV. Held in 1055, by Hildebrand, the Roman legate (afterwards Gregory VII), and cardinal Geraldus. In this council Berenger was called upon to defend his opinions; but, not being able to do so satisfactorily, he retracted, and made a public confession of the true faith, which he signed; whereupon the legates, believing him to be sincere, received him into communion. See Mansi, 9:1081.

V. Held in 1060, by cardinal Stephen, the Roman legate, and ten bishops. Ten canons were made; the first four condemn simony.

6. Declares that those bishops, priests, and deacons who, although aware of the interdict of Nicholas II, refused to abstain from the exercise of their functions, being at the time in a state of incontinence, should be irrevocably deposed. See Mansi, 9:1108.

VI. Held in Lent, 1096, by pope Urban II, who presided. The decrees of the Council of Clermont were confirmed. The pope received into favor king Philip (who had been excommunicated for forsaking Bertrade, his lawful wife), upon his humbly making satisfaction. See Mansi, 10, 601.

VII. Held May 19, 1163, in the Church of St. Maurice, by pope Alexander III, assisted by seventeen cardinals. There were also “present, besides Louis VII, king of France, one hundred and twenty-four bishops, four hundred and fourteen abbots, and an immense multitude of others,

both ecclesiastics and laics. These prelates were assembled from all the provinces in subjection to the kings of France and England; some few of them also: were Italians, who had declared for Alexander. Among the English prelates was Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, who was received by the pope with extraordinary honors, all the cardinals present, except twos in immediate attendance upon Alexander, being sent beyond the city walls to meet him. The archbishop of Canterbury sat on the right hand of the pope, the archbishop of York on the left. The immediate object of the council was the condemnation of the synods of Pisa and Lodi, convoked by the emperor Frederick. Ten canons were published.

2. Condemns usury among the clergy.

4. Is directed against the Albigenses, and forbids all intercourse with them; forbids even to give them a retreat or protection, or to buy and sell with them.

5. Forbids to let churches to priests for-an annual rent.

8. Forbids monks to leave their cloisters in order to practice medicine or to learn the civil law.

9. Declares all ordinations made by Octavianus, and other heretics or schismatics, to be null and void. See Mansi, 10, 1411.

VIII. Held June 10, 1236; Juhel de Mavenne, archbishop of Tours; presiding. Fourteen, canons were published.

1. Forbids the crusaders or other Christians to kill or injure the Jews, or to plunder or ill-use them in any way; also orders the secular judges to give up to the ecclesiastical authorities any crusaders whom they may have seized on account of any crime.

7. Orders that all wills shall be put into the hands of the bishop or his archdeacon within ten days after the death of the testator.

8. Denounces those who have two wives living, declares them to, be infamous, and orders that they shall be tied up in public, unless they can pay a heavy fine; orders priests to publish every Sunday in church the sin of having two wives living.

13. Orders the bishops to instruct and to provide for the subsistence of the new converts from Judaism and heresy. See Mansi, 11:11, 503.

IX. Held in 1239, by Juhel de Mayenne, archbishop of Tours, and his-suffragans. Thirteen canons were published, with the approbation of the holy council;” the use of which expression in this case shows that the approbation was not confined to the pope and his legates.

1. Orders that the bishop shall appoint three clerks, or three reputable laymen, in every parish, who shall take an oath to report faithfully concerning all scandals in morality, faith, etc., happening in the neighborhood.

4. Forbids to receive anything for the administration of the sacraments; without prejudice, however, to pious customs.

5 and 6. Forbid curates and rectors to excommunicate their parishioners of their own authority.

12. Forbids clerks and monks to retain any female servants in their houses or priories. See Mansi, 11:565.

X. Held Aug. 1, 1282, by John de Moonsoreau, archbishop of Tours, who presided. Thirteen canons were published.

1 and 2. Are directed against needless lawsuits.

3. Forbid clerks and monks to frequent taverns.

4. Excommunicates those who steal or tear the church books and injure the furniture.

5. Orders the observance of customary processions.

6. Orders the punishment of usurers according to the canon of Lyons.

12 Is directed against those who hinder the payment of tithe See Mansi, 11:1183.

XI. A general assembly of the French clergy was held, by order of Louis XII, in September, 1510, on account of the sentence of excommunication passed against him by pope Julius II. The object of the council was to discuss the question how far it was necessary for Louis to respect the spiritual weapons of the Church, When in the, hands of an adversary who used them only to further injustice, and in matters purely temporal. Eight questions were discussed. The following are the most important

2. Is it allowable for a prince, in defense of his person And property, not only to repel injustice by force of arms, but to seize the lands of the Church in the possession of the pope, his declared enemy, not with any view of retaining them, but only in order to cripple the pope's means of injuring him? Answer in the affirmative.

3. Is it allowable for a prince, on account of such declared hatred on the part of the pope, to withdraw from the obedience of the latter, the pope having stirred up other princes to make War upon him, and urged them to seize upon his territories? Answer: that it is lawful so to withdraw from obedience, not, however, altogether, but so far as the defense of the prince's temporal rights shall render necessary.

4. This withdrawal from obedience being supposed, how is the prince to conduct himself with regard to his subjects, and the prelates with regard to other ecclesiastics, in all those matters in which recourse is usually had to the see of Rome? Answer: it is necessary in such a case to keep to the ancient common rights, and the Pragmatic Salction taken from the decrees of the Council of Basle.

8. If the pope, without ally attention to justice, or even to the appearance of right, employs arms and artifices, and publishes censures against the prince, and against those who protect and defend him, ought the latter to be deserted? Answer: that such censures are altogether null, and not binding in law. See Mansi, 13:1481.

XII. Held in September, 1583, Simon de Maille, the archbishop, presiding, the bishops of Angers, Nantes, Saint-Brien, Rennes, and Quimper, and the deputies of those of Saint-Malo and Mans, were present.

A petition was read, which it was proposed to present to the king, Henry III, requesting him to order the publication of the decrees of Trent in his states; also another petition to the pope, to induce him to remedy certain abuses in -the matter of benefices. A formulary of faith, to be signed by all beneficed clerks, was drawn up, and regulations were made to prevent simony. In consequence of the appearance of the plague in Tours, the prelates adjourned the council to Augers. See Mansi, 15:1001.

Tousi, Councils Of (Concilium Tullense, Or Apud Saponarias)

were held at Tousi, a place in the diocese of Toul.

I. This council was held in June, 859. Charles the Bald and the sons of the emperor Lothaire were present. Thirteen canons were published, of which the first treats of the reconciliation of Charles and his brother Louis. The sixth relates to a charge of treason brought by Charles the Bald against Venilon, bishop of Sens. Canon 8 relates to the case of the Breton bishops who had been guilty of schism in: separating from their metropolitan. The tenth contains certain dogmas relating to grace (originally put forth in the first six canons of Valence, in the Synod of Quiercy), concerning which there arose a great contention among the bishops present. Synodal letters were addressed to Venilon, the Breton prelates, and to those factious and seditious persons whose unbridled licentiousness had caused extreme disorder. See Mansi, *Concil.* 8:974.

II. The second Council of Tousi (also called *Concilium Tullense*, or *Tussiacense*) was held in 860. Forty bishops from fourteen provinces attended. Five canons were published, directed against robbery, perjury, and other crimes, then very prevalent. Although only forty bishops were present, these canons are signed by fifty-seven, the decrees of councils being often sent to the bishops who were absent for their signature.

1. Is directed against invaders of sacred things.
2. Concerning the incontinence of virgins or widows consecrated to God.
3. On perjury and false witnesses.
4. Against robbers and others guilty of various crimes.
5. Concerning vagabond clerks and monks. A synodal letter was also drawn up, addressed to the invaders of ecclesiastical rights and property, and the plunderers of the poor. See Mansi, 8:702.

Toussain, or Tussanus, Daniel

a French Protestant minister, was born at Montbelliard, in the department of Doubs, July 15, 1541. After some education in his native place, Toussain went to Basle in 1555, where he studied two years. He then spent

two years in Tübingen, applying himself to belles-lettres, philosophy, and divinity. Finding himself differently acquainted with the French language, he went to Paris in 1559, and, after a residence of a year, went to Orleans, where he taught Hebrew for some time, and, being admitted into the ministry; officiated in the Church there. While in Orleans he was frequently exposed to dangers arising out of the war between the Catholics and Protestants, but escaped them and finally reached Heidelberg, whither he had been invited by Frederick III. The prince afterwards employed him in visiting the Reformed churches in his dominions. On the death of the elector in 1576, his son, Casimir, invited Toussain to Neustadt, made him superintendent of the churches there, and, on the death of Ursinus, professor of divinity. In 1578 he presided at a synod assembled by Casimir for the purpose of establishing conformity in doctrine and discipline, and of assisting the exiles of the palatinate. When the prince became regent in 1583, he removed to Heidelberg, and employed Toussain in promoting the Reformed religion. In 1586 he was appointed to succeed Grynaseus, first professor of divinity at Heidelberg; and in 1594 was chosen rector of the university. He died Jan. 10, 1602, and was buried in the university chapel. His published works, in many volumes 4to and folio, are principally commentaries on various parts of the Bible, and defenses of particular doctrines of the Reformed Church. His life was published by his son Paul under the title *Vita et Obitus Danielis Tussani*, etc. (Heidelberg, 1603, 4to).

Tow

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

(1) תרענא *tre'na* (so called as being *shaken* off from flax in hatchelling), *refuse* (^{<0710>}Judges 16:9);

(2) חטבת *pishteh* (^{<2310>}Isaiah 43:37), *flax* (as elsewhere rendered);
SEE LINEN.

Towel

(λέντιον, for Lat. *linteum*, a *linen* cloth, ^{<6104>}John 13:4, 5) was the *apron* worn by servants and persons in waiting (see Galen, *De Comp. Med.* c. 9; Sueton. *Calig.* 26). *SEE APRON.*

Tower

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

1. \hat{j} Bi \hat{w} ḡB; and \hat{W} j B;(Sept. ἑπαλξις), from \hat{j} B; to ‘search,’ “explore,” a *searcher* or *watcher*; and hence the notion of a watch-tower. In ^{<3304>}Isaiah 32:14 the tower of Ophel is probably meant (^{<1035>}Nehemiah 3:26).
2. I Dgæ and I Dgħæ or I wDgħh (πύργος; *turris*), from I dġ; to “become great,” a lofty tower; used sometimes as a proper noun. **SEE MIGDOL**,
3. rḡam;(πέτρα *munitio*), a strong fortification; only once “tower” (^{<300>}Habakkuk 2:1). **SEE EGYPT**.
4. I pġ(οικος; *domus*), only in ^{<1534>}2 Kings 5:24. **SEE OPHEL**.
5. hNP, usually “corner,” twice only “tower” (^{<3016>}Zephaniah 1:16; 3, 6; γωνία; *angulus*).
6. hPχħæ(σκοπία: *specula*), “watch-tower.” **SEE MIZPAH**.
7. bġħæ(χώρομα; *robur*), “a refuge,” only in poetry. **SEE MISGAH**.
8. Πύργος, the general term in the New Test. **SEE FORTIFICATION**.

Picture for Tower 1

Isolated watch towers or fortified posts in frontier or exposed situations are mentioned in Scripture, as the tower of Edar, etc. (^{<0521>}Genesis 35:21; ^{<3008>}Micah 4:8; ^{<2205>}Isaiah 21:5, 8, 11; ^{<3001>}Habakkuk 2:1; ^{<3027>}Jeremiah 6:27; ^{<2004>}Song of Solomon 7:4); the tower of Lebanon, perhaps one of David’s “garrisons” (*netsib*, ^{<3006>}2 Samuel 7:6; Raumrer, *Palaest.* p. 29). Such towers or outposts for the defence of wells, and the protection of flocks and of commerce, were built by Uzziah in the pasture grounds (*midbar*), **SEE DESERT**, and by his son Jotham in the forests (*choreshim*) of Judah (^{<1230>}2 Chronicles 26:10; 27:4). Remains of such fortifications may still be seen, which, though not perhaps themselves of remote antiquity, yet very probably have succeeded to more ancient structures built in the same places for like purposes (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 81, 85, 180; Roberts, *Sketches*, pl. 93). Besides these military structures, we read in Scripture of towers built in vineyards as an almost necessary appendage to them (^{<2182>}Isaiah 5:2; ^{<1233>}Matthew 21:33; ^{<1120>}Mark 12:1). Such towers are still in

use in Palestine in vineyards, especially near Hebron. and are used as lodges for the keepers of the vineyards. During the vintage they are filled with the persons employed in the work of gathering the grapes (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 1, 213; 2, 81; Martineau, *East. Lif*, p. 434; De Saulcy, *Travels*, 1, 546; Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 163, 171). **SEE LODGE.**

Picture for Tower 2

Mural towers were in all antiquity built as part of the fortifications of towns, especially at the corners of the walls and the gates (^{<4447>}2 Chronicles 14:7; 26:9, 15; 32:5; 1 Macc. 5, 55; 13:33, 43, etc.; comp. ^{<2323>}Isaiah 23:3; 30:25; ^{<3204>}Ezekiel 26:4, 9; see Pliny, *Il. N.* 6:22, 1). Also in the interior of cities towers served as citadels (^{<0046>}Judges 9:46 sq.). Jerusalem (q.v.) was especially provided with towers of this description, many of which had special names (^{<4811>}Nehemiah 3:11; 12:38; ^{<2938>}Jeremiah 31:38, etc.). Those on the walls and at the gates were used for sentries (^{<1197>}2 Kings 9:17; 17:9; 18:8; ^{<3271>}Ezekiel 27:11). The Temple (q.v.) was likewise supplied with numerous towers. The “tower in Siloam” (q.v.) (^{<0234>}Luke 13:4) was probably some mural defense near that fountain. **SEE GATE; SEE WALL.**

Among many ancient nations, especially the Babylonians, towers were employed in the siege of cities, as appears from the prophet’s account of the divination used by the king of Babylon to determine his line of march into the kingdom of Judah: “At his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem, to appoint captains, to open the mouth in the slaughter, to lift up the voice with shouting, to appoint battering-rams against the gate, and to build a tower” (^{<3222>}Ezekiel 21:22). **SEE BATTERING-RAM.** In the Maccabaeen age, towers borne on elephants were used to carry warriors in battle (1 Macc. 6:37; comp. Pliny, *H. N.* 11:1 “turrigeri elephantorum humeri”). In Roman sieges the tower (*vinea*, from the vine-branches with which it was often thatched), run on wheels along an artificial causeway (*agger*), was proverbial (^{<0293>}Luke 19:43). **SEE MOUNT.**

Picture for Tower 3

In the figurative language of Scripture, towers are used for defenders and protectors, whether by counsel or strength, in peace or in war (^{<1980>}Psalms 18:10; 61, 3). **SEE WAR.**

Tower In Christian Architecture

Picture for Tower 4

Any attempt to particularize the various kinds of towers which have been adopted by different nations in former ages would far exceed the scope of this work; the following observations, therefore, are chiefly confined to those which were in use in the Middle Ages in England and the adjacent parts of Europe, and more especially to the towers of churches. Among the Greeks and Romans, towers were employed of various forms and for different purposes, but by no means so abundantly as in after-ages, and in general they appear not to have been so lofty as those of mediæval date. The tower of Anidronicus Cyrrhestes, called also the Temple of the Winds, at Athens, is octagonal; at Autun, in France, a considerable part of a large amid lofty square tower of late Roman work exists. The tower for the use of bells is supposed not to have been introduced till the 5th century, and hence the term *campanile*, applied to the Italian towers. *SEE SPIRE.*

Picture for Tower 5

In the Middle Ages the towers of castles were numerous and of striking character. During the prevalence of the Norman style the keep often consisted of a large rectangular tower, with others of smaller size attached to the angles, and these last mentioned generally rose higher than the, main building, as at the White Tower of London and the castles of Rochester. and Guildford. The keep tower of Conisburgh Castle, in Yorkshire, which is of the latest Norman work, is circular, with large buttresses on the outside; in other examples, especially in those of *later* date, the keep towers are of various forms, often irregular, apparently so constructed as being considered best adapted to the peculiarities of the sites, and the systems of defense in use at the periods of their erection. Besides these main towers, many others, which, though of less magnitude than the keep, were often of very considerable size, were employed in different parts of fortifications, especially at the entrances, where the gateways were generally flanked by towers projecting considerably before the main walls; these were pierced with loop-holes and oilets, and were commonly surmounted with. machicolations. *SEE TURRET.*

Picture for Tower 6

Church-towers of all dates are greatly diversified, not only in their details, but also in general proportions and form; they are occasionally detached from the building to which they belong, but are usually annexed to it, and are to be found placed in almost every possible situation except about the east end of the chancel. In all cases their use was for hanging the bells, and hence the name *belfry*. Large churches have often several towers, especially when the plan is cruciform; and in this case there are generally two at the west end, and one, of larger dimensions, at the intersection of the transepts, as at the cathedrals of Canterbury, York, and Lincoln. Ordinary parish churches have usually but one tower. In some examples, where there is an entrance to the church through the lower story of a tower, it is made to form a porch with an open archway on one side, as at Cranbrook, and many other churches in Kent; or on three sides, as at Newnham, Northamptonshire. In towns, towers are sometimes placed over public thoroughfares, and in such situations are built on open archways. It is not unusual to find church-towers which batter, or diminish upward: these are generally of Norman or Early English date; but in some districts, as in Northamptonshire, this mode of construction was continued to a later period.

Picture for Tower 7

The towers belonging to the style described in the article *SEE SAXON ARCHITECTURE* (q.v.) are square and massive, not of lofty proportions, and apparently never were provided with stone staircases. Some of them are considerably ornamented, as at the churches of Barnack and Earl's Barton, Northamptonshire; and others are very plain, as at St. Michael's, Oxford, and St. Benet's, Cambridge: the tower of the Church 'of Sompting, Sussex, which belongs to this style, terminates with a gable on each of the four sides, and is surmounted by a wooden spire; but whether or not this was the original form may be doubted.

In some parts of Great Britain circular church-towers are to be found, These have sometimes been assumed to be of very high antiquity, but the character of their architecture shows that they commonly belong to the Norman and Early English styles. They are built of rough flints, generally of coarse workmanship, with very little ornament of any kind, and that little, for the most part, about the upper story one of the best examples is

that of Little Saxham Church, Sinffolk. Plain round towers in the counties of Norfolk and Sutffolk are of all periods; the only materials readily accessible being flints, an these not admitting of square corners, the towers were built round, and this practice is continued even to the present day.

Norman towers are generally square, and of rather low proportions, seldom rising much more than their own breadth above the roof of the church, and sometimes not so much. They generally have broad flat buttresses at the angles, and are usually provided with a stone staircase carried up in a projecting turret attached to one of the: angles; this is very commonly rectangular externally, but the form is not infrequently changed towards the top, especially if the turret is carried up the whole height of the tower: occasionally polygonal Norman towers are to be met with, as at Ely Cathedral. In Normandy a few examples of village church towers of this style exist, which are capped with pyramidal stone roofs, like low square spires, but in general the roofs and parapets are additions of later date. Many Norman towers are very considerably ornamented the upper stories being usually the richest, while others are very plain. Good specimens remain at St. Alban's Abbey; the cathedrals of Norwich, Exeter, and Winchester; Tewkesbury Abbey; South well Minster; the churches of St. Peter, Northampton; St. Clement, Sandwich; Iffly, Oxfordshire; Stewkley, Buckinghamshire, etc.

In *Early English* towers much greater variety of design and proportion is found than in those of prior date. The prevailing plan is square, but some examples are octagonal, and occasionally the upper part of a square tower is changed to an octagon. Projecting stair-turrets are almost universal, though they are frequently so much masked by buttresses as to be in great measure concealed. Many towers in this style are of lofty proportions, while others are low and massive. The best examples are generally more or less ornamented, and some are very highly enriched. The belfry windows are often large and deeply recessed, with numerous bold moldings in the jambs, and sometimes appear to have been originally left quite open. Considerable variety of outline is produced by the different arrangement, sizes, and forms of the buttresses at the angles of towers in this as well as in the later styles of Gothic architecture, and sometimes, instead of buttresses, small turrets are used, which rise from the ground and generally terminate in pinnacles. Many towers of this date are finished at the top with parapets; some of them with pinnacles at the angles, a few with two gables called pack-saddle roofs (as Brookthorpe, Northamptonshire), and many

are surmounted with spires, which, although perhaps in the majority of cases they are of later date than the towers, appear to have been originally contemplated. Examples remain at the cathedrals of Oxford and Peterborough, the churches of St. Mar, Stamford; Ketton and Ryhall, Rutland . Loddington and Raundes, Northamptonshire; Middleton Stoney, Oxfordshire, etc.

In the *Decorated* and *Perpendicular* styles towers differ very considerably both in proportions and amount of enrichment, and considerable diversity of outline and effect is produced by varying the arrangement and form of the subordinate parts, such as windows, buttresses, pinnacles, etc.; but in general composition they do not differ very materially from. Early English towers. Many are very lofty, and others of low proportions; some highly enriched, and some perfectly plain; a large, and probably the greater, number are crowned with parapets, usually with a pinnacle at each corner, and sometimes with one or two others, commonly of rather smaller size, on each of the sides; many, also, terminate with spires, or, especially in the Perpendicular style with lanterns. Decorated towers remain at Lincoln Cathedral; the churches of Heckington and Caythorpe, Lincolnshire; Newark, Nottinghamshire; Finedon, Northamptonshire; St. Mary's, Oxford, etc. Perpendicular towers are very numerous in all parts of the kingdom, especially in Somersetshire. Among such as are best deserving of attention may be mentioned those at Canterbury, York, and Gloucester cathedrals; and the churches at Boston and Louth, Lincolnshire; Kettering, Northamptonshire; Cirencester. Gloucestershire; Great Malvern, Worcestershire; and that at St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford.

Towers, Joseph, LL.D.

a Dissenting minister, was born in Southwalk, London, in 1737, and was apprenticed to Mr. Goadby, printer, at Sherborne, Dorsetshire, in 1754. He returned to London in 1764, where he worked at his trade, and afterwards became a book-seller. He was ordained a preacher in 1774, and was 'chosen pastor of a congregation at Highgate. In 1778 he became forenoon preacher at a chapel in Newington Green. He died in 1799. 'Mr. Towers was an Arian, though closely connected with the Unitarians. He wrote, *Review of the Genuine Doctrines of Christianity* (Lond. 1763, 8vo): *Observations on Hume's History of England* (ibid. 1778, 8vo): — *British Biography* (1766-72, 7 vols. 8vo; 1773-80, 10 vols. 8vo [vols. 1-7 by Towers; 8-10 by a clergyman]): — *Vindication of the Political Opinions*

of Locke, (1782, 8vo): — *Memoirs of Frederick the Great* (1788, 2 vols. 8vo; 1795, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Tracts on Political and other Subjects* (1796, 3 vols. 8vo): — besides *Sermons*; and articles to the *Biographia Britannica*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 9s.v.

Towerson, Gabriel, D.D.

a learned English divine, was a native of Middlesex, and became a commoner of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1650, where he took his A.M. in 1657. In 1660 he was elected fellow of All-Souls, and entered holy orders at about the same time. He was first preferred to the rectory of Welwyn, in Hertfordshire, and took his degree of D.D. in 1677. An April, 1692, he was inducted into the living of St. Andrew Undershaft, London, to which he was presented by king William. He died in October, 1697, and was interred at Welwyn. His works are, *A Brief Account of Some Expressions in St. Athanatsius's Creed* (Oxford, 1663, 4to): — *An Explication of the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, and an Explication of the Catechism of the Church of England* (Lond. 1676-88, 4 pts. fol.): *Of the Sacraments in General*, etc. (ibid. 1686, 8vo): — *Of the Sacrament of Baptism in Particular among the Heathen and Jews*, etc. (1687, 8vo). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* S.v.; Allibone *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.

Towgood, Micaiah

an English Dissenting minister, was born at Axminster in 1700, became pastor at Moreton-Hampstead in 1722, removed to Crediton in 1735, and in 1750 to Exeter, where he died in 1792. He wrote, *Dissenter's Apology* (Lond. 1739, 8vo): — *Dissenting Gentleman's Answer to Rev. Mr. White* (1746-48, 6th ed. 3 vols. 8vo): — *Essay on Charles I* (1748; new ed. 1811, 12mo): — *Dissertations on Christian Baptism* (1750; new ed. with notes, etc., 1815, 12mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Manning, *Life and Writings of Towgood* (1792); Skeats, *Hist. of Free Churches of England*, p. 419 sq.

Towgood, Richard

an English prelate, was made dean of Bristol in 1667 and died in 1683. He published a *Sermon on ~~4008~~ Acts 7:8* (Lond. 1676). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Town

(not carefully distinguished in the A. V. from “city,” which latter is the usual rendering of **ρυ[α]** occasionally “town” this latter is also the translation, at times, of **ρυγα** prop. a *wall*, as usually rendered; **ρξϕ**; a *village*, as generally rendered; and so **κόμη** in the New Test. [once more distinctively **κωμόπολις** ark 1:38]; **τβι** a *daughter*, sometimes fig. employed; **h/Wj i** only in the phrase Havoth-jair [q.v.]; **h/Wj i** “unwalled towns,” means rather *open country*). The first mention of such collective residence occurs early in the antediluvian history (^{<0047>}Genesis 4:17), but we are not to think, in the case of such primitive “cities,” of anything more than a mere hamlet, the nucleus, perhaps, of an eventual metropolis. Towns, however, appear in the history of the patriarchs as strong central points of the agricultural tribes in nomadic regions. They were therefore enclosed with walls, and thus each town was originally a fortress (see ^{<0027>}Numbers 32:17; hence the term **ρξβηται** literally *a fort*, applied **κατ̄ ἔξοχὴν** to Tyre, ^{<0623>}Joshua 19:29; ^{<1047>}2 Samuel 24:7); such as the cities which the Israelites captured and demolished under Joshua. For this purpose eminences and hills (comp. ^{<1514>}Matthew 5:14) were naturally selected as more commanding and secure sites (see König, *De Montibus, Urbium Antiquiss. Sedibus* [Annseberg. 1796]), a precaution which Palestine, with its varied surface and exposed situation, especially suggested (comp. ^{<1046>}2 Samuel 4:6). We know little, however, of the exact architectural style of its cities, with the exception of Jerusalem. In modern times Oriental towns are built very wide-spreading, and often include extensive open spaces, gardens, etc. (see Thevenot, 2, 114; Buckingham, p. 95, 335; Taverhier, 1, 169; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 4:395 sq.), e.g. Damascus:(Kampfer estimates Ispahan as more than a day’s ride in circuit, *Amer. Exot.* p. 163). This especially applies to the larger cities of Asia, such as Babylon and Nineveh, which enclosed an area of many miles (see Ritter, *Erdk.* 11:903). The gates of the cities were closed (Joshua 2, 5 sq.; ^{<0743>}Judges 16:3; ^{<0207>}1 Samuel 23:7; ^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:13; ^{<1473>}Psalms 147:13, etc.) with strong folding-doors (**μυτι D]t/ti D]**) with brazen or iron bars (**μυj ρε βε**) and were surmounted by turrets (^{<1082>}2 Samuel 18:32), which were guarded by sentries (ver. 24 sq.). In these the governors and judges held their sittings, and a more or less extensive square (**βj σα** which, however, does not always mean an open place, but sometimes a wide [**πλατεῖα**] street, ^{<1192>}Genesis 19:2; ^{<0715>}Judges 19:15, 17, 20) adjoined

(^{<4510>}Ezra 10:9; ^{<4681>}Nehemiah 8:1, 3, 16; ^{<1212>}2 Samuel 21:12; 1 Chronicles 32:6; ^{<4830>}Job 29:7; ^{<2182>}Song of Solomon 3:2) where the market was held (^{<1201>}2 Kings 7:1; comp. ἄγοράι, Josephus, *Life*, 22). The streets (^{t/xWj} , ^{<4887>}Job 18:17; ^{<2165>}Isaiah 5:25; ^{<2672>}Jeremiah 37:21, etc.; ^{yqWV}], ^{<2182>}Song of Solomon 3:2; ^{<2124>}Ecclesiastes 12:4, etc.; ^{πλατεῖα}, ^{<4165>}Matthew 6:5; 12:19; ^{<4465>}Acts 5:15, etc.) were not so narrow (yet see ^{στενωπός} applied to those of Jerusalem in Josephus, *War*, 6:8, 5) as in modern Oriental towns (Maundrell, p. 172; Olearius, p. 291; Russegger, 1, 367; Robinson, 1, 38; 3, 697), where, as in Acre (Mariti, p. 246), scarcely two laden camels, or in Damascus (Schubert, 3, 29) scarcely a single one, can pass (Burckhardt, *Arab*. p. 151). The streets of Hebrew antiquity (at least in the large towns) had names, which were sometimes taken from those of the kind of trade carried on in them (^{<2672>}Jeremiah 37:2; comp. ἄγοράι, Josephus, *War*, 5, 8, 1, like modern *bazaars*; Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 29 sq.; Harmer, 1, 245 sq.; Arvieux, 1,55; Ker Porter, 1, 406,407). They were occasionally paved in the later period (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9,6; 16:5, 3; 20:9,7); in earlier times (comp. Isidore, *Orig.* 15:16) we find notice of paving in the court of the Temple (^{<1217>}2 Kings 16:17). From ^{<1124>}1 Kings 20:34 it would seem that kings sometimes constructed or improved certain avenues (comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 3, 201 sq.). Aqueducts (^{twb [T]}) were built in Jerusalem before the exile (^{<2182>}2 Kings 20:20; ^{<2108>}Isaiah 7:3; 22:9; for Pilate's undertaking see Josephus, *Ant.* 18:3, 2; comp. *War*, 2, 17, 9; Robinson, 2, 166 sq.); other cities were supplied by springs (see Josephus, *Ant.* 17:13, 1) and cisterns, the latter, at times, of very expensive construction (*War*, 7:8, 3). **SEE WATER.**

As to the varied condition of cities in pre-exile times of Palestine we have only disconnected notices. The oldest ones of the land were destroyed by a natural or miraculous combustion in Abraham's time (^{<01624>}Genesis 19:24 sq.). During the conquest by the Israelites many were destroyed by fire (^{<01624>}Joshua 6:24, 26; 11:13), but later were in part rebuilt (^{<01125>}Judges 1:26; ^{<11624>}1 Kings 16:24) and embellished (^{<07838>}Judges 18:28; ^{<1125>}1 Kings 12:25; 15:17; 17:21; comp. ^{<4485>}2 Chronicles 8:5). The Chaldaean invasion made (especially in the case of Jerusalem) many changes, and during the exile most of the cities were deserted. The Syrian wars under the Maccabees wasted or destroyed several (see 1 Macc. 5, 44,65; 9:62). Others, however, especially Jerusalem, were fortified, and castles and citadels were built (ver. 50: 12:38; 13:33; 15:7, 39, 40; Josephus, *War*, 4:7, 2; *Ant.* 13:16, 3). During the Roman period cities especially multiplied, chiefly

under the patronage of the Herodian family; but many of them were largely occupied by Gentiles, with their heathenish theatres, gymnasia, stadia, and temples (*ibid.* 15:5, 2; 18:2, 1 and 3; 20:9, 4, etc.). Fortifications and towns also increased (*ibid.* 15:9, 4; *War*, 7:8, 3). The post-exilic topography of Palestine therefore exhibits many names of places not mentioned in the Old Test.; some of them, however, may have existed earlier. The district of Galilee was especially rich in towns and villages which amounted in all to two hundred and four (Life, 45). **SEE PALESTINE.**

The names of Palestinian cities were almost invariably significant, as appears from the present situation and configuration of the land (e.g. *Agin*, fountain; Bethlehem, bread-producing Gibeon, elevation; Mizpah, look-out; Ramah, height; many of them, accordingly, used with the article). Numbers of these are compounded, e. g. with **tyB**(house; see Rödiger, *De Arb. Libror. Hist. Interpret.* p. 21), **ry[or hyrḡa**(city) **rxh**(court), **qm[**(valley), **l ba**(meadow), **raB**(well), **ʿy[**(spring), and in the post-exilic period with **rpK**(village); those with **l [Bi**(Baal) appear to have been of Canaanitic origin (see Panofka, *Ueb. d. Einfluss der Gottheiten auf Ortsnamen* [Berl. 1842]). Some are of dual (Kitrjathaim, Jerusalem, Dothan) or plural form (Kerioth, Anathoth, Gebim); in one case (Beth-horon) we have the distinction of *upper* and *lower* villages. Several places of the same name are distinguished by the name of the tribe added (see **ⲙⲏⲧⲏ** Matthew 2:1, 5; 21:11; **ⲙⲏⲧⲏ** Luke 4:31). In Roman times, especially under the Herods, many old names were displaced by others of Greek or Latin origin (e.g. Diospolis, Neapolis, Sebaste, Caesarea, Tiberias, later Elia Capitolina), some of which have still survived (comp. Ammian, Marcel. 14:8), while the most of them have again yielded to the older appellation (comp. Josephus, *War*, 1, 4, 2; *Ant.* 13:13, 3; see Reland, *Palest.* p. 567), or to an imitation in Arabic of a similar sound (Palmer, *Desert of the Wandering*, p. 31). **SEE NAME.**

On the population of the cities of Palestine nothing definite is known, for the numbers (as **ⲙⲏⲧⲏ** Judges 20:15) from which an estimate might be made are in many cases corrupt (Josephus's statements [e.g. *War*, 3, 3,1] are suspicious; but see Raumer, *Palaest.* p. 430 sq.). **SEE NUMBER.** A distinction between walled towns and open villages is not uniformly maintained in the Old Test., although in the later period they began to be distinguished (see **t/zrP** **ⲉⲗⲉⲕⲓⲏ** Ezekiel 38:11; **ⲙⲏⲧⲏ** **ⲛⲉⲃⲉⲙⲓⲏ** Nehemiah 12:25;

comp. **twoB**; ^{<0212>}Numbers 21:25; 32; ^{<0556>}Joshua 15:45; ^{<0712>}Judges 11:26; ^{<0125>}Nehemiah 11:25; **mae** ^{<0019>}2 Samuel 20:19; see Gesenius, *Monum.*

Phoen. 2, 263; a metropolis or province is called **hnydæ** in the Talmud, *Maas. Sheni*, 3, 4, etc.). The New Test., however, makes such distinctions (^{<0038>}Mark 1:38; comp. ^{<0011>}Matthew 10:11; ^{<0066>}Mark 6:56 [8:27]; ^{<0083>}Luke 8:13, 22; ^{<0085>}Acts 8:25): **κώμη**, e.g. Bethphage (^{<0022>}Matthew 21:22), Bethany (^{<0100>}John 11:1), Emmaus (^{<0243>}Luke 24:13), Bethlehem (^{<0070>}John 7:42); but **πόλις**, e.g. Nazareth, Capernaum, Nain; but these terms are used loosely, and the compound **κωμόπολις** even occurs. So, likewise, Josephus uses **πόλις** and **κώμη** almost interchangeably (see *Life*, 45; *Ant.* 20:6, 2), and he occasionally employs the ‘diminutive **πολίχνη** (*War*, 4:2, 1). In general, however, **κώμη** (village) chiefly belongs to those places whose name is compounded with **rpκ** (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* 2, 707). The Talmudists (but comp. *Megillah*, 1 3; *Erubin*, 5, 6) distinguish places thus: **μυκακα** cities with defenses; **twoy[æ]** towns without fortifications; **yrpκ**, villages (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 599 sq.). Reland gave the first extensive list of the localities of Palestine (in his *Palaestina*), which might be greatly enlarged from the Talmud (see *Baba Bathra*, 2 and 3; *Baba Metsiah*; 11:5). **SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.**

On the municipal government of pre-exilic Palestine no definite information remains. There were judges (**myfæv**) and overseers (**myrææ**) both named as officers (^{<0518>}Deuteronomy 16:18), but the latter title is not clear; and elsewhere the elders appear as civil authorities. In post-exilic times the magistrates of Palestinian cities are called councilors (**βουλαί**, Josephus, *Life*, 12, 13, 34, 61, 68), at whose head, as it would seem, stands a ruler (**ἄρχων**, *ibid.* 27; *War* 2, 21, 3). But from these are to be distinguished the territorial **στρατηγοί** or **ἑπαρχοί**, who had their seat in certain towns, and probably had civil jurisdiction over a particular district (*Life*, 9, 11, 17; *Ant.* 19:7, 4). On the civil law in cities see the Mishna (*Sanhedr.* 1, 1 sq.). **SEE GOVERNMENT.**

The gates of cities were guarded during the day by sentinels, who looked out from the turret on the walls no the distance (^{<0034>}2 Samuel 13:24 sq.; ^{<0307>}2 Kings 9:17 sq.; comp. ^{<0371>}Ezekiel 27:11), and either with the voice or with a horn gave the news (^{<0067>}Jeremiah 6:17; ^{<0086>}Ezekiel 3:6). Night patrols are also mentioned (*Song of Solomon* 3, 3). Of lighting the streets,

however, there is no trace, as in western towns (Becker, *Gallus*, 1, 333 sq.). *SEE WATCH*.

The mile-stones (still extant, Robinson, 3, 693) set up along the roads to indicate the distance of one town from another belong to Roman times (see Ideler, in the *Schrif. d. Berl. Akad.* 1812, hist. class. p. 134 sq.). On this point, and on the geographical position of towns, there are only incidental notices in the canonical books (see ^{<0123>}Genesis 12:8; ^{<0219>}Judges 21:19, etc.), and clearer indications appear in the books of Maccabees, and particularly in Josephus (see *Life*, 12, 24, 51, etc., collated by Reland, *Palaest.* 2, c. 6; comp. Mishna, *Maas. Sheni*, 5, 2); but it is not till the time of Eusebius and his Latin editor, Jerome (in his *Onomasticon*), that we get definite data (on these points; while the later itineraries (namely, the *Itiersar. Antoinii* [not the emperor of that name] and the *Itin. Herosol.* [both edited by Wesseling, Amst, 1735, 4to] and Abulfeda (*Tabula Syria*) give full and exact details on the subject, which, however, have to be supplemented (and often corrected) by modern; comparisons and measurements. *SEE GEOGRAPHY*.

Town-clerk

Picture for Town-clerk

(*γραμματεύς*, *a scribe*, as elsewhere often rendered) is the title ascribed in the A. V. to the magistrate at Ephesus who appeased the mob in the theatre at the time of the tumult excited by Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen (^{<4195>}Acts 19:35). The other primary English versions translate in the same way, except those from the Vulg. (Wycliffe, the Rhemish), which render "scribe." A digest of Bockh's views, in his *Staatshaushaltung*, respecting the functions of this officer at Athens (there were three grades of the order there) will be found 'in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. "Grammateus." The *γραμματεύς*, or "town-clerk," at Ephesus was, no doubt, a more important person in that city than any of the public officers designated by that term in Greece (see Creswell, *Dissertations*, 4:152). The title is preserved on various ancient coins (Wettstein, *Nov. Test.* 2, 586; Akermann, *Numismatic Illustrations*, p. 53), which fully illustrate the rank and dignity of the office. It would appear that what may have been the original service of this class of men, viz. to record the laws and decrees of the state and to read them in public, embraced at length especially under the ascendancy of the Romans in Asia Minor, a much wider sphere of duty,

so as to make them in some instances, in effect the heads or chiefs of the municipal government and even high-priests (Deyling, *Observ.* 3., 383; Krebs, *Decreta Rom.* p. 362). They were authorized to preside over the ‘popular assemblies and submit votes to them, and are mentioned on marbles as acting in that capacity. In cases where they were associated with a superior magistrate, they succeeded to his place and discharged his functions when the latter was absent or had died. “On the subjugation of Asia by the Romans,” says Baumstark (Pauly, *Encyclop.* 3, 949), **γραμματεῖς** were appointed there in the character of governors of single cities and districts, who even placed their names on the coins of their cities, caused the year to be named from them, and sometimes were allowed to assume the dignity, or at least the name, of **Ἀρχιερεῖς**. See Schwartz, *Dissertatio de γραμματεῦσι, Magistratis Civitatum Asiae Proconsulis* (Altdorf, 1735); Van Dale, *Dissertat.* 5, 425; Spanheim, *De Usu et Præst. Numm.* 1, 704; *New-Englander.* 10:144; Lewin, *St. Paul,* 1, 315. **SEE ASIARCH.**

It is evident, therefore, from Luke’s account, as illustrated by ancient records, that the Ephesian town-clerk acted a part entirely appropriate to the character in which he appears. The speech delivered by him, it may be remarked, is the model of a popular harangue. He argues that such excitement as the Ephesians evinced was undignified, inasmuch as they stood above all suspicion in religious matters (~~4185~~ Acts 19:35, 36); that it was unjustifiable; since they could establish nothing against the men whom they accused (ver. 37); that it was unnecessary, since other means of redress were open to them (ver. 38, 39); and, finally, if neither pride nor a sense of justice availed anything, fear of the Roman power should restrain them from such illegal proceedings (ver. 40). **SEE EPHESUS; SEE PAUL.**

Townley, James (1)

an English clergyman and educator, was born in London in 1715. He was educated at the Merchant Tailors School, and thence elected to St. John’s College, Oxford. Soon after taking orders he was chosen morning preacher at Lincoln’s Inn Chapel, and lecturer of St. Dunstan’s in the East. Through the patronage of lady Spencer, to whom his wife was related, he obtained the living of St. Bennett, Gracechurch, London; and afterwards became grammar master to Christ’s Hospital. In 1759 he was chosen high master of the Merchant Tailors School, and in 1777 was presented to a living in Wales by bishop Shipley, to whom he was chaplain. He died July 15, 1778.

Besides his *High Life Below Stairs*, a farce (Lond. 1759, 8vo); *False Concord*, a farce, (1764, unsuccessful and not printed). *The Tutor*, a farce (1765, 4to, unsuccessful), he published seven single *Sermons* (1741-69, each 4to). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Townley, James (2), D.D.

an eminent Wesleyan minister, was born in Manchester, England, May 11, 1774. His early education was received at the school of Rev. David Simpson (q.v.) of Macclesfield. The training of his pious mother and the impressions made upon his heart by the funeral services of his lamented teacher, resulted in the commencement of that earnest and true Christianity which was ever his best adornment. He became a local preacher at the age of nineteen, and in 1796 was received on probation as an itinerant, from which time until 1832 he fulfilled the duties his ministry faithfully and with increasing honor. In 1827 he was appointed general secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, in which office he abounded in loving and arduous services. At the Conference at Sheffield in 1829 he was elected to the chair, he presided at the Irish Conference of 1830, and retired to Ramsgate in, 1832. This forced cessation from active work was due to physical prostration under his great literary, mission office, and presidential toils. Dissolution, in fact, was already in progress; it was only a question of time. After a sickness of great suffering, the spirit of the gentle and generous Townley was released in the triumph of peace and faith, Dec. 12, 1833.

Amid the active duties of his pastorate and offices, Dr. Townley devoted himself to literary labors with an indomitable perseverance. His studies in Biblical lines made him in all probability the most learned man in the Wesleyan Conference after the death of Dr. Clarke (whom he only survived fifteen months and a half), particularly in all relating to the literary history of the Bible, The following is a list of his works: *Biblical Anecdotes* (Lond. 1813, 12mo). *Illustrations of Biblical Literature*, exhibiting the history and fate of the sacred writings, including notices of translators and other eminent Biblical scholars (ibid. 1821, 3 vols. 8vo; N.Y. 1842, 2 vols. 8vo) — *Essays on various subjects in ecclesiastical history and antiquity* (Lond. 1824): — *The Reason: of the Laws of Moses*, from the *More Nebochim* of Maimonides, excellently translated, with notes (100 pp.), dissertations (nine), and life of the author (ibid. 1827, 8vo): — *Introd. to Literary Hist.*

of the Bible (ibid. 1828, 12mo; N. Y. 1832 [a kind of a sequel to his *Anecdotes*, and introduction to his *Biblical Literature*): — *Introd. to the Critical Study of the Old and New Testaments* (his last): — *Sermon* (in the volume of *Miscellaneous Sermons*, by Wesleyans, published at the Conference Office [Lond. 1833]): — *History of Missions* (valuable sketches published posthumously in the *Wesl. Meth. Mag.* for 1834, an earnest of an exhaustive work to have, been written had his life been spared): — various articles in the *Meth. Mag.*, etc.

Dr. Townley's fame rests upon his *Biblical Literature*, a work as valuable now as it was upon the day of its publication, and which the *Eclectic Review* (18, 386, 407) affirms to be the most comprehensive of the kind in the world. It won for him the doctorate from an American university (that being the first instance of such a degree being conferred upon an English Wesleyan minister), the congratulations of the University of Dublin, and numerous encomiums slight compensation, however, for the immense labor it cost. For reviews and notices of this work see *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1843, art. 1; October, 1842, p. 638; *Christ. Rev.* [Baptist], June, 1844 (by Dr. Smith); *Meth. Quar. Mag.* 1822, see Index; Orme, *Biblioth. Bibl.* p. 435; Horne, *Introd.* etc. On the *Life* of Dr. Townley, see *Minutes of Eng. Conf.* 1834; Hoole, *Wesl. Meth. Mag.* May, 1835; Peck, in Amer. ed. of *Bibl. Lit.* vol. 1; Smith, *Hist. of Wesl. Meth.* 2, 649, 650; 3, 144-146, 203; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 2, 79; *Meth. Mag.* 1834, p. 78.

Townley, John H.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1817. In early life he became a devoted Christian. His career was short but brilliant. He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Elizabeth, and ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Hackettstown, N.J. He remained in this charge eight years, preaching with great acceptability and usefulness, greatly beloved by the congregation and people of the town. On resigning this charge, he accepted a call to the Church at Morristown, N.J. As in the former charge, during his ministry there were repeated outpourings of the Holy Spirit, in which many souls were converted and added to the Church, so in this, revivals followed. His energy and fidelity greatly endeared him to the people of his charge, and gave promise of continued success. His devotion to the cause of Christ, his prompt and ready co-operation in every good work, and his ability and fidelity in the discharge of every duty

devolved upon him, rendered his loss peculiarly afflicting to the Church and the community. He died at Morristown, Feb. 5, 1855. (W. P. S.)

Townsend, George, D.D.

an English divine, was born at Ramsgate in 1788, and was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He became chaplain to bishop Barrington in 1822, and was canon of Durham from 1825 till his death, Nov. 23, 1857. He was the author of *The Old Testament Arranged in Historical and Chronological Order, on the Basis of Lightfoot's Chronicle*, etc., with copious indexes:— (Lond. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo): *the New Testament Arranged in Historical and Chronological Order*, etc. (ibid. 1825, 2 vols. 8vo; 5th ed. 1860, imp. 8vo; Amer. ed. of both the foregoing, revised by T. W. Colt, D.D., Boston, 1.837, 2 vols. 8vo): — *The Accusations of History against the Church of Rome* (Lond. 1825, 8vo; new ed. 1845, 18mo): — *Thirty Sermons on some of the most Interesting Subjects in Theology* (1830, 8vo): — *Plan for Abolishing Pluralities and Non-residence*, etc. (ibid. 1833, 8vo): — *Life and Defense, etc., of Bishop Bonner* (1842, 8vo); *Spiritual Communion with God, or the Pentateuch and the Book of Job Arranged*, etc. (ibid. 2 vols. roy. 8vo; vol. 1 in 1845; vol. 2, October, 1849): — *Historical Researches: — Ecclesiastical and Civil History*, etc. (ibid. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Journal of a Tour in Italy in 1850, with an Account of an Interview: with the Pope at the Vatican* (1850, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.

Townsend, John

an English Dissenting minister, was born March 24, 1757, in the parish of Whitechapel, County of Middlesex. He was educated for five years at Christ's Hospital, and was then apprenticed to his father. Having received some religious impressions from the preaching of the Rev. Henry Peckwsell, he offered himself as a member at the Tabernacle, and commenced public teaching in some of the villages around London but soon received an invitation to supply the Independent meeting at Kingston, where he was ordained, June 1, 1781. After three years Mr. Townsend quitted Kingston and settled at Bermondsey, where he commenced his official duties at midsummer, 1784, and in which situation he continued to labor in his Master's vineyard till the period of his death, Feb. 7, 1826.

Mr. Townsend was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. He also aided in the formation of the Tract Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Female Penitentiary, the Irish Evangelical, the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, the Congregational School (raised entirely by his influence), the Fund for the Relief of Aged Ministers, and especially the Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb, which, if we are not mistaken, owed its establishment chiefly to his exertions. His sober, solid, judicious hints and observations were always listened to with profound 'attention, and his advice, which was never officially obtruded, was always acceptable. As a preacher he was distinguished by good sense and sound doctrine, commending himself to the conscience and the heart by a clear and judicious exhibition of divine truth. His principal works are, *Three Sermons* (1797, 8vo): — *Nine Discourses on Prayer* (2nd ed. Lond. 1799, 8vo): — *Hints on Sunday schools and Itinerant Preaching* (1801, 8vo): single *Sermons* (1786-1808). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Townsend, Joseph

an English clergyman, was a fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, and studied medicine at Edinburgh. He afterwards entered holy orders, and became rector of Pewsey, Wiltshire, anti chaplain to Lady Huntingdon, preaching in her chapel at Bath. He died in 1816. He published, *Every True Christian a New Creature* (Lond. 1765, 12mo): — *Thoughts on Despotic and Free Governments* (1781-91, 8vo. -*Dissertation on the Poor-laws, by a Well-wisher to Mankind* (1786, 8vo): — *Observations on Various Plans for the Relief of the Poor* (1788, 8vo): — *The Character of Moses - Established for Veracity as. a Historian*, etc. (Bath, 1813-15, 2 vols. 4to): — besides medical and scientific works, sermons, etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.

Townsend, Thomas Stuart, D.D.

an English prelate, was born in Cork about 1801, and became dean of Lismore in July, 1849; dean of Waterford in August, 1800; bishop of Meath in September, 1850; and died at Malaga. Spain, Sept. 16, 1852. He published some educational and religious treatises. See *Lond. Athen.* 1849, p. 829, 1057; *Lond. Gent. Mag.* 1852, 2, 522.'

Townshend, Chauncy Hare

an English clergyman, was born in 1800, and was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated A.B. in 1821 and A.M. in 1824. He received the university prize for English *verse*. (*Jerusalem*) in 1828. During his last years he lived chiefly at Lausanne, Switzerland, and died Feb. 25, 1868. He bequeathed to Charles Dickens money, manuscripts, essays, letters, etc., some of which he desired to be published. Accordingly Mr. Dickens published in December, 1869, *Religious Opinions of the Rev. Chauncy Townshend*, published as directed by his will (London, 8vo). He also wrote, *Poems*; (ibid. 1821, 8vo): — *Descriptive Tour in Scotland* (ibid. 1840, 8vo): — *Facts in Mesmerism* (ibid. 1840, 8vo): — *Sermons in Sonnets*, etc. (ibid. 1851, 8vo) *The Three Gates, in-verse* (ibid. 1859, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict., of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Townson, Thomas, D.D.

an English clergyman was born at Much Lees, in Essex, in 1715. He was educated at Oxford, where he took his degree of A.M. in 1739; was ordained priest in 1742; became vicar of Hatfield Peverel in 1746; senior proctor of the university: and rector of Blithfield, Staffordshire, in 1749; and rector of Malpas in 1751, where the rest of his life was spent; In 1781 he was made archdeacon of Richmond, and in 1783 was offered the professorship of divinity at Oxford, which he declined. He died April 15, 1792. His most important works are: his *Discourses on the Four Gospels, chiefly with regard to the Peculiar Designs of Each, and the Order and Places in which they were Written*, published in 1778, which has passed through three editions; and his *Discourse on the Evangelical History from the Interment to the Resurrection of our Lord* (1792); His collected works were issued in 2 vols. 8vo (Land. 1810), edited by Ralph Churton, A.M. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Tozer, Henry

a learned Puritan divine, was born at North Tawton, Devonshire, in 1602; was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, and was chosen fellow in 1623. Having taken orders, he was engaged in moderating, reading to novices, and lecturing in the chapel. He was adverse to overturning the establishment of the Church, and in 1643 declined to be one of the assembly of divines. He remained at Oxford, where he preached at Christ

Church before the king, and at St. Mary's before the Parliament. He was appointed in 1646 to take his degree of D.D., but declined. Dr. Hakewell, the rector, having left the college, the government devolved on Mr. Tozer, as sub-rector, who manfully opposed the illegality of the parliamentary visitation, and maintained the rights and privileges of the college. In March, 1647-48, he was cited before the parliamentary visitors to answer the charge of continuing the common prayer in the college after the ordinance for the directory (the new form) came in force; for having sent for and admonished one of the house for refusing to attend the chapel prayers on that account. He replied, in effect, "that these matters referred to the discipline of the college, and that they could be submitted to no other visitors, than those mentioned in the statutes," meaning the bishop of Exeter. The visitors ordered him to be ejected, but Dr. Tozer continued to keep possession of the college for some time, and they expelled him from the college and university in June, 1648. He refused to surrender the keys of the college, there being no rector to whom he could legally give them, as a consequence he was imprisoned. After a while he was allowed to remain in his rooms in the college, and to enjoy the profits, of a traveling fellowship for three years. On the strength of this he went to Holland and became minister to the English merchants at Rotterdam. He died there Sept. 11, 1650. Mr. Tozer published a few occasional sermons, *Directions for a Godly Life, etc.* (1628, 8vo): — *Dicteæ et Facta Chnisti ex, quatuor Evangelistis collecta* (1634, 8vo).

Trachoni'tis

(*Τραχωνίτις*) is mentioned in the Scriptures only in describing the political divisions of Palestine at the time of John the Baptist's first public appearance: "Philip was then tetrarch of Itursea and the *region* (*χώρας*) of *Trachonitis*" (~~4001~~ Luke 3:1). Although Trachonitis was a distinct and well-defined province, yet it appears that in this passage the phrase "region of Trachonitis" is used in a wider sense, and included two or three other, adjoining provinces. As considerable misapprehension has existed among geographers regarding Trachonitis, and as its exact position and boundaries were first clearly ascertained by the researches of recent writers, it may be well in this place to give a brief resume of the ancient notices of the province, and then to show how they can be applied in setting aside modern errors and establishing correct views.

Josephus states that Uz, the son of Aram, founded Trachonitis and Damascus, which “lay between Palestine and Coele-Syria” (*Ant.* 1, 6, 4). His next reference to it is when it was held by Zenodorils; the bandit chief. Then its inhabitants made frequent raids, as their successors do still upon the territories of Damascus (*Ant.* 15, 1). Augustus took it from Zenodorus, and gave it to Herod the Great, on condition that he should repress the robbers (*Ant.* 16:9, 1). Herod bequeathed it to his son Philip, and his will was confirmed by Caesar (*War.* 2, 6, 3). This is the Philip referred to in Luke 3, 1. At a later period it passed-into the hands of Herod Agrippa (*War.* 3, 5). After the conquest of this part of Syria by Cornelius Palma, in the beginning of the 2nd century, we hear no more of Trachonitis.

From various incidental remarks and descriptions in Josephus’s writings, the position of Trachonitis in relation to the other Transjordanic provinces may be ascertained. It lay on the east of Gaulonitis, while it bordered on both. Anranitis and Batanaea (*War.* 4:1, 1; 1, 20, 4). It extended, farther north than Gaulonitis, reaching to the territory of Damascus (*Ant.* 15:10, 3, and 10, 1; *War.* 3, 10,7), Ptolemy-locates the Trachonitic Arabs along-the base of Mount Alsadamus, and he includes this mountain in the province of Batanea, of which Saccea was a chief town (*Geogr.* 5; 15). Stabo states that there were two Trachons (δύο Τραχῶνες), amid he groups Damascus and Trachon together and states that the latter country is rugged and wild, and the people daring robbers (*Geogr.* 16:11). Jerome, speaking of Kenath, calls it a city of Trachonitis near Bozrah (*Onomast.* s.v. “Canath”); and the writers of the Talmud extend Trachon as far as Bobzrah (Lightfoot, *Opp.* 2, 473; comp. Jerome, *Onomast.* s.v. “Ituraea;” *Reland, Palest.* p. 109 sq.).

From these statements, compared with the results of modern research, the exact position and boundaries of this ancient province can be determined. It extended from the southern confines of Damascus, near the bank of the River Awaj (Pharpar), on the north, to Busrah (Bostra and Bozrah), on the south. Bozrah was the capital of Auranitis, and consequently that province lay along the southern end of Trachon. The province of Gaulanitis (now Jaulan) was its western boundary. Batanaea has been identified With Ard el-Bathanyeh, which embraces the whole ridge of Jebel Hauran, at whose western base lie the splendid ruins of Kenath, one of the ancient cities of Trachon (Jerome, *Ozomnast.* s.v. “Canath,” Kenath”). Consequently the ridge of Jebel Hauran formed the eastern boundary of Trachon, which extended southward to Busrah in the plain, near the south-western

extremity of the range (Porter, *Damascus*, 2, 259 sq.; also in *Journal of Sac. Lit.* for July, 1854). The region thus marked out embraces the modern district of the *Lejoah*, which may be considered the nucleus of Trachonitis; also the smooth plain extending from its northern border to the ranges of Khiyarah and Maiia. The rocky strip of land running along the western base of Jebel Hauran, and separating the mountain range from the smooth expanse of Auranitis, was likewise included in Trachonitis. This may explain Strabo's two Trachons. In the ruins of Muosmeih, on the northern edge of Lejah, Burckhardt discovered a Greek inscription, which proves that that city was Phaeno, the ancient metropolis of Trachon (*Travels in Syria*, p. 117; see also *Preface*, p. 11).

At first sight it might appear as if *Trachon*, or *Trachonitis* (Τραχών.or Τραχωνίτις), were only a Greek name applied to one of the subdivisions of the ancient kingdom of Bashan; yet there is evidence to show that it is a translation of a more ancient Shemitic appellation, descriptive of the physical nature of the region. Τραχών signifies rough and rugged; and Τραχωνίτις is "a rugged region" (τραχὺς καὶ πετρώδης τόπος), and peculiarly applicable to the district under notice. The Hebrew equivalent is *Argob* (ארגוב "a heap of stones ;" from *bgr* = *μgr*), which was the ancient name of an important part of Og's kingdom in Bashan. The identity of Trachon and Argob cannot now be questioned. It was admitted by the Jewish rabbins, for the Targums read *anwkr t* (*Trachona*) instead of *bgra* (*Argob*) in ^{<RB4>}Deuteronomy 3:14 and ^{<IB3>}1 Kings 4:13 (Lightfoot, *Opp.* 2, 473); and it is confirmed by the fact that Kenath, one of the threescore great cities of Argob (^{<IB2>}1 Chronicles 2:23), was also, as has been seen, a city of Trachon. Eusebius, led doubtless by similarity of names, confounded Argob with the castle of Erga or Ragaba, near the confluence of the Jordan and Jabbok. In this he has been followed by Reland (*Palcest.* p. 959, 201), Ritter (*Pal. 2nd Syr.* 2, 1041), and even Robinson (*Bibl. Res. App.* p. 166, 1st ed.). Nothing can be more clear, however, than that Argob, a large province of Bashan containing sixty great cities, was quite distinct from Ragaba, an obscure castle in Gilead (Porter, *Dmnascus*, 2, 271). Eusebius also confounded Trachonitis and Itiraea (*Onomast. s.v.* "Itureea"); a manifest error. William of Tyre gives a curious etymology of the word Trachonitis: "Videtur autem nobis a *traconibus* dicta. Tracones enim dicuntur occulti et subterranei meatus, quibusista regio abundat" (*Gesta Dei pelr Fsrancos*, p. 895). Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that the whole region abounds in caverns, some

of which are of vast extent. Strabo refers to the caves in the mountains beyond Trachon (*Geogr.* 16), and he affirms that one of them is so large that it would contain 4000 men. Travelers have visited some spacious caves in Jebel Hauran, and in the interior of the Lejah.

The province of the *Lejah* (Arab. "the Retreat") comprises the principal part of the Hebrew Argob and Greek Trachon. It is oval in form, about twenty-two miles long by fourteen wide. Its physical features are unparalleled in Western Asia. It is a plain, but its surface is elevated above the surrounding plain to an average height of thirty feet or more. It is entirely composed of a thick stratum of black basalt, which appears to have been emitted from pores in the earth in a liquid state, and to have flowed out on every side until the surface of the plain was covered. Before completely cooling, it seems to have been agitated as by a tempest, and then rent and shattered by internal convulsions. The cup-like cavities from which the liquid mass was projected are still seen; and likewise the wavy surface such as a thick liquid generally assumes which cools while flowing. There are deep fissures and yawning gulfs with rugged broken edges; and there are jagged mounds that seem not to have been sufficiently heated to flow, but which were forced up by some mighty agency, and then rent and shattered to their centers. The rock is filled with air-bubbles and is almost as hard as iron. "In the interior parts of the Lejah," says Burckhardt, "the rocks are in many places cleft asunder, so that the whole hill appears shivered and in the act of falling down; the layers are generally horizontal, from six to eight feet or more in thickness, sometimes covering the hills, and inclining to their curve, as appears from the fissures which traverse the rock from top to bottom" (*Travels in Syria*, p. 112).

It is worthy of note how minutely this description accords -with that of Josephus, who says of the inhabitants of Trachon that it was extremely difficult to conquer them or check their depredations, as they had neither towns nor fields, but dwelt in caves that served as a refuge both for themselves and their flocks. They had, besides, cisterns of water and well-stored granaries, and were thus able to remain long in obscurity and to defy their enemies. The doors of their caves are so narrow that but one man can enter at a time, while within they are incredibly large and spacious. The ground above is almost a plain, but it is covered with rugged rocks, and is difficult of access, except when a guide points out the paths. These paths do not run in a straight course, but have many windings and turns" (*Ant.* 15:10, 1).

The character of the inhabitants remains unchanged as the features of their country. They are wild, lawless robbers, and they afford a ready asylum to murderers, rebels, and outlaws from every part of Syria. It seems to have been so in Old-Test. times; for when Absalom murdered his brother, he fled to his mother's kindred in Geshur (a part of Trachon), and was there three years (¹⁰⁵⁷2 Samuel 15:37, 38). *SEE GESHUR.*

It is a remarkable fact that the great cities of Argob, famed at the time of the Exodus for their strength, exist still. The houses in many of them are perfect. The massive city walls are standing; and the streets, though long silent and deserted, are in some places complete as those of a modern town. The city gates, and the doors and roofs of the houses, are all of stone, bearing the marks of the most remote antiquity. It is not too much to say that, in an antiquarian point of view, Trachon is one of the most interesting provinces in Palestine (Porter, *Bashaz's Giant Cities*; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*; Graham, in the *Journal of R. G. S.* vol. 28; and *Camb. Essays*, 1858; Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über Hauran ulid die Trachonen*). Such as desire to compare with the above account the views previously set forth by geographers may consult Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*; Reland, *Palaest.* p. 108 sq.; Cellarius, *Geogr. Ant.* 2, 617 sq. *SEE ARGOB.*

Tract

a psalm, or portion of a psalm, sung in the Latin mass instead of the Gradual, on fixed days; from Septuagesima to Easter, after the Epistle. At the time at which the Church is commemorating the passion of our Lord, this Tract is slowly chanted in lieu of the joyous Gradual. It is called *the Tract*, as some ritualistic writers affirm, because it is *drawn out* in a slow and solemn strain. It is said that the psalm or hymn chanted by one voice was *the Tract*, and when the singer was interrupted by the choir his part was known as *the versicle*, and the portions allotted to them were called *responsories*. See Lee, *Gloss. of Liturg. Terms*, s.v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* s.v.

Tractarianism

SEE ENGLISH CHURCH; SEE OXFORD TRACTS; SEE PUSEYISM.

Tractator

the name given in the early Church to preachers and expositors of Scripture; his sermon or treatise being called *Tractatus*. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 14:ch. 4:§ 1.

Tractatus

the Latin name for a sermon, discourse, etc.

Tractoriee

a name sometimes given to the circular letters of metropolitans summoning the bishops to a council. These circular letters were a legal summons, which no bishop of the province might disobey under: pain of suspension, or some such canonical censure. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 2, ch. 16:§ 17.

Tracts and Tract Societies

The term *tract*, although etymologically signifying something *drawn* out (Lat. *tractus*), has long been employed in the English language to designate a short or condensed treatise in print. It has primary reference to the form of publication, and is usually applied only to unbound sheets or pamphlets. Thus, a treatise on any topic may be published either in a book or tract form, the tract being much cheaper than the book, but also much more liable to be injured or destroyed. While many political, scientific, and other tracts have been published, yet the vast majority of publications known as tracts are of a religious character; So generally is this true that the word *tract* used without qualification rarely suggests any other idea than that of a brief religious treatise or appeal. To some extent the idea has been employed by propagandists of error, but far more generally by lovers of truth and by persons willing to make sacrifices for its promotion. Had only miscellaneous tracts been published, or had the publication of tracts on religious subjects only taken place in an accidental or unsystematic manner, there would have been no occasion for this article.

I. *Occasion and Character of the Tract Movement.* There has, in fact, arisen a great Christian enterprise having for its object the publication and dissemination of religious tracts. This enterprise, like the Gospel itself and other of its auxiliaries, has from small beginnings grown to vast proportions and commanding influence. Although its history is chiefly

limited to the last one hundred years, it has already come to be considered one of the cardinal agencies of Christian propagandism, taking rank with the missionary and Sunday school enterprises, and serving as a powerful auxiliary to both. Although asserting no specific divine appointment, it nevertheless claims to be authorized by inspired analogies. The sacred books both of the Old and the New Testaments were issued and circulated as separate treatises or tracts; so that the Bible itself, in its most approved modern form, may be said to be a bound volume of tracts.

The principle involved is that of giving truth a permanent and available expression in written or printed language, thus enabling it to survive the voice of the living teacher, and to reach persons and places to which he could never have access. God, from the beginning, appointed language as the medium of communication between himself and man, as well as between man and man. He spoke to our race, not only through the hearing of the ear, but also through the perceptions of the eye, thus consecrating both spoken and written language to the office of religious instruction. In giving a written law, he not only provided for the moral guidance of the generation to whom it was first addressed, but for all subsequent ages, while he also continued to teach and admonish men by the voice and the pen of prophets and holy men in successive periods. As a counterpart of the spoken language to be used in preaching, the chosen disciples of our Lord were inspired to write narratives of the life, miracles, and death of him who was the eternal Word, together with the acts and letters of the apostles embodying the instructions which they had personally received from the Lord himself, and which were thus handed down to those who should come after them. Spoken language has the advantage of instant readiness, wherever there is a tongue to speak and an ear to hear. It can also be varied with circumstances, and, adapted to the special wants and changing perceptions of those to whom it is addressed. On the other hand, written language is available at all times and in all places. It can be cheaply multiplied and scattered on the wings of the wind. It also endures from age to age, while living speakers die. Great as was the personal influence of the apostles through the agency of spoken language, the influence of their writings has been infinitely greater. Their voices expired with their natural life, but their written speech was immortal. It survived all persecutions. It became embodied in many languages, and was diffused in every direction. It has come down through the centuries. It has been taken up by the modern printing-press, and having been translated into hundreds of tongues

and dialects, is now multiplied more rapidly than ever before for the benefit of the present and succeeding generations. By this adjustment of Providence, the apostles, though dead, yet speak, and will continue to speak to increasing millions while the world endures; and those who read their writings may not only receive their teachings, but become partakers and propagators of like precious faith. They may echo the truth, which has made them free in their own forms of expression and with new adaptations to the ever-changing circumstances of humanity.

A peculiarity of written language is that its dissemination challenges co-operation from many not called to the office of preaching. Copyists, printers, purchasers, and distributors may in their several spheres cooperate to bring the truth of God by means of it into contact with human hearts. The tract enterprise, in fact, employs and combines for a common purpose many and, varied agencies. In order that a religious tract may be produced and started. on a career of usefulness, there must first be a writer imbued with the spirit of truth and love, and willing to labor with his pen, in order to express his thoughts in language at once attractive and impressive.” Then there must be pecuniary investment for the publication of the document written. The task of publication, although possible to individuals, is best performed by public institutions, like the existing tract societies, which, having a corporate existence, live on though their founders die. Such societies can develop and carry out great systems of effort, which their projectors may only live to initiate. Superadded to the publication of tracts, in order to their extended usefulness, there must be co-operative and systematic agencies for their proper and continuous dissemination among readers. When this complicated machinery of moral and spiritual influence is appropriately organized, the humblest Christian may come into working relations with it and be a helper to its highest success. Thenceforward there is a grand co-partnership of results, in which those who write, who print, who circulate, and who read may rejoice together.

As an illustration of the endless stream of influences, which may flow onward from a single instance of bringing religious truth in a printed form to the attention of the unconverted, the following facts are condensed from authentic documents. In the latter part of the 16th century, a good man, known as Dr. Sibbs, wrote a little book entitled *The Bruised Reed*. A copy of that book, sold by a poor peddler at the door of a lowly cottage in England, was the agency of the Christian awakening of Richard Baxter, who was born in 1615. “The additional reading of a little piece of Mr.

Perkins's work *On Repentance*, borrowed from a servant," says Baxter, in a sketch of his own life, "did further inform me and confirm me; and thus, without any means, but books, was (God pleased to resolve me for himself." Thus brought to tie knowledge and experience of the truth, Baxter became one of the most earnest preachers and prolific writers of any age. He died in 1691, having published matter enough to fill twenty-three large volumes. Two of his smaller works *The Call to the Unconverted* and *The Saints' Everlasting Rest* have passed through countless editions both in England and America, and, doubtless, will continue to be widely read in English speaking countries while time endures. Of the full extent of their influence it is impossible to form an adequate estimate, but here and there links in the chain of sequences can be discovered. Philip Doddridge, when young, borrowed the works of Baxter, and in due time became the author of the *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, a work which led William Wilberforce to seek for pardon through the Redeemer. Wilberforce's *Practical View of Christianity* was the instrument employed by the Holy Spirit to lead to repentance and a true faith in Christ Legh Richmond, the writer of *The Young Cottager*, *The Dairyman's Daughter*, and various other tracts. Mr. Richmond was a laborious clergyman, and for many years a secretary of the Religious Tract Society of London. His tracts above named have been translated into many languages, and have been instrumental, under the blessing of God, in the conversion of many precious souls. Only two days before his summons to a better world, he received a letter mentioning the conversion of two persons, one of them a clergyman, by the perusal of his tract *The Dairyman's Daughter*. Nearly half a century has since passed away, but the tract has lived on, and, by the help of printers, donors, and distributors, has continued to do its work; while many of those converted through its influence have themselves become successful actors in starting agencies of influence, destined to work on with ever-increasing and multiplying power. Volumes might be filled with incidents illustrating the utility and power of tracts as an agency of evangelization and religious influence both in Christian and pagan lands. In fact, judging from the reports and annals of the, various tract organizations, no branch of Christian activity has been more uniformly productive of the best results than tract distribution.

While the tract enterprise may thus be spoken of in its separate character, it should be borne in mind that it seldom acts or stands alone. Its most approved modes of action are in connection with Church work at home

and missionary effort abroad; consequently its best fruits will doubtless be found in the great day to have been the joint product of many forms of Christian activity. It may be confidently urged that Christian work in connection with the use of religious tracts is practicable to a greater number of people of every age and circumstance in life than any other generally recognized agency of usefulness. Comparatively few are called to be-ministers or missionaries. Many cannot be Sunday-school teachers. But who cannot be the bearer or sender of a tract who indeed, cannot, with comparatively little sacrifice, circulate many tracts through channels of business, in public thoroughfares, through the mails, and, what is better than any other way, by personal presentation?

The present is a reading age, and while, on the one hand, it is important to antagonize the evils resulting from bad reading in all its forms, on the other hand there is no community in which many person mama not be found who will have little, if any, good reading that is not brought to them by the hand of benevolence. He that searches them out and bestows upon them good gifts in the form of Christian tracts and books, accompanied, if need be, with other acts of kindness, will seldom fail of doing good; but he who adds' to the tract earnest Christian inquiry or conversation will do still greater good, and in many instances secure an interest in such promises as these. He which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall' save a soul from death" (~~STB~~James 5:20). "And they that turn many to righteousness [shall shine] as the stars forever and ever" ~~STB~~Daniel 12:3). Ministers of the Gospel especially should consider it a great privilege to have provided and ready to their hand a large supply of Christian truth strongly stated, neatly printed, and specially adapted to aid and render permanent the very work they are endeavoring to do by preaching and pastoral labor. In this respect the publications of the tract societies become an arsenal filled with legitimate weapons of the Christian warfare, a vast store of fixed ammunition with which to defend the citadel of Christian truth, and to assault the positions of the adversary.

In the pulpit the minister is chiefly limited to his own thoughts and expressions. In the use of tracts he may avail himself of the best thoughts, the largest experience, and the ablest statements of the wisest men who have used their pen for the glory of God. His own spoken words may vanish with the breath which utters them. At most, they are not likely to be long remembered; but the printed pages which he scatters may remain to be perused when the giver is dead, and may even descend to coming

generations. In preaching, the minister is limited to his own personal efforts, and can only address those who come to hear him. In his pastoral work he is at liberty to seek out the people; and often the present of a tract or a book will secure for him the friendship and the interested attention of those who would not have volunteered to enter his congregation. Besides, in the work of tract distribution, a hundred willing hands can help him, and feet “shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace” will run for him in paths of duty farther and oftener than he with the utmost diligence can hope to go himself. Ministers should therefore enlist their people in the practical work of tract-distribution. This is too great and too good a work to be confined to ‘a few. Specially appointed tract committees and visitors have their duties; which should neither be omitted nor excused; yet no individual should consider his or her personal responsibility relieved by the official appointment of others. The truth is, that in order to the full accomplishment of tract distribution as a means of evangelical effort in any community, both systematic and occasional, public and individual, exertions must be put forth. The periodical distribution of tracts through districts and towns is very important, but it has disadvantages. For instance, where the district is large there is not time for sufficient personal conversation with different characters — besides, many will not listen to the voice of a stranger. If the Christian acquaintances of such persons should-give them tracts as tokens of friendship, and follow up the gift with affectionate warning and entreaty, the end would be more effectually gained. Thus it is that individual Christians, in their several circles of acquaintance and, business, have a work to do in which well-selected tracts may furnish invaluable aid.

II. *History of Initial Tract Enterprises.* Aside from the circulation of portions of the Holy Scriptures in fragmentary or tract form, the use of tracts as an agency of religious usefulness dates from the dawn of the Reformation in Europe. Long before the invention of printing, the early Reformers sent out their little tractates to awaken and instruct the people who still sat under the shadow of the Dark Ages. Wycliffe’s writings were the means of extensive usefulness. He sent out more than one hundred volumes, small and great, besides his translation of the Bible. Notwithstanding many of his works were burned and people were forbidden to read them on pain of death, yet they spread far and wide. Like seeds of truth borne by the wind, they lodged on the soil of the Continent, and brought forth fruit there in after-years. Works produced by the writers

of that period, although extensively useful, were greatly hindered in their circulation by the size and expensiveness of the manuscript form in which they were issued.

The invention of printing in the 15th century removed many formidable obstacles to the diffusion of truth, and greatly stimulated the literary efforts of those who were striving to reform the Church. Luther appeared, and by his powerful writings and those of his associates, millions of people were led to renounce the errors than which they previously knew nothing better. The efforts of the later Reformers are thus characterized by one of their opponents: "The Gospellers of these days do fill the realm with so many of their noisome little books that they be like to the swarms of locusts which' did infest the land of Egypt." Fox, the martyrologist, exults over the work and promise of the art of printing in language like this: "God hath opened the *press* to preach, whose voice the pope is never able to stop with all the puissance of his triple crown. By this printing, as by the gift of tongues and as by the singular organ of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the Gospel soundeth to all nations and countries under heaven; and what God revealed unto one man is dispersed to many; and what is known to one nation is opened to all."

In the 17th century several traces are found of associations for promoting the printing and sale of religious works, while-much good resulted from the efforts of individuals, both in England and on the Continent. At length, movements on a larger scale began to be made in the line of associated efforts for the diffusion of truth in printed form. The earlier organizations of this kind, though not strictly tract societies, were preliminary, and in some sense introductory, to the great institutions subsequently formed for the exclusive object of printing and circulating religious tracts. In 1701 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was established in England. In 1742 the Rev. John Wesley, in the prosecution of his evangelical work in Great Britain, commenced printing and circulating religious tracts by personal effort and the co-operation of the preachers associated with him. In 1750 the Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor was organized. In 1756 societies for a similar object were commenced both in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Although the three societies named accomplished good, they did not remain permanently established. In 1782 Mr. Wesley instituted a Society for the Distribution of Religious Tracts among the Poor. In his published proposals in behalf of the society, he said," I cannot but earnestly recommend this to all those who desire to see

true scriptural Christianity spread throughout these nations. Men wholly unawakened will not take the pains to read the Bible. They have no relish for it. But a small tract may engage their attention for half an hour, and may, by the blessing of God, prepare them for going forward.” Membership in the society required the subscription of half a guinea or more, for which a quota of tracts would be delivered yearly. The publications of the society at that date were thirty in number, embracing *Alleine’s Alarm*, *Baxter’s Call*, *Ten Short Sermons*, *Tokens for Children*, *A Word to a Soldier*, *A Word to a Sailor*, *A Word to a Swear*, *A Word to a Sabbath-breaker*, *A Word to a Drunkard*, etc. It is not difficult to see in the above scheme the germ of the largest tract societies now in existence. Its tenor, more especially when taken in connection with Mr. Wesley’s methods of supplying religious books wherever his societies existed or his preachers went, fully authorized the following assertion of his biographer, Richard Watson “He was probably the first to use, on any extensive scale, this means of popular reformation.” About 1790 Hannah More appeared as a writer of popular tracts. Her first tract, entitled *William Chip*, was published anonymously. Having been encouraged by its reception, she prepared, with the aid of her sisters, a series of small publications, entitled *The Cheap Repository Tracts*. In a private memorandum, published after her decease, she said, “I have devoted three years to this Work. Two millions of these tracts were disposed of during the first year. God works by weak instruments to show that the glory is all his own.” From that time forward the number of persons who made themselves useful by publishing and circulating tracts in various ways became considerably increased. Among them honorable mention may be made of Mrs. Rebecca Wilkinson, of Clapham; Rev. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, and Rev. John Campbell, of Edinburgh.

III. *Tract Societies distinctively so-called.* The time had now arrived for broader and more thoroughly organized movements in behalf of the tract enterprise. The Religious Tract Society of London was initiated in May, 1799. Rev. George Burder, Rowland Hill, Matthew Wilks, Joseph Hughes, and others were among its organizers. A rule of the society, like that of Mr. Wesley, before noted, provided that its membership “consist of persons subscribing half a guinea or upwards annually.” The society was placed upon a basis of broad catholicity. Its object was defined to be the publication of “those grand doctrinal and practical truths which have in every age been mighty through God in converting, sanctifying, and

comforting souls, and by the influence of which men may have been enabled, while they lived, to live to the Lord, and when they died to die unto the Lord." It is impossible to give in this article a detailed history of any of the societies enumerated; brief and general notices must suffice. But in the briefest notice of the Religious Tract Society of London, it is not too much to say that in the eighty years of its existence it has well and faithfully illustrated the catholic and evangelical principles announced by its founders in the beginning. In so doing it has accomplished its objects on a grand scale and to an unforeseen extent. An incidental event of the most interesting character grew out of the operations of the Religious Tract Society in the third year of its existence. It was no less than the preliminary step towards the organization of the British and Foreign Bible Society—the parent Bible Society of the world. *SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES.*

For a score of years the business of the Religious Tract Society was of such a moderate extent that a small hired depository sufficed for its transaction. From 1820 the business so expanded as to require the occupation of enlarged premises in Paternoster Row, where, in 1843-44, its present commodious buildings were erected. The design of the society contemplated the double purpose of sales at or near cost, and gratuitous distribution. Both phases of its work were therefore limited to its supply of funds.. Its only income, at first, was from the annual subscriptions of its members. But by degrees, and as necessity required, additions were made from other sources, such as congregational collections, auxiliary societies, life-memberships, legacies, and special donations. As the operations of the society increased, new and varied forms of action were developed, including not only sales through depositories, but by hawkers or peddlers throughout the provinces. Donations were made not only of tracts, but of assorted libraries to soldiers barracks, to sea-going vessels, to emigrant and convict-ships, to workhouses, to coastguard stations, to missionaries' families, to clergymen, to schoolmasters, and city missionaries, to be used for loaning to persons in destitute circumstances. During the first five years of the society's existence, it published only sixty-six different tracts in the ordinary form. Subsequently it began to enlarge the variety as well as the number of its publications. Broadsheets, handbills, children's books, periodicals adapted to different ages and classes, monthly volumes, standard works, and even commentaries on the Scriptures came in turn to be regularly and constantly issued under the imprint of the society. From active work in different parts of Great Britain, the society was led to

extend its work into foreign fields. Such an extension had not been originally contemplated, but nevertheless took place in the order of Providence, and became a striking illustration of the expansive nature of true Christian benevolence. The circumstance which first led to the preparation of tracts in foreign languages was the obvious duty of giving religious instruction to a number of prisoners-of-war confined in England; and the first foreign languages in which the society's tracts were published were the French and the Dutch. As was to have been expected, the foreign prisoners, when released, carried more or less of the tracts they had received to their own countries, and thus, to some extent, created a demand for more and similar publications in those countries. About the same time, a correspondence sprang up between the society and representative evangelical Christians in most of the nations of Europe. Soon afterwards the enterprise of foreign missions began to be extended to various pagan nations. By similar processes, the work of the Religious Tract Society has been expanding and enlarging ever since, with a prospect of continuous expansion and usefulness in time to come.

The Reports of the society from year to year have been replete with interesting details, not only of progress, but also of results; and yet it may safely be inferred that the good which has been directly and indirectly accomplished through its instrumentality has not half been told. Eternity only can reveal the full extent of influences that have been so far-reaching, and in many instances so remote from ordinary human observation. A few items, condensed from the society's official documents, may serve as partial indications of the magnitude to which, from the small beginnings noted above, its operations have grown. The society has printed important tracts and books in one hundred and twenty different languages and dialects. Its present annual issues from its own depositories and those of foreign societies, through which it acts, are about sixty-three millions, and its aggregate issues during eighty years past have been about two thousand millions. It has co-operated with every Protestant Christian mission in the world. It has assailed popery on the Continent of Europe, Mohammedanism in the East, and paganism of various forms in heathen lands. It has given a Christian literature to nations just emerging from barbarism. Its publications have passed the wall of China, and have entered the palace of the Celestial emperor. They have instructed the princes of Burmah, and opened the self-sealed lips of the devotee in India. They have gone to the sons of Africa to teach them, in their bondage, the liberty of

the Gospel. They have preached Christ crucified to the Jew and also to the Greek; while in the home land they have continued to offer the truths and consolations of religion to soldiers, to sailors, to prisoners, to the inmates of hospitals, and, in short, to rich and poor in every circumstance of life. In the year 1849, the Religious Tract Society celebrated its semi-centennial jubilee. In connection with that interesting event, a large jubilee fund was raised to increase the usefulness of the society. A jubilee memorial volume was also published, setting forth in an able and interesting manner the history of its first fifty years of work and progress. When, in the year 1899, the society shall celebrate its centennial, a still grander showing of results may be expected.

The additional tract societies of Great Britain, aside from merely local organizations, are not numerous. The following are the principal: The Religions Tract and Book Society of Scotland (Edinburgh). The primary organization of this society dates back to 1793. It is not a publishing society, and for many years had a feeble existence. About 1856 it adopted a system of colportage similar to that of the American Tract Society, and, since that period, has greatly multiplied its influence and usefulness. It embraces branch societies at Glasgow and Aberdeen, and employs some two hundred colporteurs. The Stirling Tract Enterprise, founded in 1848, is chiefly a publishing institution, issuing both tracts and periodicals. The Dublin Tract Society issues tracts in large numbers. The Monthly Tract Society, London, was instituted in 1837.

In passing from Great Britain to other countries, the number of tract societies is found to be very great. For the most part, they combine publication with distribution, receiving aid from the Religious Tract Society of London to enable them to publish tracts and books in their several localities. It is therefore deemed sufficient to give the title and date of organization, omitting details of history and statistics, although in many instances of great interest.

CONTINENT OF EUROPE. Tract Society of Norway and Denmark, 1799; Stockholm Evangelical Society, 1815; Religious Tract Society of Finland, 1818; Tract Society of Copenhagen, 1820; Stuttgart Tract Society, 1813; Prussian Tract Society, Berlin, 1815; Tract Society of Wupperthal, 1814; Lower Saxony Tract Society, Hamburg, 1820 ; Tract Society of Leipsic, 1821; The Netherlands Tract Society, 1821; The Belgian Tract Society, 1835; The Belziain Evangelical Society, 1839;

Religious Tract Society of Paris, 1820; Evangelical Society of France, 1829; Religious Book Society of Toulouse, 1835; Tract Society of Berne, 1802; Tract Society of Basle, 1810; Tract Societies of Lausanne, Neufchâtel, and Geneva, 1828; Evangelical Society of Geneva, 1831; Tract Societies of St. Gall, Zurich, and Chur., 1834; Tract and Book Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Bremen, 1850.

INDIA. Native Tract Society at Nagercoil, Travancore, 1824; Calcutta Book and Tract Society, 1825; Tract Societies of Madras, Bellary, Belgaum, Bombay, Surat, and Benares, 1825-26; Tract Societies of Bangalore, Orissa, Alleppee, Chunar, and Quilon, 1829-30; Tract Societies of Mirzapore, Vizagapatam, Cuddapah, Neyoor, and Mangalore, 1832-40; Jaffna Religious Tract Society, 1825; Tract Societies of Cotta and Colombo, 1835; Ceylon Christian Vernacular Education Society and Religious Tract Society, 1840; North Indian Tract Society, Allahabad; Pnjamab Religious Book Society; The Christian Union of Java, 1833; Tract Society of Mauritius, 1824; Burmah Bible and Tract Society, 1861.

CHINA. From the beginning of Christian missions in China the circulation of religious tracts and books has been diligently prosecuted. To that end nearly every separate mission has served as a publishing agency of greater or less extent. Almost all the missions have received from the tract societies of England and America aid for their work of publication. In 1878 the Chinese Religious Tract Society was organized at Shanghai. It is composed of representative missionaries of various churches, and proposes to organize auxiliaries and local societies wherever Christian churches are established.

JAPAN. Active measures are in progress for the preparation and diffusion of Christian tracts and books in Japan. But as yet such efforts are limited to the various missions aided by the principal Bible and Tract societies of England and America.

AUSTRALIA. Tract Society of Sydney, 1823; Tract Society of Van Diemen's Land, 1837; Religious Tract Society of Victoria, 1855; Victoria Tract Distribution Society, 1858.

NEW ZEALAND. New Zealand Tract Society, 1839; Wellington Tract Society, 1848.

SOUTH AFRICA. Cape Town Auxiliary Tract Society, 1820; South African Ladies' Tract. and Book Society, 1832.

WEST INDIES. Jamaica Tract Society, 1835; New Providence Tract Society, 1837.

CANADA. Tract Society of Quebec, 1824; Tract Society of Montreal, 1825; Religious Tract Society-of Toronto, 1824; Religious Tract Society of Halifax, 1824; Religious Tract Society of St. Johns, N. B., 1825; British American Book and Tract Society, Halifax, 1868.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1803; Connecticut Religious Tract Society, 1808 Vermont Religious Tract Society, 1808; The Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, 1809; New York Religious Tract Society, 1812; Evangelical Tract Society, Boston, 1813; Albany Religious Tract Society, 1813; New England Tract Society, 1814; Religious Tract Society of Philadelphia, 1815. Religious Tract Society of Baltimore, 1816; New-York Methodist Tract Society, 1817; Baptist General Tract Society, 1824; American Tract Society, Boston, 1823; American Tract Society, New York, 1825; New York City Tract Society, 1827; New York City Mission and Tract Society, 1864; Willard Tract Society, Boston, 1866; Monthly Tract Society of the United States, New York, 1874.

It is not within the design of this article to give the history of the tract societies enumerated; but it is proper to remark that various modifications have taken place in the title and specific character of some of the earlier American organizations. In several instances primary associations have been merged in the formation of more important societies, while others have continued under new names and with modified forms of action. With increasing experience, the tendency has been to centralize the work of publication in a few strong societies and to multiply the agencies of distribution outward from the great centers of publication. A few examples of combination and reconstruction may be noted. 'The New England Tract Society, organized in 1814, became in 1823 the American Tract Society, having its location in Boston. The same society in 1878 was merged in the American Tract Society, which was organized in New York in 1825. The last-named arrangement was consummated none too soon, as great confusion had arisen from having two publishing societies of the same corporate name. The Baptist General Tract Society, organized in Washington in 1824, was subsequently transferred to Philadelphia, and in

1840 became, with enlarged designs, the American Baptist Publication Society. The New York Methodist Tract Society, organized in 1817, subsequently became incorporated as the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

As a counterpart to the above sketch of the rise and development of the Religious Tract Society of London, and as a specimen illustration of results from about half a century's operations of a similar American organization, the following facts are condensed from official publications of the American Tract Society; The society has a large and commodious building in Nassau Street, New York, with twenty steam-presses, tens of thousands of stereotype plates, and every facility for composing, printing, binding, storing, and issuing its own publications to the number of 4000 books, 30,000 tracts, and 20,000 papers daily. It is therefore enabled to abate, in fixing the prices of books, what otherwise would have to be added for rent of buildings hired, and for the profits of trade. It numbers on its list about 6000' distinct publications, including, besides tracts and handbills of various kinds, 1240 volumes of biography history, and helps to Biblical study. Among what are called its home publications, 1584 distinct issues are in foreign languages viz. German, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish, Welsh, Dutch, Danish, Finnish, and Hungarian, designed for immigrants coming to the United States. Of its home publications in the English language, 28,000,000 volumes, besides about 3,000,000,000 pages of tracts, have been issued. Of its periodicals, several of which are illustrated and printed in the highest style of typography, over 5,000,000 are issued yearly to 350,000 subscribers. This society has become distinguished for its faithful and systematic prosecution of the work of colportage. By its agents, employed chiefly in frontier and destitute sections of the country, it has within a period of forty years done a work equal to that of one man for more than 5000 years. It has sold more than 11,000,000 volumes, and donated 3,000,000 to destitute persons and families. It has made more than 12,000,000 visits to families; in about 1,000,000 of which no religious book was found, with the exception of Bibles in. about one third of the number. It has thus done much to meet the moral and religious wants of our frontier population in advance of schools and churches. It is accustomed to make grants each year of fifty thousand dollars' worth of its publications for circulation in prisons and hospitals, in Sabbath-schools and mission-schools, in cities and remote and lonely hamlets, to soldiers and to sailors on our inland waters, and in hundreds of

outward-bound vessels for every corner of the globe. The foreign work of the society has been chiefly accomplished through donations of money granted to missionaries in seventy different foreign stations.. By means of some \$700,000 thus appropriated, the society has printed, in 145 different languages and dialects, not less than 4211 distinct publications, including 640 volumes. Thus “fruits” of the society’s sowing may be found in almost every land from Russia to the Cape of Good Hope, and from China in the East to Hawaii in the West.”

As a summary of the work accomplished by a distributing tract society, the following items are copied from the Report of the American Tract Society for 1890:

SUMMARY VIEW OF COLPORTAGE FOR FORTY-NINE YEARS

Time employed, months	69,601
Volumes sold	12,341,183
Volumes granted	3,134,305
Public meetings addressed, etc.	463,208
Families destitute of all religious books except the Bible	1,155,377
Protestant families destitute of the Bible	686,097
Families of Roman Catholics visited	1,733,438
Protestant families habitually neglecting Evangelical preaching	1,946,959
Families conversed with on personal religion or prayed with	7,792,963
Family visits	13,775,030

In addition to the above regular operations, more than \$150,000 have been expended for the erection of mission stations and chapels. The total amount of grants in publications for 65 years amount to \$2,109,890.84, The foreign grants in cash amount to \$696.949.93. Number of pages printed since the formation of the society, 9371,832,882.

The detailed statistics of the tract enterprise in its various forms of action would fill many volumes with facts of intense interest and form a just basis not only of admiration for its past success but also of high expectation for its expanding and multiplying influence in the years and centuries to come.

IV. Collateral Publishing Organizations. Before proceeding to enumerate the more important of them, some words of explanation seem necessary. In the development of the tract enterprise, various kinds of organizations have been found necessary or expedient. Only a few have become great publishing institutions, and no other one has attained such a magnitude of operations as that of the Religious Tract Society of London. Nevertheless, societies for the effective and appropriate distribution of tracts have been found essential to the object of the enterprise as a whole. They have worked in more limited spheres, but have proved indispensable to the highest forms of success. Religious reading, when merely printed, has no more value than other merchandise. A single tract, brought to the eye and heart of an interested reader, accomplishes more for God and humanity than millions of pages resting upon the shelves of a depository. Societies, therefore, that circulate religious publications, and especially by the agency of skilful and sympathetic Christian workers, deserve high respect. Not all of them bear the specific name of tract society. Some of them have mingled the work of Bible and tract distribution. Some have adopted colportage as their chief form of work, while others have devoted their energies largely to other forms of evangelization. In this state of the case, it may not be possible to give a complete list of all the societies that have been organized to promote the circulation of religious tracts. Still less possible would it be to give, within a convenient space, the full historical data of all such institutions. Fortunately, however, numerous details are quite unnecessary, since specimen sketches like those given above are sufficiently descriptive of all similar institutions and their auxiliaries, whether conducted on a larger or smaller scale.

As to plan of organization, there are two classes of tract and book publication societies. One class represents united Christian effort in the sense of being composed of the members of different churches. The other is denominational in the sense of separate church action. These two classes of societies, though distinct from each other, are by no necessity antagonistic. They may, and usually do, simply represent different modes of accomplishing the same or similar objects. While in England, owing to the pre-eminence and catholicity of the Religious Tract Society, denominational action has generally limited itself to the work of dissemination, there is at least one important example of separate church action—it is that of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. By that body the joint enterprise of tract and book publication and circulation has been continued

from the time of its inception by the Rev. John Wesley in the first half of the 18th century. The publications of the Wesleyan book-room embrace a large assortment of tracts, a variety of periodicals, and a large list of religious books. A due proportion of its tracts and books has been prepared and printed in foreign languages, in adaptation to the wants of the various mission fields of that Church. Book affairs constitute a standard topic of business at the annual meeting of the Conference, which officially appoints a publishing agent and the requisite editors. It also appoints a tract committee charged with the duty of promoting the circulation of tracts by means of auxiliary and-loan societies and suitable grants. As a branch of church work, cities, villages, and country neighborhoods are districted for consecutive and: periodical visitation by tract distributors. In America, several of the more prominent denominations maintain publication societies both of tracts and books on a similar plan, although few are, as thorough in the work of dissemination.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, founded in London in the early part of the present century, deserves in several respects to be classed alongside of the publishing tract societies of England. It issues, chiefly on business principles, a large assortment of books adapted to juvenile, Sunday-school, and popular reading, all of which have for their object at least indirect Christian influence, besides many thousands of religious tracts.

In addition to facts heretofore stated, it must be borne in mind that the Sunday-school unions (q.v.) of the United States have to a large extent provided the Sunday-school tracts and books used by the different churches, and thus covered an important department of publication embraced within the operations of the Religious Tract Society of London. Besides these, several denominational religious publishing houses have grown up, in which vast numbers of tracts, books, and periodicals are printed.

The oldest and largest of these is the Book Concern of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which was a direct outgrowth of Mr. Wesley's publication enterprise in England, mentioned above. It was begun in Philadelphia by official action of the Church in 1789, and in 1804 was removed to New York, where its principal establishment has since remained. It has branch publishing-houses in Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis; together with depositories in most of the large cities.

Corresponding in character to the above are the American Baptist Publication Society and the Presbyterian. Board of Publication, both located in Philadelphia. All the institutions thus far named publish more or less books and tracts on the subject of temperance. But in 1866 the National Temperance Society was organized in New York, for the express purpose of providing a cheap and sound literature on all subjects relating to theoretical and practical temperance. The National Temperance Publication House may therefore be numbered among the tract and book publishing institutions of the United States. Its publications, already six hundred in number, are circulated to some extent through Sunday-schools, but more extensively through auxiliary temperance organizations in all parts of the land. It may thus be seen that from small beginnings less than a century ago, a vast system of tract and book publication in the interest of Christianity has sprung up and spread abroad its influence in most of the countries and languages of the world.

V. The *literature* of the subject is as yet chiefly to be found in the annual reports of the various societies and institutions above enumerated. The *Jubilee Memorial Volume of the Religious Tract Society* (Lond. 1850, 700 pp. 8vo) is a specimen of many similar volumes that will hereafter be forthcoming from that and other societies. (D. P. K.)

Tracts for the Times

SEE PUSEYISM.

Tractus

SEE TRACT.

Tracy, Bernard Destult de

a French, ascetic writer, was born Aug. 25.1720, at Paray-le-Fraisil, near Moulins. At the age of sixteen he joined the Theatines, and passed his whole life in retirement and piety. He died in Paris, Aug. 14,1878. He is the author of several works on practical-religion and the biographies of saints, for which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Tracy, William, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Norwich, Conn., June 2,1807. He went to Philadelphia and united with the Church in February; 1827. Being

induced, by the advice of Rev. John L. Grant, to study for the ministry, he accordingly entered Williamstown Academy, and from thence Williams College, where he remained three years, but left before graduation. After this he taught school a year in Lexington, Ky. Then he spent a year in Andover Theological Seminary, and thence went to Princeton Seminary, where he remained two years. He was licensed to preach in 1835, and was ordained by the Philadelphia Presbytery as an evangelist. Having devoted himself to the work of foreign missions, he sailed for India, and, having reached Madras, he went to the Madura district, his field of labor, in 1837. He established a boarding-school at Tirumangaltum, which grew to a high-grade seminary, having fifty pupils. Here he spent twenty-two years of his life, and he educated more than 250 young men. He prepared many textbooks in theology and science and gave important aid in revising the Tamil Bible. In November, 1877, his youngest son and wife joined him and his mother in India as missionaries, to share their labors and their home, but his work was done. After the Sabbath which he spent in the sanctuary, he was attacked with rheumatic cramps and diarrhea, which brought him rapidly to the end, and he died at Tirumangaltum, Nov. 28, 1877. (W.P.S.)

Trade

SEE MECHANIC; SEE MERCHANT.

Traditio (Et Redditio) Symboli (Delivery Of The Creed)

These words are used by ecclesiastical writers in reference to the practice generally adopted of requiring baptized persons to repeat the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, in which they had previously been instructed. In the case of infants the sponsors at first repeated these formularies on behalf of the child for whom they answered; but afterwards, in the Middle Ages, the Romish Church began to dispense with this usage, and to satisfy itself with the priest's repeating them. There is still a remnant of this practice in some countries: sponsors are subjected to a catechetical examination by the minister previously to their admission.

Tradition

(παράδοσις), Jewish The Jews pretend that, besides their written law contained in the Pentateuch, God delivered to Moses an oral law, which was handed down from generation to generation. The various decisions of the Jewish doctors or priests on points which the law had

either left doubtful or passed over in silence were the true sources of their traditions. They did not commit their numerous traditions (which appear to have been a long time in accumulating) to writing before their wars against the Romans under Hadrian and Severus. The Mishna, the Gemara, and perhaps the Masorah were collected by the rabbins of Tiberias and later schools. *SEE RABBINISM*. Many of their false traditions were in direct opposition to the law of God; hence our Savior often reproached the Pharisees with preferring them to the law itself. He also gives several instances of their superstitious adherence to vain observances, while they neglected essential things (^{<Q1E>} Matthew 15:2, 3; ^{<40B>} Mark 7:3-13). The only way in which we can know satisfactorily that any tradition is of divine authority is by its having a place in those writings which are generally acknowledged to be the genuine productions of inspired men. All traditions which have not such authority are without value, and tend greatly to detract and mislead the minds of men (^{<52E>} 2 Thessalonians 2:15; 3:6).

In this respect, however, a notable division existed among the Jews themselves, which has been transmitted to the modern representatives of the two great parties. The leading tenet of the Sadducees was the negation of the leading tenet of their opponents. As the Pharisees asserted, so the Sadducees denied, that the Israelites were in possession of an oral law transmitted to them by Moses. The manner in which the Pharisees may have gained acceptance for their own view is noticed elsewhere in this work, *SEE PHARISEE*; but, for an equitable estimate of the Sadducees, it is proper to bear in mind emphatically how destitute of historical evidence the doctrine was which they denied. That doctrine is, at the, present day, rejected, probably by almost all, if not by all, Christians; and it is, indeed, so foreign to their ideas that the greater number of Christians have never even heard of it, though it is older than Christianity, and has been the support and consolation of the Jews under a series of the most cruel and wicked persecutions to which any nation has ever been exposed during an equal number of centuries. It is likewise now maintained all over the world by those who are called the orthodox Jews. It is therefore desirable to know the kind of arguments by which, at the present day, in a historical and critical age, the doctrine is defended. For this an opportunity has lately been given by a learned French Jew, grand-rabbi of the circumscription of Colmar (Klein, *Le Judaisme, ou la Veriti sur le Talmud* [Mulhouse, 1859]), who still asserts as a fact the existence of a Mosaic oral law. To do

full justice to his views, the original work should be perused. But it is doing no injustice to his learning and ability to point out that not one of his arguments has a positive historical value. Thus he relies mainly on the inconceivability (as will be again noticed in this article) that a divine revelation should not have explicitly proclaimed the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, or that it should have promulgated laws left in 'such an incomplete form and requiring so much explanation, and so many additions as the laws in the Pentateuch. Now arguments of this kind may be sound or unsound; based on reason or illogical; and for many they may have a philosophical or theological value; but they have no pretence to be regarded as historical, inasmuch as the assumed premises, which involve a knowledge of the attributes of the Supreme Being and the manner in which he would be likely to deal with man, are far beyond the limits of historical verification. The nearest approach to a historical argument is the following (p. 10): "*In the first place, nothing proves better the fact of the existence of the tradition than the belief itself in the tradition. An entire nation does not suddenly forget its religious code, its principles, its laws, the daily ceremonies of its worship to such a point that it could easily be persuaded that a new doctrine presented by some impostors is the true and only explanation of its law and has always determined and ruled its application. Holy Writ often represents the Israelites as a stiff-necked people impatient of the religious yoke; and would it not be attributing to them rather an excess of docility, a too great condescension, a blind obedience, to suppose that they suddenly consented to troublesome and rigorous innovations which some persons might have wished to impose on them some fine morning? Such a supposition destroys itself, and we are obliged to acknowledge that the tradition is not a new invention, but that its birth goes back to the origin of the religion; and that, transmitted from father to son as the word of God, it lived in the heart of the people, identified itself with the blood, and was always considered as an inviolable authority.*" But, if this passage is carefully examined, it will be seen that it does not supply a single fact worthy of being regarded as a proof of a Mosaic oral law. Independent testimony of persons contemporary with Moses that he had transmitted such a law to the Israelites would be historical evidence; the testimony of persons in the next generation as to the existence of such an oral law which their fathers told them came from Moses would have been secondary historical evidence: but the belief of the Israelites on the point twelve hundred years after Moses cannot, in the absence of any intermediate testimony, be deemed evidence of a historical

fact. Moreover, it is a mistake to assume that they who deny a Mosaic oral law; imagine that this oral law was at some one time as one great system introduced suddenly among the Israelites. The real mode of conceiving what occurred is far different. After the return from, the Captivity, there existed probably among the Jews a large body of customs and decisions not contained in the Pentateuch; and these had practical authority over the people long before they were attributed to Moses. The only phenomenon of importance requiring explanation is, not the existence of the customs sanctioned by the oral law, but the belief accepted by a certain portion of the Jews that Moses had divinely revealed those customs as laws to the Israelites. To explain this historically from written records is impossible, from the silence on the subject of the very scanty historical Jewish writings purporting to be written between the return from the Captivity in B.C. 536 and that uncertain period when the canon was finally closed, which probably could not have been very long before the death of Antiochus Epiphanies, B.C. 164. For all this space of time, a period of about three hundred and seventy-two years, a period as long as from the accession of Henry VIII to the present day, we have no Hebrew account, nor, in fact, any contemporary account, of the history of the Jews in Palestine, except what may be contained in the short works entitled Ezra and Nehemiah. The last named of these works does not carry the history much later than one hundred years after the return from the Captivity; so that there is a long and extremely important period of more than two centuries and a half before the heroic rising of the Maccabees during which there is a total absence of contemporary Jewish history. In this dearth of historical materials, it is idle to attempt a positive narration of the circumstances under which the oral law became assigned to Moses as its author. It is amply sufficient if a satisfactory suggestion is made as to how it *might* have been attributed to Moses; and in this there is not much difficulty for any one who bears in mind how notoriously in ancient times laws of a much later date were attributed to Minos, Lycurgus, Solon, and Numa.

Under this head we may add that it must not be assumed that the Sadducees, because they rejected a Mosaic oral law, rejected likewise all traditions and all decisions in explanation of passages in the Pentateuch. Although they protested against the assertion that such points had been divinely settled by Moses, they probably, in numerous instances, followed practically the same traditions as the Pharisees. *SEE SADDUCEE.*

Tradition, Christian.

In the older ecclesiastical fathers, the words *παράδοσις* and *traditio* are used to denote any instruction which one gives to another, whether oral or written. In the New Test. also, and in the classical writers, *παράδουναί* and *tradere* signify, in general, to teach, to instruct. In this wider sense, tradition was divided into *scripta* and *non scripta sive oralis*. The latter, *traditio oralis*, was, however, frequently called *traditio*, by way of eminence. This oral tradition was often appealed to by Irenaeus, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, and others of the ancient fathers, as a test by which to try the doctrines of contemporary teachers, and by which to confute the errors of the heretics. They describe it as being instruction received from the mouth of the apostles by the first Christian churches, transmitted from the apostolic age, and preserved in purity until their own times.

Oral tradition is still regarded by the Roman Church as a *principium cognoscendi* in theology and they attempt to support their hypothesis respecting it by the use made of it by the fathers. Much dispute has arisen, about the degree of weight to be assigned to tradition *generally*; many, however, consider that this is an idle controversy, and that *each* particular tradition should be tried on its own grounds. In coming to a decision on the merits of the question respecting doctrinal tradition, everything depends upon making the proper distinctions with regard to *time*.

In the first period of Christianity, the authority of the apostles was so great that all their doctrines and ordinances were strictly and punctually observed by the churches, which they had planted. The doctrine and discipline which prevailed in those apostolical churches were, at the time, justly considered by others' to be purely such as the apostles themselves had taught and established. This was the more common, as the books of the New Test. had not, as yet, come into general use among Christians; nor was it, at that early period, attended with any special liability to mistake. In this way we can account for it that Christian teachers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries appeal so frequently to oral tradition. But in later periods of the Church, the circumstances were far different. After the commencement of the 3rd century, when the first teachers of the apostolical churches and their immediate successors had passed away and another race sprung up, other doctrines and forms were gradually introduced, which differed in many respects from apostolical simplicity. And now those innovators appealed

more frequently than had ever been done before to apostolical tradition, in order to give currency to their own opinions and regulations. They went so far, indeed, as to appeal to this tradition for many things not only at variance with other traditions, but with the very writings of the apostles which they had in their hands. From this time forward, tradition naturally became more and more uncertain and suspicious. No wonder, therefore, that we find Augustine establishing the maxim that it could not be relied upon, in the ever-increasing distance from the age of the apostles, except when it was universal and perfectly consistent with itself. The Reformers justly held that tradition is not a sure and certain source of knowledge respecting the doctrines of theology, and that the Holy Scriptures are the only *principium cognoscendi*. See Knapp, *Christian Theology*, 7:3; Eden, *Theol. Dict. s.v.*; Cunningham, *Hist. Theology*, 1, 186, 480; Hagenbach, *fist. of Doctrines* (Index); Hook, *Church Dict. s.v.*; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, 2, 42; Van Oosterzee. *Christian Dogmatics*, art. "Faith, Rule of."

TRADITION, *in the Church of England*, refers to customs, forms, rites, ceremonies, etc. which have been transmitted by oral communication, and, as used in Article 34, is not to be understood as including *matters of faith*. The traditions for which the article requires respect and obedience are all those customs and ceremonies in established use which are not expressly named in the Scriptures, nor in the written laws or rubrics of the Church, but stand simply on the ground of prescription. Among these may be mentioned the alternate mode of reading the Psalter, the custom of bowing in the Creed, the postures in various offices of the Church, the use of a doxology and collects after a sermon, the practice of pouring the baptismal water upon the head, the quantity of the elements consumed in the Eucharist, etc. These, though unwritten, are not the less obligatory when ascertained to be standing customs of the Church. The article ordains that "whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked, openly (that others may fear to do the like) as he that; offendeth against the common order of the Church," etc.

Traditores

(*surrenderers or, traitors*), a name applied by the ancient Christians to those persons who delivered up their Bible and sacred utensils of the

Church to the heathen in time of persecution. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 16:ch. 6:§ 25.

Traducianism

is the belief that the souls of children, as well as their bodies, are propagated from their parents, and is opposed to Creationism (q.v.) and the doctrine of the Pre-existents (q.v.). According to Jerome, both Tertullian and Apollinaris were advocates of this opinion, and the opponents of Pelagianism, in general, have been inclined to it. Since the Reformation, it has been more approved than any other in the Lutheran Church, and that not by philosophers and naturalists merely, but also by divines. Luther himself, though he did not declare distinctly in its favor, was also inclined towards this theory; and in the *Formula Concordiae* it is distinctly taught that both soul and body are propagated by the parents in ordinary generation. What has rendered the hypothesis more acceptable to theologians is its affording the easiest solution of the doctrine of native depravity; and it seems to receive confirmation from the psychological facts that the natural disposition of children not infrequently resembles that of their, parents, and that the mental excellences and imperfections of parents are inherited nearly as often by their children as any bodily attributes. But, after all that can be said, we must be content to remain in uncertainty respecting the subject. As thou knowest not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child, even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all” (Eccles. 11:5). See Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychology*, p. 128-131; *New-Englander*, July, 1868, p. 475. **SEE SOUL, ORIGIN OF.**

Traducians

the adherents of Traducianism (q.v.).

Traheron, Bartholomew

a learned English divine at the period of the Reformation, was born at Cornwall and educated at Oxford, either in Exeter College or Hart Hall. He traveled extensively in Germany and Italy, and, returning to England, was made keeper of the king’s library. In 1551 king Edward VI conferred on him the deanery of Chichester. This he lost on the accession of queen Mary, and, joining the English exiles in Germany, wrote all his important works there. The time of his death is uncertain. Traheron’s works are,

Parceresis, lib. I: — Carmina in Mortem fienrici Dudlei: Analysis Scoparum Johannis Cochlei Exposition of a Part of St. John's Gospel (1558, 8vo): *Exposition of the Fourth Chapter of St. John's Revelation* (1557, 8vo): — *An Answer Made by Bartholomew Traheron to a Private Papist.*

Traill, Robert

an eminent divine of the Church of Scotland, was born at Ely, May, 1642. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and pursued the study of divinity with great ardor for several years. In 1666 he was obliged to secrete himself, because some copies of *An Apologetic Relation*, etc., were found in his mother's house; and the following year, being suspected of opposing the king, he was obliged to join his father in Holland. In 1670 he went to England, and was ordained by Presbyterian divines in London. In 1677 Mr. Traill was imprisoned for preaching privately, but was released in October of the same year. He then located at Cranbrook, in Kent, but for many years afterwards was pastor of a Scotch congregation in London. He was warmly attached' to the Calvinistic doctrines, and took a zealous concern in the doctrinal controversies. He died in May, 1716. He published a number of theological treatises and discourses, which for many years were printed separately, but collectively after his death (Edinb. 1745, 4 vols. 12mo; 1754, 2 vols. 12mo; Glasgow, 1776-3 vols. 8vo; best ed. 1806, 4 vols. 8vo). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Train, Arthur Savage, D.D.

a Baptist divine, was born at Framingham, Mass., Sept. 1, 1812, and was a graduate: of Brown University in the class of 1833. He was tutor in the university two years after his graduation, carrying on at the same time his theological studies under Dr. Wayland. In 1836 he was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church in Haverhill, Mass., where he had a successful ministry of twenty-three years. He was elected professor of sacred rhetoric and pastoral duties in the Newton Theological Institute in 1859, and held the office for seven years. In 1866 he accepted a call to the pastorate of the Baptist Church in Framingham, where he remained until his death, Jan. 2, 1872. Dr. Train was a trustee of Brown University from 1845 till his death. (J. C. S.)

Trajan, Marcus Ulpius Nerva

Picture for Trajan 1

emperor of Rome from A.D. 98 to 117, is a noteworthy personage in the history of ancient times by reason of his personal qualities, and also as a general and ruler. He is important to the history of the Church through his connection with the persecution of the adherents of Christianity in his time. At first tolerated by the policy of the Roman rulers as a comparatively feeble though despicable excrescence on the loathsome superstition of Judaism, Christianity was forced upon the notice of the emperors by the tumults excited among the populace by heathen priests, who observed the remarkable progress of that faith. With alarm, and Trajan was accordingly led to issue edicts for the gradual suppression of the new teaching which transformed men into haters of the gods. The administration of the younger Pliny as governor of Bithynia was complicated with matters growing out of the rapid extension of Christianity and the consequent rage of the heathen population within his province. He therefore endeavored to enforce against Christians the laws for the suppression of the really dangerous *Hetaeries* (see Pliny, *Epist.* 10:43), but found the complaints to be so numerous and the result of the judicial investigations so unsatisfactory that he referred the whole matter to the emperor for instructions. Of the accused, many denied that they were in any way implicated in Christianity; others declared that they had returned to the old faith, and offered incense and libations before the image of the emperor and blasphemed the name of Christ.

Picture for Trajan 2

Those who avowed themselves Christians confessed to nothing of a damaging character. Their offence consisted merely in meeting before sunrise of a specified day to sing a common hymn in honor of Christ as a god, and in the assumption of a voluntary obligation, under oath, to commit no theft, robbery, nor adultery, but to keep a promise and acknowledge the possession of goods committed to their trust. The torture applied to two maids disclosed nothing more criminal than these statements. Trajan commended the governor's action, and observed that no general and definite prescriptions could be given for such matters. He added that search should not be made for suspected persons, though, if accused and convicted, they should be punished unless they interposed a denial of the charge of being Christians, and authenticated it by calling on

the gods. Anonymous accusations of any sort should not be received. The execution of several Christians, among them the aged Symeon, who was the son of Clopas, and successor of James at Jerusalem, must be explained in view of the fact that the emperor was at the same time regent of the State and chief priest (*pontifex maximus*), and would consider it necessary to protect and preserve the religion which was so closely interwoven with the interests of the State. The same idea will apply to the case of Ignatius.

Literature. The principal sources for the history of Trajan are Pliny the younger, *Epistolce*, especially lib. 10 and *Panegyricus* (ed. Gierig); Dion Cass. *Hist. Rom.* lib. 68 (unfortunately extant only in the extract by Xiphilinus); Aurel. Victor, *Caes.* 13, 1 sq. and *Epitome* 13; Eutrop. 8:2; Orosius, 7:2 sq.; Tertull. *Apologet.* c. 1; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 12 sq.; Justin. *Apologet.* 1, 68; Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:9. See Ritterhusii *Trajanus in Lucem Reproductus* (1608); Mannert, *Res Traj. Imp. ad . anu. Gestca* (Norimb. 1793); Engel, *Coment. de Expedit. Traj. ad Danub. et Origine Valachorum* (Vindeb. 1794); Wolf, *Einermilde Stiftung Trajan's* (Berl. 1808, 4to); Francke, *Zür Gesch. Traj. u. seiner Zeifgenossen* (Gustrow, 1837); Baldwin, *Comment. et Edict. Vett. Princc. Rom. de Christianis* (Hal. 1727, 4to); Bohmer, *XII Dissertt. Juris Eccl. Ant. ad Plin. Sec. et Tertull.* (2d ed. ibid. 1729), Martini, *Persecutt. Christianorum sub Imp. Rom.* (Onost. 1802, 4to); Kopke, *De Statu et Condit. Christi sub Imp. Rom. Alterius post Christ. Scce.* (Berol. 1828); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 2, 320 sq.; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* 1, 134 sq.; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 95, 98. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v. **SEE PLINY.**

Tramontane

(*across the mountain*), a term applied by the Italians to those dwelling north of the Alps, and especially to the ecclesiastics and professors of the canon law of Germany and France. **SEE ULTRAMONTANE.**

Trance

(ἔκστασις, *ecstasy*), a supernatural state of body and mind, the nature of which has been well conjectured by Doddndge, who defines it “such a rapture of mind as gives the person who falls into it a look of astonishment, and renders him insensible of the external objects around him, while in the meantime his imagination is agitated in an extraordinary manner with some striking scenes which pass before it and take up all the attention.” He refers

to some extraordinary instances of this kind mentioned by Gualterius in his note on ^{<4100>}Acts 10:10, (*Family Expositor*, ad loc. note g). Stockius also describes it as “a sacred ecstasy, or rapture of the mind out of itself, when, the use of the external senses being suspended, God reveals something in a peculiar manner to prophets and apostles, who are then taken or transported out of themselves.” The same idea is intimated in the English word *trance*, from the Latin *transitus*, the state of being carried out of one’s self. *SEE INSPIRATION*; *SEE PROPHECY*.

1. In the only passage (^{<0204>}Numbers 24:4,16) in which this word occurs in the English of the Old Test. there is, as the italics show, no corresponding word in Hebrew, simply **l pē**, falling,” for which the Sept. gives **ἐν ἐπνω**, and the Vulg. more literally *qui cadit*. In the New Test. we meet with the word three times (^{<4100>}Acts 10:10; 11:5; 22:17), the Vulg. giving “excessus” in the two former, “stupor mentis” in the latter. The Greek word **ἔκστασις** employed in these passages denotes the effect of any passion by which the thoughts are wholly absorbed. In the Sept. it corresponds to **hmç**, a “wonderful thing” (^{<2450>}Jeremiah 5:30), **whmt**, “astonishment” (^{<0333>}Deuteronomy 28:28), and **hmdrt** a prophetic lethargy or “deep sleep” (^{<0021>}Genesis 2:21; 15:12, etc.). In the New Test. it usually represents the absorbing effects of admiration (^{<4152>}Mark 5:42; ^{<4155>}Luke 5:26; ^{<4180>}Acts 3:10); of terror (^{<4168>}Mark 16:8).

2. Used as the Greek word is by Luke (Acts, *ut sup.*) “the physician,” and, in this special sense, by him only, in the New Test., it would be interesting to inquire what precise meaning it had in the medical terminology of the time. From the time of Hippocrates, who uses it to describe the loss of conscious perception, it had probably borne the connotation which it has had, with shades of meaning for good or evil, ever since. Thus, Hesychius gives as the account of a man in an ecstasy that he is **ὁ εἰς ἑαυτὸν μὴ ὄν**. Apuleius (*Apologia*) speaks of it as “a change from the earthly mind (**ἀπὸ τοῦ γήινου φρονήματος**) to a divine and spiritual condition both of character and life.” Tertullian (*De An.* 45) compares it to the dream-state in which the soul acts, but not through its usual instruments. Augustine (*Confess.* 9:11) describes his mother in this state as “abstracta a presentibus,” and gives a description of like phenomena in the case of a certain Restitutus (*De Civ. Dei*, 14:24).

3. We may compare with these statements the more precise definitions of modern medical science. There the ecstatic state appears as one form of catalepsy. In catalepsy pure and simple, there is “a sudden suspension of thought, of sensibility, of voluntary motion.” The body continues in any attitude in which it may be placed, there are no signs of any process of thought; the patient continues silent. In the ecstatic form of catalepsy, on the other hand, “the patient is lost to all external impressions, but wrapped and absorbed in some object of the imagination.” The man is “as if out of the body.” “Nervous and susceptible persons are apt to be thrown into these trances under the influence of what is called mesmerism. There is, for the most part, a high degree of mental excitement. The patient utters the most enthusiastic and fervid expressions or the most earnest warnings. The character of the whole frame is that of intense contemplative excitement. He believes that he has seen wonderful visions and heard singular revelations” (Watson, *Principles and Practice*, lect. 39; Copland, *Dict. of Medicine*, s.v. “Catalepsy”). The causes of this state are to be traced commonly to strong religious impressions; but some, though, for the most part, not the ecstatic, phenomena of catalepsy are producible by the concentration of thought on one object, or of the vision upon one fixed point (*Quart. Rev.* 93, 510-22, by Dr. Carpenter); and, in some more exceptional cases, like that mentioned by Augustine (there, however. under the influence of sound, “ad imitatas quasi lamentantis cujuslibet hominis - voces”), and that of Jerome Cardan (*Vat. Rer.* 8:43), men have been able to throw themselves into a cataleptic state at will.

4. Whatever explanation may be given of it, it is true of many if not of most, of those who have left the stamp of their own character on the religious history of mankind, that they have been liable to pass at times into this abnormal state. The union of intense feeling, strong volition, long-continued thought (the conditions of all wide and lasting influence), aided in many cases by the withdrawal from the lower life of the support which is needed to maintain a healthy equilibrium, appears to have been more than the “earthen vessel” will bear. The words, which speak of “an ecstasy of adoration”, are often literally true. The many visions the journey through the heavens, the so-called epilepsy of Mohammed-were phenomena of this nature. Of three great mediaeval teachers, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Joannes Scotus, it is recorded that they would fall into the ecstatic state, remain motionless, seem as if dead, sometimes for a whole day, and then, returning to consciousness, speak as if they had drunk deep

of divine mysteries (Gualterius, *Crit. Sac.* on ~~4000~~ Acts 10:10). The old traditions of Aristeas and Epimenides, the conflicts of Dunstan and Luther with the powers of darkness, the visions of Savonarola, George Fox. Swedenborg, and Bihme are generically analogous. Where there has been no extraordinary power to influence others, other conditions remaining the same, the phenomena have appeared among whole classes of men and women in proportion as the circumstances of their lives tended to produce an excessive susceptibility to religious or imaginative emotion. The history of monastic orders, of American and Irish revivals, gives countless examples. Still more noticeable is the fact that many of the *improvisatori* of Italy are “only able to exercise their gift when they are in a state of ecstatic trance, and speak of the gift itself as something morbid” (Copland, *loc. cit.*); while in strange contrast with their earlier history, and pointing perhaps to a national character that has become harder and less emotional, there is the testimony of a German physician (Frank), who had made catalepsy a special study, that he had never met with a single case of it among the Jews (Copland, *loc. cit.*; comp. Maury, *La Magie et Astrologie*).

5. We are now able to take a true estimate of the trances of Biblical history. As in other things, so also here, the phenomena are common to higher and lower, to true and false systems. The nature of man continuing the same, it could hardly be that the awfulness of the divine presence, the terrors of divine judgment, should leave it in the calm equilibrium of its normal state. Whatever made the impress of a truth more indelible, whatever gave him to whom it was revealed more power over the hearts of others, might well take its place in the divine education of nations and individual men. We may not point to trances and ecstasies as proofs of a true revelation, but still less may we think of them as at all inconsistent with it. Thus, though we have not the word, we have the thing in several clear instances in the Bible. Some, perhaps many, things recorded in Scripture belong to this supernatural state of trance, which are not expressly referred to it. See the long list of such supposed cases in Bp. Law’s *Consideration of the Theory of Religion* (Lond. 1820, p. 85, 86). We notice here only the most marked examples.

In the Old Test. a state of supernatural ecstasy is evidently denoted by the “deep sleep” which fell upon Adam during the creation of Eve (~~01021~~ Genesis 2:21), and during which, as appears from the narrative, he was made aware of the transaction, and of the purport of the attendant circumstances (ver.

21-24). *SEE MARRIAGE*. A similar state occurs again in the “deep sleep” which fell upon Abraham (15:12), during which the bondage of his descendants in Egypt was revealed to him. Possibly all the accounts recorded in that chapter occurred in “vision” (ver. 1-12), which ultimately deepened into the trance (ver. 12-21). Comp. ver. 5, 12, where he is said to have seen the stars, though the sun had not gone down. The apparent objection that Abraham was “brought forth abroad” to see the stars is only of the same nature with others explained in the art. *SEE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST*. Balaam, as if overcome by the constraining power of a spirit mightier than his own,” sees the vision of *God, falling*, but with opened eyes” (^{<0204>}Numbers 24:4). The incident of the ass speaking to him, etc., is also understood by many learned Jews and Christians to have occurred in a vision (Bp. Law, *ut. sup.*). To the same mode of divine communication must be referred the magnificent description in ^{<0203>}Job 4:13-21. Saul, when the wild chant of the prophets stirred the old depths of feeling, himself also “prophesied” and “fell down” (most, if not all, of his kingly clothing being thrown off in the ecstasy of the moment) “all that day and all that night” (^{<0202>}1 Samuel 19:24). Something there was in Jeremiah that made men say of him that he was as one that “is mad and maketh himself a prophet” (^{<0205>}Jeremiah 29:26). In Ezekiel the phenomena appear in more wonderful and awful forms. He sits motionless for seven days in the stupor of astonishment, till the word of the Lord comes to him (^{<0205>}Ezekiel 3:15). The hand of the Lord” falls on him, and he too sees the visions of God” and hears the voice of the Almighty, is “lifted up between the earth and heaven,” and passes from the river of Chebar to the Lord’s house in Jerusalem (8:3). As other elements and forms of the prophetic work were revived in “the apostles and prophets” of the New Test., so also was this. More distinctly even than in the Old Test., it becomes the medium through which men rise to see clearly what before was dim and doubtful, in which the mingled hopes and fears and perplexities of the waking state are dissipated at once. Though different in form, it belongs to the same class of phenomena as the “gift of tongues,” and is connected with “visions and revelations of the Lord.” In some cases, indeed, it is the chosen channel for such revelations. To the “trance” of Peter in the city, where all outward circumstances tended to bring the thought of an expansion of the divine kingdom more distinctly before him than it had ever been brought before, we owe the indelible truth stamped upon the heart of Christendom, that God is “no respecter of persons,” that we may not call any man “common or unclean” (^{<4011>}Acts 10:11). To the “trance” of Paul, when his work for

his own-people seemed utterly fruitless, we owe the mission which was the starting-point of the history of the Universal Church, the command which bade him “depart ... far hence unto the Gentiles” (~~427~~ Acts 22:17-21). Wisely, for the most part, did that apostle draw a veil over these more mysterious experiences. He would not sacrifice to them, as others have often sacrificed, the higher life of activity; love, prudence. He could not explain them to himself. “In the body or out of the body,” he could not tell but the outer world of perception had passed away, and he had passed in spirit into “paradise,” into the third heaven,” and had heard “unspeakable words” (~~471~~ 2 Corinthians 12:1-4). Those trances too, we *may* believe, were not without their share in fashioning his character and life, though no special truth came distinctly out of them. United as they then were, but as they have seldom been since, with clear perceptions of the truth of God, with love wonderful in its depth and tenderness, with energy unresting, and subtle tact almost passing into “guile,” they made him what he was, the leader of the apostolic band, emphatically the “master-builder” of the Church of God (comp. Jowett, *Fragment on the Character of St. Paul*).

Persons receiving this divine influence often fell to the earth under its influence, as in ordinary catalepsy (~~017~~ Genesis 17:3, etc.; ~~092~~ 1 Samuel 19:24, Heb. or margin; ~~303~~ Ezekiel 1:28; ~~278~~ Daniel 8:18; 10:15,16; ~~610~~ Revelation 1:10, 17). It is important, however, to observe that in all these cases the visions beheld are also related; hence such cases are distinguished from A mere *deliquium animi*. We find likewise in the case of Peter that “he fell into a trance” (or rather a “trance fell upon him, ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἑκστασις), *during* which he “saw a vision,” which is therefore distinguished from the trance (~~400~~ Acts 10:10 comp. Paul’s trance, 22:17; ~~472~~ 2 Corinthians 12:2, etc.). The reality of the vision is established by the correspondence of the *event*. The nearest approach we can make to such a state is that in which our mind is so occupied in the contemplation of an object as to lose entirely the consciousness of the body a state in which the highest order of ideas, whether belonging to the judgment or imagination, is undoubtedly attained. Hence we can readily conceive that such a state might be supernaturally induced for the higher purpose of revelation, etc. The *alleged* phenomena of the mesmeric trance and clairvoyance, if they serve no higher purpose, may assist our conceptions of it. **SEE VISION.**

Trani

a name common to some Jewish authors, of whom we mention the following:

1. ISAIAH DA, so-called after his native place Trani, a seaport town of Naples, and, by way of abbreviation, *Ridi dyr*, from the initials *ynarf d hy[çy 8r* i.e. *R. Isaiah da Trani*, flourished about A.D. 1232-70. He may be regarded as the founder of the school of Talmudical and traditional exegesis in Italy. He wrote not only numerous annotations on the Talmud, and theological decisions (*µyqsp*) connected with traditional law, but also *scholia* (*µyqwmn*) to the Bible, which are as follows: *çmwj h yqwmn*, *Scholia on the Pentateuch* (Leghorn, 1792): — [*çwhy çwrp rwxq*, *Annotations on Joshua*, published, with a Latin translation: by J. A. Steinmetz, under the title *Esaiæ Comment. in Josuama quens in Codiae VMS. Bibl. Senat. Lips. Descriptum et Versione at Notis Illustratum*, *Pracside J. G. Abicht Ercuditorsunm Examini subjecit* (Lips. 1712): — *Annotations on Judges and 1 Samuel*, printed in the Rabbinical Bible's (q.v.). Besides these published commentaries, the following annotations of Trani are in MS. a commentary on Ezra, Cod. Opp.; a commentary on the Five Megilloth and Daniel, in the Angelica at Rome; commentaries on the minor prophets, Psalms, and Job, to be found in MS. in several European libraries. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 438 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 318 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* col. 1389-92; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Leips. 1873), 7:175; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 3, 33; Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Literatur*, p. 58.

2. MOSES DA, was born at Salonica in 1505. When a boy he went to Adrianople, and was educated in the house of his uncle. In the year 1521 he went to Safet to continue his studies, and four years later he received ordination, and in 1535 went to Jerusalem, where he died in 1585. His success in teaching was so great that he was styled "The Light of Israel," "The Senate of Mount Sinai and the Uprooter of Mountains," because he solved the difficulties in the law. He wrote, *tyb yhl a*, on Jewish rites, ceremonies, prayers, morals, etc. (Venice, 1576): — *rps tyrq 8s*, a body of Jewish laws, in which he distinguishes between the laws written by Moses, those which were transmitted by tradition, and those only founded on the decisions of the doctors: — a collection of decisions in 3 parts, and

other works of minor import. See First, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 441 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 319 sq.; Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 703; Adams, *Hist. of the Jews*, 2, 14; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u.s. Sekten*, 3, 129; Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Literatur*, p. 229, 230. (B. P.)

Transanimation

the transfer of souls from one body to another TRANSMIGRATION *SEE* TRANSMIGRATION (q.v.).

Transcendent, or Transcendental

(from *transcendere*, to go beyond), words employed by various schoolmen, particularly Duns Scotus, to describe the conceptions that, by their universality, rise above or transcend the ten Aristotelian categories. Thus, according to Scotus, *Ens*, or Being, because it is predicable of substance and accident alike, of God as well as of the world, is raised above these by including or comprehending them. Again, the predicates assumed by Scotus to belong to *Ens*, or simple existence, viz. the One, the True, the *Good-Unun*, *Verum*, *Bonum*-are styled transcendent because applicable to *Ens* before the *descent* is made to the ten classes of real existence. According to Kant, transcendental applies to the conditions of our knowledge which transcend experience, which are *a priori*, and not derived from sensitive reflection. Between the hitherto convertible terms transcendental and transcendent Kant drew a distinction of considerable importance in understanding his own system. By the word *transcendental* he designates the various forms, categories, or ideas assumed to be native elements of human thought; implying that, although they are not products of experience, they are manifested only in experience such as space and time, causality, etc. The word *transcendent* Kant reserves for those among the transcendental or *a priori* elements that altogether transcend experience. They may seem to be given in experience, but they are not really given. Such are the "Ideas of the Pure Reason," God, an immaterial soul, etc. Transcendental elements, when legitimately applied to experience, as causality and relation, are called *immanent*. See *Chambers's Encyclop.* s.v.; Fleming and Krauth, *Vocab. of Phil. Science*, s.v.

Transcendentalism

a name given to some forms of recent German philosophy. Fichte taught a subjective idealism, Schelling an objective idealism, and Hegel an absolute idealism—regarding thought and being as identical. Nature is God coming into self-consciousness, for he is ever striving after self-realization: “In order to philosophize aright, we must lose our own personality in God, who is chiefly revealed in the acts of the human mind. In the infinite developments of divinity, and in the infinite progress towards self-consciousness, the greatest success is reached in the exertions of human reason. In men’s minds, therefore, is the highest manifestation of God. God recognizes himself best in human reason, which is a consciousness of God. And it is by human reason that the world (hitherto without thought, and so without existence, mere negation) comes into consciousness; thus God is revealed in the world. After arriving at an ideal God, we learn that philosophy and religion draw us away from our little selves, so that our separate consciousness is dissolved in that of God. Philosophy is religion; and true religion frees man from all that is low, and from himself, from clinging to I-hood (*Ichheit*) and subjectivity, and helps him to life in God as the truth, and thereby to true life. In this ablation of personal identity, we must not claim property even in our own thoughts. Hegel teaches that it is God who thinks in us; nay, that it is precisely that which thinks in us which is God. The pure and primal substance manifests itself as the subject; and true knowledge of the absolute is the absolute itself. There is but a step to take and we arrive at the tenet that the universe and God are one. The Hegelians attempt to distinguish this from the doctrine of Spinoza, but their distinctions are inappreciable; their scheme is pantheism. And as God is revealed by all the phenomena of the world’s history, he is partly revealed by moral action, and consequently by sin, no less than by holiness. Sin is, therefore, a part of the necessary evolution of the divine principle; or, rather, in any sense, which can affect the conscience, there is no evil in sin there is no sin. It was reserved for Hegel to abandon all the scruples of six thousand years, and publish the discovery certainly the most wonderful in the history of human research that something and nothing are the same! In declaring it he almost apologizes, for he says that this proposition appears so paradoxical that it may readily be supposed that it is not seriously maintained. Yet he is far from being ambiguous. Something and nothing are the same. The absolute of which so much is vaunted is nothing. But the conclusion, which is, perhaps, already anticipated by the reader’s mind, and

which leaves us incapacitated for comment, is this—we shudder while we record it—that after the exhaustive abstraction is carried to infinity in search of God, we arrive at nothing. God himself is nothing!” (*Princeton Essays*).

These systems of philosophy in Germany, “that nation of thinkers and critics,” have, each in its turn, influenced the science of Biblical philology; and whether it be the moralism of Kant, or the idealism of Fichte, or the deeper transcendentalism of Hegel, it makes Scripture speak its own dogmas, and consecrates the apostles the coryphaei of its system. When Strauss wrote his *Leben Jesu*, Germany was thrilled by the publication — all classes of her divines and philosophers, historians and scholars. When, as in this work of Strauss, all historical reality is denied to the gospels, and they are declared to be composed, not of facts, but ideas, and are affirmed to describe, not a personal God or a historical Christ, but a cluster of notions intensely prevalent in Judaea; and when it is argued that the names and events occurring in the evangelical narrations are but symbols of inward emotions, and the blasphemies of pantheism are reasoned for from the union of deity and humanity in Jesus, as shadowing forth the identity of the forms vulgarly named Creator and creature, it is easily seen that the author uses the philosophy of Hegel as the great organ of perverting and desecrating the records of the evangelists, especially of polluting the finer and more experimental portions of the work of the beloved disciple. Weisse, the producer of a similar mixture of boldness and impiety, declares it impossible for any one to understand his theology unless he have mastered his philosophy. No one can comprehend the systems of Daub, Schwartz, or Schleiermacher till he has mastered the philosophy which Schelling propounded in his early and adventurous youth. “A life beyond the grave,” says Strauss, “is the last foe which speculative criticism has to encounter, and, if it can, to extirpate.” So, to find a place for such theories, this author commenced a series of wild and unjustifiable attacks on the gospels, finding discrepancies where there are none, creating exaggerations where the narrative is easy and simple, denying the possibility of miracles, and involving the whole narrative in confusion and mystery, in order to destroy its historical character, and render its interpretation possible only on the supposition of its being a useless and disconnected mythology. Whatever sophistry and perverted logic could supply, whatever perplexity a shrewd and malicious criticism could suggest, whatever reasoning a clever and fascinating philosophy could produce, were used to create and garnish the new hypothesis. The whole system is a sad memorial of the

proud and unhallowed wisdom of this world, impugning the revelation already given, delighting in every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, and exalting in withdrawing every thought from the obedience of Christ. Well might Eschenmayer speak of the “Ischariotismus” of Hegelianism. While it kissed, it betrayed, and at length proceeded to the trial and condemnation of its victim (*Old and New*, Aug. 1870, p, 186). *SEE DEISM; SEE PANTHEISM; SEE RATIONALISM,*

Transelementation

(*trans* and *elementum*), a term used to signify the change of the elements in one body into those of another.

Transfiguration

Picture for Transfiguration

The Greek word **μετεμορφώθη**, well rendered “was transfigured,” signifies a *change of form or appearance* (~~<407E>~~ Matthew 17:2; ~~<408E>~~ Mark 9:2), and is so explained in ~~<402E>~~ Luke 9:29, “the fashion of his countenance was altered.” This is one of the most wonderful incidents in the life of our Savior upon earth, and one so instructive that we can never exhaust its lessons. The apostle Peter, towards the close of his life, in running his mind over the proofs of Christ’s majesty, found none so -conclusive and irrefragable as the scenes when he and others were with his Master in the holy mount (~~<601E>~~ 2 Peter 1:18) as eye-witnesses that he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory,” This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” The apostle John likewise refers to the convincing power of the “glory” exhibited on that occasion (~~<601E>~~ John 1:14). If we divide Christ’s public life into three periods the first of miracles, to prove his divine mission; the *second* of parables, to inculcate virtue; and the third of suffering, first clearly revealed and then endured, to atone for sin-the transfiguration may be viewed as his baptism or initiation into the third and last. He went up the Mount of Transfiguration on the eighth day after he had bidden every one who would come after him take up his cross, declaring that his kingdom was-not of this world that he must suffer many things, and be killed, etc.

The Mount of Transfiguration is traditionally thought to have been Mount Tabor; but as *this* height is fifty miles from Caesarea Philippi, where Jesus

last taught, it has of late been supposed to have been a mountain much less distant, namely, Mount Hermon. As there was an interval, however, of a week between this and the preceding occurrence, we may naturally conclude that a part of this time was occupied in the journey. *SEE TABOR*. The only persons thought worthy to *ascend* this mount of vision were Peter, James, and John, three being a competent number of witnesses, or they being more faithful and beloved than any others. Whatever the reason was, these three disciples appear on more than one other occasion as an elect triumvirate at the raising of Jairus's *daughter*, and during our Lord's agony in the garden. The disciples, in all probability, ascended the mountain anticipating nothing more than that Jesus, as at other times (~~and~~ Luke 6:12), would continue all night in prayer to God. When the curtains of night closed around them, they were so worn out by their labors as to sink down in sleep, till startled from their slumbers by the glory of the Lord shining round about them; for, as Jesus prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered," and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white *as* the light... And behold there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." Peter's words, "Master, it is good for *us* to be here," are a natural expression of rapture; and his proposal to build three tabernacles indicated his desire both to keep his Lord from going down to Jerusalem to die there, and to prolong the blessedness of beholding with open face the glory of God. Such is at least a plausible interpretation of his language, while "he wist not what to say." It is worthy of remark that Peter had no thought of tents for himself and his companions, his only desire being that the beatific vision might endure forever. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them not a black cloud such as that which rested on Mount Sinai, but a cloud glistening as the Shechinah when the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, or as the cloud that filled the house of the Lord when the priests were come out of the holy place. "And behold a voice out of the cloud" that is, out of the long-established symbol of Jehovah's presence" which said, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased hear ye him. And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid" like Daniel and all others who have felt themselves entranced by revelations of God. "And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid" showing such gentleness as proved him to be fitly named the Lamb of God. How long the glorification of our Savior continued it were vain to inquire; but it appears from the narrative of Luke that he did not lead down

his disciples till the day following that on which they had ascended the height. As they descended, he bade his disciples keep what they had seen a secret till after his resurrection, doubtless because the whole vision, to those who had not seen it, would have been a rock of offence, appearing, as an idle tale. He also opened their eyes to see that. Elias whom they looked for in the future was to be sought in the past, even In John the Baptist, who was clothed with his spirit and power.

The final causes of the transfiguration, although in part wrapped up in mystery, appear to be in part plain. Among its intended lessons may be the following: First, to teach that, in spite of the calumnies which the Pharisees had heaped on Jesus the old and new dispensations are in harmony with each other. To this end the author and the restorer of the old dispensation talk with the founder of the new, as if his scheme, even the most repulsive feature of it, was contemplated by theirs, as the reality of which they had promulgated only types and shadows. Secondly, to teach that the new dispensation was superior to the old. Moses and Elias appear as inferior to Jesus, not merely since their faces *did* not, so far as we know, shine like the sun, but chiefly because the voice from the excellent glory commanded to hear *him* in preference to them; thirdly, to gird *up* the energies of Jesus for the great agony which was so soon to excruciate him; as in Gethsemane itself an angel appeared unto him strengthening him; as the Holy Ghost descended upon him in the likeness of a dove before his temptation in the wilderness and as, when the devil left him, angels came and ministered unto him. Fourthly, to comfort the hearts of the disciples, who, being destined to see their Master, whom they had left all to follow, nailed to a cross, to be themselves persecuted, and to suffer their want of all things, were in danger of despair. But, by being eye-witnesses of his majesty, they became convinced that his humiliation, even though he descended into the place of the dead, was voluntary and could not continue long. Gazing at the glorified body of their Master, they beheld not only a proof but an express and lively image, of his resurrection, ascension, and exaltation above the heavens. As in a prophetic vision, they beheld him seated upon clouds; and seen by every eye as the Judge of the quick and the dead, or enthroned in heaven amid the host of his redeemed. Henceforth they ceased not questioning one another what the rising from the dead should mean. Fifthly, to teach that virtue will not allow supine contemplation, but demands the exercise and exertion of our several powers. To some this lesson may seem a refinement, but it is ingeniously deduced by

Schleiermacher from the fact that while Peter yet spake in his ecstasy, the vision in which he longed to wear out his life vanished away as if the aim were to teach us that when we have ascended the mount of vision on the cherub-wings of contemplation, even if we burn to dwell there in a perpetual sweetness, yet We must shun all monastic seclusion that we may mingle among men and do them good; even as the great Exemplar would not let his chosen repose in rapturous musings, and had scarcely come down from the mountain of his glory before he recommenced his works of usefulness.

The transfiguration is so fine a subject for the painter that we are not surprised to learn that it employed Raphael's best hours, and that his portraiture of it is confessedly the highest of all efforts of pictorial genius. The original work, still unfaded, though more than three centuries have passed over it, hangs in the Vatican. A copy of it in mosaic on a colossal scale, and which might pass with most men for the original, fills the head of the left aisle in St. Peter's at Rome. The design is as simple as the artless narrative of the evangelists. In the center, and in raiment white as the light, is he, the fashion of whose countenance was altered. On either hand, and floating on the air, appear in glory Moses and Elias. Beneath, the disciples, overshadowed by a bright cloud, their hands shielding their dazzled eyes, are fallen on their faces, sore afraid of the voice proceeding out of the cloud, but catching glimpses of Jesus transfigured before them.

For monographs on the transfiguration, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 47.; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 161; Bagot, *On the Transfiguration* (Lond. 1840); Anon. *Tabor's Teachings* (ibid. 1867, 1868); also the (Am.) *Free-will Baptist Quarterly*, Jan. 1858. **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**

Transfiguration (or Jesus) day

was kept in the Western Church in the time of St. Leo, and in the Greek Church about A.D. 700. By a bull of Calixtus III, 1456 (or 1457), it was ordered to be generally observed, in memory of the victory of Hunniades and the Hungarian army over Mohammed and the Turks. In the English calendar it stands on Aug. 6. In France, after consecration, the chalice was filled with new wine, or, as at Tours, received some of the juice of the ripe grapes; and the clusters are blessed in Germany and the East on this day. Blunt, *Dict. of Theol.* s.v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* s.v.

Transitorium

a term for a short anthem, or respond, in the rite of Milan, chanted after the communion of the priest. Lee, *Gloss. of Liturg. Terms*, s.v.

Translation, Biblical

SEE VERSIONS, TRANSLATION, in ecclesiastical usage, is the removal of a bishop from the charge of one diocese to that of another. After such removal, the bishop, in all his attestations, dates: from the year of his translation (*anno translationis nostrae*), not from that of his consecration (*anno consecrationis nostrae*). In the early Church a bishop could not translate himself to another see without the consent and approbation of a provincial council. Some, indeed, thought it absolutely unlawful for a bishop to forsake his first see and betake himself to any other, because they looked upon his consecration to be a sort of marriage to his church, and therefore looked upon his removal to another see as spiritual adultery.

Transmigration

(a *passing over*), in the theological acceptance of the term, means the supposed translation of the soul after death into another substance or body than that which it occupied before. The basis of this belief being the assumption that the human soul does not perish together with the body, it can belong only to those nations, which believe in the immortality of the soul. But in proportion as such an idea is crude or developed, as it is founded merely on a vague fear of death, and a craving for material life, or on ethical grounds, and a supposed causal connection between this and a future life, the belief in transmigration assumes various forms. The notion, dating back to a remote antiquity, and being spread all over the world, seems to be anthropologically innate, and to be the first form in which the idea of immortality occurred to man.

1. India. It was in India where the problems of metaphysics and ethics as connected with ontology and the destiny of the soul were elaborated to the last degree on a theistic basis that metempsychosis was most ingeniously and extensively developed. The Hindus believed that human-souls emanated from the Supreme Being, which, as it were, in a state of bewilderment or forgetfulness allowed them to become separate existences and to be born on earth. The soul thus severed from the real source of its life is bound to return to it, or to become merged again into that divine

substance with which it was originally one. But having become contaminated with sins it must strive to free itself from guilt and become fit for its heavenly career. Religion teaches that this is done by the observance of religious rites and a life in conformity with the precepts of the sacred books; philosophy, that the soul will be reunited with Brahman, if it understands the true nature of the divine essence whence it comes. So long, therefore, as the soul has not attained this condition of purity, it must be born again after the dissolution of the body to which it was allied; and the degree of its impurity at one of these various deaths determines the existence which it will assume in a subsequent life. So closely was the account of a soul's misdeeds kept that it might pass thousands of years, or *kalpas* (aeons), in one or other of the heavens, as a reward for good deeds or self-inflicted suffering, and yet be obliged to return to earth or hell to expiate as an animal, man or demon certain sins. To us the details of the soul's migration, as described in the religious works of the Hindus, are only interesting as they afford a kind of standard by which the moral merit or demerit of human actions was measured in India (see Manu, *Code of Laws*, bk. 12). A more general doctrine of the transmigration of souls is based by Hindi philosophers on the assumption of the three cosmic qualities of *sattwa*, i.e. purity or goodness; *rajas*, i.e. troubledness or passion and *tamas*, i.e. darkness or sin, with which the human soul may become endued. On this basis Manu and other writers built an elaborate theory of the various births to which the soul may be subject. Manu teaches that "souls endued with the quality of *sattwa* attain the condition of deities; those having the quality of *rajas* the condition of men; and those having the quality of *tamas*, the condition of beasts." The Buddhistic belief in transmigration is derived from that of the Brahmanic Hindus, and agrees with it in principle, though it differs from it in the imaginary detail in which it was worked out. To enlarge here on this difference is not necessary, and yet it will not be superfluous to point out one great difference which separates the notions of one class of Buddhists from those of the rest, as well as from those of the Brahmanic Hindus. While other Hindus believe that the same soul appears at the several births, the Southern Buddhists teach that the succession of existences is a succession of souls; that when the body dies the soul is "extinguished," and nothing remains but the good and bad acts performed in life; the result of these acts becomes the seed of a new life, which soul is the necessary product of the soul of the former life. This dogma is illustrated by various similes, e.g. "One lamp is kindled

at another; the light of the former is not identical with that of the latter, but, nevertheless without this the other light could not have originated.”

2. Egypt. — According to the doctrine of the old Egyptians, the human race originated after the pure gods and spirits had left the earth; and this they did because the daemons, who inhabited the earth, had revolted against them, and tainted it with guilt. In order that the daemons might purify themselves, the gods created human bodies, so that in them they might expiate their guilt. These earthly bodies united to the daemons, are the human race, and human life is merely intended as a means of purifying the soul. All the precepts regulating the course of life are laid down by the Egyptians for this end, and the judgment after death in the palace of Osiris decides whether it has been attained or not. If it has not, then the soul must return to the earth, to renew its expiations either in a human body, in the body of an animal, or in a plant. Matter was believed to be a substantial reality; and the material form that was once united with spirit in the one being of man was believed to maintain that connection so long as the material form remained. Hence the Egyptian practice of embalming the dead, to arrest the passage of the soul into other forms.

3. Persia. — The transmigration of souls was also a tenet of the Persian religion before the time of Zoroaster, and was derived, with the language of Avesta, from Indian sources. Pherecydes of Syros who lived before the age of Zoroaster, taught the doctrine, and Pythagoras received it in Babylon from the Magi (q.v.).

4. In Greece, the doctrine of transmigration did not become the belief of the people, but was confined to the mysteries and tenets of philosophers, who probably received it from Egypt or India. According to some, Thales was the first Greek philosopher who propounded it; according to others, Pherecydes the teacher of Pythagoras. It was subsequently greatly developed by Pythagoras and Plato. The Greek mysteries were in fact, not only a school in which metempsychosis was taught, but an indispensable grade or lodge through which all of the aspirants must pass before they could be purified and go on to higher stages of existence. In the system of Plato transmigration had a remedial function, and the soul could attain to divinity only by a varied probation of ten thousand years. The Epicureans denied it, but it appears to have been generally inculcated as one of the deepest doctrines of the mysteries. The Neo-Platonists, who believed in magic, assumed the doctrine of metempsychosis as a natural inheritance.

5. Among the Jews the doctrine of transmigration the *Gilgul Neshamoth*-was taught in the mystical, system of the Cabala (q.v.). “All the souls,” says the *Zohar*, or Book of Light, “are subject to the trials of transmigration and men do not know which are the ways of the Most High in their regard. They do not know how many transformations and mysterious trials they must undergo; how many souls and spirits come to this world without returning to the palace of the divine king.... The souls must re-enter the absolute substance whence they have emerged. But to accomplish this end they must develop all the perfections, the germ of which is planted in them; and if they have not fulfilled this condition during one life, they must commence another, a third, and so forth, until they have acquired the condition which fits them for-reunion with, God. On the ground of this doctrine it was held, for instance, that the soul of Adam migrated into David, and will come into the Messiah; that the soul of Japheth is the same as that of Simeon, and the soul of Terah migrated into Job. Modern Cabalists for instance, Isaac Loria have imagined that divine grace sometimes assists a soul in its career of expiation by allowing it to occupy the same body together with another soul, when both are to supplement each other, like the blind and the lame. Sometimes only one of these souls requires the supplement of virtue, which it obtains from the other soul, better provided than its partner. The latter soul then becomes, as it were, the mother of the other soul, and bears it under her heart as a pregnant woman. Hence the name of gestation-or impregnation is given to this strange association of two souls.

6. Of the Druids, it is told by classical writers that they believed in the immortality of the soul, and in its migration after a certain period subsequent to death. Little is known of the manner in Which they imagined such migrations to take place; but, to judge from their religious system, there can be no doubt that they looked upon transmigration as a means of purifying the soul and preparing it for eternal life

7. Norse. — A very poetical form of belief in transmigration is found in Germanic mythology, according to which the soul, before entering its divine abode, assumes certain forms on alternate certain objects, in which it lives for a short period-as a tree, a rose, a vine, a butterfly, a pigeon, etc.

8. Among the early Christians, Jerome relates, the doctrine of transmigration was taught as a traditional: and esoteric one, which was only communicated to a select few. Gnostics and Manichaeans welcomed

it, and the more speculative or mystical of the Church fathers found in it a ready explanation of the fall of man and the doctrine of evil spirits. This considerable step towards reconciling the existence of suffering with that of a merciful God was distinctly set forth by Porphyry and Origen, and passed, in all probability, with all the strange heresies of "Illumination," through such institutions as the Cairene House of Sight and the Knights Templars, into the wild doctrines of the obscure sects of the Middle Ages in Europe. The Taborites, an extreme branch of the Hussites, are said to have accepted the doctrine.

One great philosopher, at least, of modern times, G. E. Lessing, accounted for human progress by a species of transmigration. He argues that the soul is a simple being capable of infinite conceptions, which are obtained "in an infinite succession of time. The order and measure of the acquisition of these conceptions are the senses. These, at present, are five; but there is no evidence that they have always been the same. Nature, never taking a leap, must have gone through all the lower stages before it arrived at that which it occupies now.... And since nature contains many substances and powers which are not accessible to those senses with which it is now endowed, it must be assumed that there will be future stages at which the soul will have as many senses as correspond with the powers of nature.

9. *Modern Savages.* — Probably the lowest forms of this belief are those found among some of the tribes of Africa and America, which hold that the soul, immediately after death, must look out for a new owner, entering, if need be, even the body of an animal. Some of the Africans assume that the soul will choose with predilection the body of a person of similar rank to that of its former owner, or a near relation of his. They therefore frequently bury their dead near the houses of their relatives in order to enable the souls of the former to occupy the newly-born children of the latter, and the princely souls to re-enter the princely family; and sometimes holes are dug in the grave to facilitate the soul's egress from it.

In North America some tribes slaughter their captives to feed with their blood such souls in suspense. The Negro widows of Matamba are especially afraid of all, souls of their husbands; for at the death of these they immediately throw themselves into the water to drown their husbands' souls, which otherwise, they imagine, would cling to them. The natives of Madagascar seem to have invented a kind of artificial transmigration; for in the hut where a man is about to die they make a hole in the roof in order to

catch the outgoing soul and to breathe it into the body of another man at the point of death.

See *Metempsychosis by. a Modern Pythagorean*, in *Blackwood's Mag.* 19:511; *Confessions of a Metempsychosian*, in *Fraser's Mag.* 12:496; Blunt, *Dict of Hist. Theology*, s.v.; *Chambers's Encyclop.* s.v.; Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 645; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*; Hendrick, *Christianity*'; Hardy, *Buddhism*, art. a "Metempsychosis;" Ueberweg, *history of Philosophy* (see Index).

Transportation

is a term used in Scotland for the removing or translation of a minister from one parish or congregation to another.

Transubstantiation

(*change of substance*), a word applied to the alleged conversion or change of the substance of the bread and wine in the eucharist into the body and blood of Jesus Christ at the time the officiating priest utters the words of consecration.

I. The Terms. — Probably the first to make use of the word *transubstantiatio* was Peter Damili (*Epositio Can. Miss. cap. 7*; Mai, *Script. Vet. t. Nov. Col. I, 2, 215*), A.D. 988-1072; though similar expressions, such as *transitio*, had previously been employed. Its use was, however, limited, and in the 12th century was becoming very rare. Its first appearance as a term accepted and recognized by the Church is in the first of the *Seventy Constitutions* presented to the fourth Council of Lateran (1215) by Innocent II, and tacitly adopted by that council. The term thus adopted by the Western Church has its counterpart in the Eastern Church in the term *Metousiosis* (ετουσίωσις), which was formally adopted, in the "Orthodox Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East," in 1643; and in Art. 17 of the Council of Bethlehem, or of Jerusalem, in 1672.

The Church of England never adopted the word. "transubstantiation" in any formal document; and at the same time that the Council of Trent was fixing it upon the Latin Church, the sacred synod of the English Church was declaring, in the 28th art. of Religion "Panis et vini Transubstantiatio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis Scripture

verbis adversatur et multarum superstitionum dedit occasioneum” (A.D.1552). This part of Art. 28 now stands in English in the following form: “Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions” (A.D. 1571).

II. The Doctrine. — In the Confession of the Synod of the fourth Lateran Council, transubstantiation is thus defined: “There is only one universal Church, beyond which no man can in any way be saved. In’ which Jesus Christ is himself the priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are really contained in the sacrament of the altar, under the form of bread and wine, being *transubstantiated*, the bread into the body and the wine into the blood, by divine power.” By the institution of Corpus Christi Day by pope Urban IV in 1264 and pope Clement V in 1311 at the Synodo of Vienne, the doctrine in question was expressed in a liturgical form and its popularity secured. Henceforth the sacrifice of the mass formed more than ever the center of the Catholic ritual, and reflected new glory upon the priesthood.

The change effected by transubstantiation is declared to be so perfect and complete that, by connection and concomitance, the soul and divinity of Christ coexist with his flesh and blood under the species of bread and wine; and thus the elements, and every particle thereof, contain Christ whole and entire divinity, humanity, soul, body, and *blood*, with all their component parts. Nothing remains of the bread and wine except the accidents. The whole God and man Christ Jesus is contained in the bread and wine, and in every particle of the bread, and every drop of the wine. The natural result of such a doctrine is the elevation of the Host for adoration, a practice unknown till the rise of transubstantiation.

It is claimed by the advocates of transubstantiation that it had the belief and approval of the early fathers of the Church. Bingham (*Christ. Antiq.* bk. 15 ch. 5, § 4) asserts that “the ancient fathers have declared as plainly as words can make it that the change made in the elements of bread and wine by consecration is not such a change as destroys their nature and substance, but only alters their qualities, and elevates them to a spiritual use, as is done in many other consecrations, where the qualities of things are much altered without any real change of substance.” We give some extracts from the authorities quoted by Bingham. Thus Gregory of Nyssa

(*De Bapt. Christi*, 3, 369); This altar before which we stand is but common stone in its nature, but after it is consecrated to the service of God, and has received a benediction, it is a holy table, an immaculate altar, not to be touched by any but the priests, and that with the greatest reverence. The bread also at first is but common bread, but when once it is sanctified by the holy mystery, it is made and called the body of Christ.” Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Myst.* 2, note 3), “Beware that you take not this ointment to be bare ointment; for as the bread in the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not mere bread, but the body of Christ, so this holy ointment, after invocation, is not bare or common ointment, but it is the gift or grace of Christ and the Holy Spirit, who by his presence and divine nature makes it efficacious.” Chrysostom, in his famous *Epistle to Caesarius*, explaining the two natures of Christ that he had both a human and a divine substance in reality says, “As the bread, before it is sanctified, is called bread, but after the divine grace has sanctified it by the mediation of the priest it is no longer called bread, but dignified with the name of the body of the Lord, though the nature of bread remain in it, and they are not said to be two, but one body of the Son; so here, the divine nature residing or dwelling in the human body, they both together make one Son and one Person.” When this passage was first produced by Peter Martyr, it was looked upon as so unanswerable that the Romish Church declared it to be a forgery, and it was stolen from the Lambeth Library during the reign of queen Mary. Theodoret plainly says that the bread and wine remain still in their own nature after consecration. Augustine, instructing the newly baptized respecting the sacrament, tells them that what they saw upon the altar was bread and the cup, as their own eyes could testify to them; but what their faith required to be instructed about was that the bread is the body of Christ, etc. Answering an objection, supposed to be urged, that Christ had taken his body to heaven, Augustine replies, “These things, my brethren, are therefore called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen and another is understood. That which is seen has a bodily appearance; that which is understood has a spiritual fruit.” He also says that “this very bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ; consequently. it could not be his natural body in the substance, but only sacramentally. The natural body of Christ is only in heaven, but the sacrament has the name of his body, because, though in outward, visible, and corporeal appearance it is only bread, yet it is attended with a spiritual fruit.” Isidore, bishop of Seville (A.D. 630), speaking of the rites of the Church, says, “The bread, because it nourishes and strengthens our bodies, is therefore called the body of

Christ; and the wine, because it creates blood in our flesh, is called the blood of Christ. Now, these two things are visible, but, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, they become the sacrament of the Lord's body" (*De Eccles. Ofic.* 1, 18). From the time of Paschasius this doctrine had been the subject of angry contention, and one of its bitterest opponents was the able scholastic writer Duns Scotus, whose opinions were maintained in the 11th century by Berengarius and his numerous followers.

III. Arguments. — The doctrine of transubstantiation is defended by a literal interpretation of the words spoken by our Lord at the last supper, "This is my body," "This is my blood." From these words it is argued that there is the real bodily presence of Christ's body, which is accounted for by the miracle of a change of substance of the bread and wine. In answer it is urged,

1. The accounts which the Romanists give of this supposed miracle are at variance with their own statement of it. In such a case, for instance, as that of the miracle of Moses' rod, every one would say, "the *rod* was changed into a *serpent*" (all the attributes of this last being present), not *vice versa*; so that by Romanists' own account it is Christ's body and blood that are *changed into bread and wine*.

Wherever a miracle was wrought in the Old or New Test., as in the instance above alluded to, or in the turning of the water into wine at Cana, such change was obvious to the *senses*; the appeal, in fact, for the reality of the miracle is to the senses; while, therefore, we might admit that if a Romish priest were to assert that he had converted our Savior's body into bread and wine, he was safe as far as the senses go, we should hold, *per contra*, that if he professed to have turned bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, that body and blood ought to be clear to the senses.. We had bread and wine *before* the consecration; we have, as to *sense*, bread and wine *after*. In the whole history of miracles, nothing of this sort has ever been known; nor can we, under such circumstances, admit that the alleged change has taken place. Suppose Aaron's rod to have remained still with all the attributes of a rod, could Pharaoh and his court believe it to be now a serpent?

2. The late origin of the doctrine of transubstantiation has been alleged as one reason for its rejection, and it is certainly a point worthy of

considerable notice. If, however, it had been as early as the superstitious veneration for relics and images, it would have been but an ancient error.

3. It must be evident to everyone who is not blinded by ignorance and prejudice that our Lord's words, "This is my body," are mere figurative expressions; and that they were no more likely to be designed to be received literally than the declarations; made by our Lord that he was a "vine," a "lamb," a "door," a "way," a "light..."

4. Besides, such a transubstantiation is so opposite to the testimony of our senses as completely to undermine the whole proof of all the miracles by which God has confirmed revelation. According to such a transubstantiation, the same body is alive and dead at once, and may be in a million of different places whole and entire at the same instant of time; accidents remain without a substance, and substance without accidents; and a part of Christ's body is equal to the whole. It is also contrary to the end of the sacrament, which is to represent and commemorate Christ, not to believe that he is corporeally present (^{<4124>}1 Corinthians 9:24, 25).

5. The practical evil of this and of consubstantiation (q.v.) is that it leads to the paying divine adoration to a bit of bread, and the still more noxious superstition of thinking that Christ's body can be received and act like a medicine on one who is "not considering the Lord's body," as, e.g., an infant, or a man in a state of insensibility.

See Blunt, *Dict. of Hist. Theol.* s.v.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.; Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* (see Index); Brown, *Compendium*, p. 613; Cosen, *On Transubstantiation* (1858); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Hill, *English Monasticism* (Lond. 1867); Kidder, *Messiah*, 3, 80; Knott, *On the Supper of our Lord* (1858); Smith, *Errors of the Church of Rome*, dial. 6; Thirlwall, *Transubstantiation: What Is It?* (1869); Van Oosterzee, *Christ. Dogmat.* (see Index); Watson, *Biblical Dict.* s.v.

Trap

(**vqem**, *mokesh*, ^{<6233>}Joshua 23:13, a *snare*, as elsewhere rendered; **td&bñi** *malkodeth*, ^{<4880>}Job 18:10, a *noose*; **tyj &ñi**, *mashchith*, ^{<4126>}Jeremiah 5:26, a *destroyer*, as elsewhere; and so *Spa*, ^{<5109>}Romans 11:9, lit. the *chase*).

SEE HUNTING.

Trapp, John

a Puritan divine, was born in 1601, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was schoolmaster at Stratford-on-Avon and vicar of Weston-on Avon from 1624 until his death, in 1669. He wrote, *God's Love-Tokens* (Lond. 1637, 4to): — *Theologia Theologicæ* (1641, 8vo): — *Commentaries on the Scriptures*, viz.— *St. John the Evangelist* (1646, 4to); *All the Epistles and the Revelation of St. John* (1647, 4to; 2d ed. 1649, 4to); *All the New Testament* (1647, 2 vols. 4to; new ed. 1663, imp. 8vo); *Pentateuch* (1650, 4to; 2d ed. 1654, 4to); *Joshua to 2d Chronicles; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Songs of Solomon* (1650, 4to); *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (1654, fol.); *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, and the Psalms* (1656, fol.; 2d ed. 1657, fol.); *Proverbs to Daniel* (1656, fol.) all published together in 1662 (5 vols. fol.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Trapp, Joseph, D.D.

an English divine, was born at Cherrington, Gloucestershire, in November, 1679. Educated at first by his father, he was afterwards placed under the care of the master of New College, Oxford, and in 1695, entered Wadham College in the same city. 'He was chosen, a fellow of his college in 1704, and first professor of poetry in 1708. In 1709-10 he acted as manager for Dr. Sacheverell on his memorable trial, and in 1711 was appointed chaplain to Sir Constantine Phipps, Lord Chancellor of Ireland. In 1720 he was presented to the rectory of Damltzey, Wiltshire, which he resigned in 1721 for the vicarage of the united parishes of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and St. Leonard's, Foster Lane, London. He received his degree of D.D. from Oxford in February, 1727. He was, in 1733, preferred to the rectory of Harlington, Middlesex, by lord Bolingbroke, whose chaplain he had previously been. In 1734 he was elected one of the joint lecturers of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. He died at Harlington, Nov. 22, 1747. Mr. Trapp was a hard student, and published numerous works, viz., *Praelectiones Poeticæ*, etc. (Oxon. 1711-19, 3 vols. 8vo), being his Latin lectures as professor of poetry: — *A Preservative*, etc., in several discourses (collected in 1722, 2 vols. sm. 8vo): — *The AENEID of Virgil Translated into Blank Verse* (1718, 2 vols. 4to): — *Explanatory Notes on the Four Gospels*, etc. (1747-48, 2 vols. 8vo; Oxford, 1775, 8vo; 1805, 8vo): — besides poems, sermons, theological tracts, etc. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Trappists

Picture for Trappists

the members of a monastic order in the Church of Rome which is characterized by the extreme austerity of its rule. It had its origin in the Cistercian abbey of La Trappe in Normandy during the abbacy of Rancé (q.v.). This prelate had been grossly addicted to sensual pleasures, and had also evinced considerable fondness for scholarly pursuits; but his conscience became awakened, and he was transformed into an intense ascetic. He renounced all the benefices he possessed except that of La Trappe; and when he had repaired the buildings of that abbey, he undertook the restoration of its ancient discipline. He introduced a number of strict Benedictines, and became a monk himself and regular abbot. In 1675 he caused the members of the order to renew their vows, and imposed on them the additional obligation to preserve unchanged all his arrangements and rules.

This immutable rule obliges the Trappists to sleep on a bed of straw, with pillow also of straw, placed on a board and covered with a blanket. They must rise at two o'clock in the morning. Eleven hours of their day are devoted to prayers and masses, the remaining hours to hard labor performed in strict silence. Scientific pursuits are forbidden. The Trappist's thoughts are to be directed only to repentance and death. His only speech, apart from hymns and prayers, is the responsive greeting "Memento mori." He maintains a constant fast till the plainness and frugality of his food, which is served upon a bare table. After supper and subsequent religious meditations and exercises, he labors for a time upon the grave he is to occupy after death, and then retires to rest at eight o'clock in summer and at seven in winter. The order contains lay brothers, professors, and *feres donnes*, i.e. temporary associates. Its garb consists of a long robe with wide sleeves of coarse grayish-white wool; a black woolen cowl with two strips a foot wide which reach down to the knee; a broad girdle of black leather, from which are suspended a rosary and a knife, symbols of devotion and toil; and wooden shoes. In the choir a dark brown mantle with sleeves, and a cowl of like color, are worn. The lay brothers wear gray habits.

Rancé's immoderate austerity occasioned the death of a number of monks, and brought upon him the censure of many critics. His aversion to literary

employments was also condemned, among others by Mabillon in the *Traite des Etudes Alonastiques* (1691). The order did not spread beyond its original limits until after the founder's death (Oct. 12, 1700), and has never become very strong in its numbers. A female branch was instituted at Clocet, France, in 1705, by princess Louise de Conde. The revolution expelled the Trappists from France, but they established themselves in Valsainte, Freiburg, Switzerland, where a monastery founded by Augustine l'Estrange (1791) was made an abbey by Pius VI, and Augustine placed at its head. Again assailed by the French and compelled to flee, the Trappists found a temporary home in Poland. They were everywhere disliked, however, and found no settled home until after the restoration of the Bourbons: in 1817, when they recovered their original abbey of La Trappe. Other stations were established, among them a female convent near London. In 1834 a papal decretal consolidated the Trappists into a *Congregation des Religieux Cisterciens de N. D. de la Trappe*. They possess settlements in Algiers and North America, but are chiefly found in France. See the *Allgem. Darmst. Kirchenzeitung*, 1831, p. 1424; 1832, p. 90, 119; 1833, p. 1464; 183, p. 1087; Chateaubriand, *Vie de Rancé* (Par. 1844); Ritsert, *Ordeno d. Trappisten* (Darmst. 1833).

In 1851 Muard founded an order of Trappist preachers in the bishopric of Sens, who established themselves in a convent near Avallon. They observe the Trappist rule and wear the habit of the order, but by dispensation are allowed to break the vow of silence and serve the Church by preaching. See *Der Kattholik*. Sept. 1851, p. 239 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*, s.v.

Trask, John

a Sabbatarian Puritan, was a native of Somersetshire, and, after being a schoolmaster until he was thirty-four years of age, became a preacher in London about 1617. He was at first refused ordination by the bishop of Bath and Wells, but "afterwards got orders and began to vent his opinions." He enjoined severe asceticism upon his followers, inducing them to fast three days at a time, alleging that the third day's fast would bring them to the condition of justified saints, according to the promise "after two days he will revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight" (~~2~~²HOSEA 6:1). Among other precepts strictly enforced by Trask was that of doing everything by the law of Scripture, having been converted to this view by the arguments of Hamlet Jackson. Trask

prescribed to his followers ceremonial customs respecting dress and domestic life; required Jewish strictness in the observance of Sunday; and eventually adopted Saturday as the Sabbath. On April 1, 1634, the commissioners for ecclesiastical causes ordered the prosecution of all separatists, novelists, and sectaries, among whom the Traskists were named. Trask was brought before the Star-chamber, where his Judaizing opinions and practices were refuted by bishop Andrewes, and he was put in the pillory. He is said to have afterwards recanted his errors, but became an Antinomian before his death, the date of which is not given. His followers began to be called Seventh-day men about the year 1700. The published works of Trask are, *Sermon on* ^{<4166}*Mark 16:16* (Lond. 1615, 8vo): — *Treatise of Liberty from Judaism* (1620, 4to): — *Power of Preaching* (1623, 8vo): — *The True Gospel, etc., from the Reproach of a New Gospel* (1636, sm. 12mo). See Paget, *Heresiography* (1662, p. 161, 184); Baker, *Chronicle*; Fuller, *Church History of Great Britain*; Brook, *Puritans*; Chamberlain, *Present State of England for 1702*. p. 258. — Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Traskites

SEE TRASK, JOHN.

Trauthson

the name of an ancient Tyrolese family which furnished two representatives to the episcopal office in the Church of Rome. The former of these was twenty-first bishop of Vienna, and died in 1702. The latter, JOHANN JOSEPH, *Count Trauthson and Falckenstein*, was born in 1704 at Vienna, in which city he studied (and possibly at Rome and Sienna), became canon and provost, and in 1751 was made prince-archbishop of Vienna. He issued a pastoral letter in which he urged his clergy to prefer the presentation of necessary truths to that of merely useful truths in their sermons, and remonstrated against the excessive zeal expended in the preaching of the merits of saints, while but little attention was given to the preaching of the merits of Christ. He also condemned the introduction of odd or laughable elements into the preaching. This circular occasioned great excitement, and called forth a number of apologetical and; polemical tracts, which are enumerated in *Acta Hist. Eccl.* 18:1008 sq.; Heinsius, *Kirchenshist.* 4:329 sq.; and Henke, *Kirchengesch* 5, 292 sq. Many Protestants suspected that the archbishop had understated the tenets of his Church in order to win

over uninformed Protestants, and many Romanists charged him with having begun the betrayal of the Church. Both, however, were mistaken. Trauthson was influenced by the “enlightenment” of his time, but was none the less a zealous supporter of the Church of Rome. His letter was, however, productive of no special results. Maria Theresa appointed him chief director of studies in the University of Vienna and director of the Theresianum, and pope Benedict XIV made him cardinal in 1756. He persuaded the curia to reduce the number of festivals in his diocese. He died March 10, 1757. His pastoral letter has been translated into many languages. See Von Einem, *Vers. einer vollsf. Kirchengesch. d. 18. Jahrh.* (Leips. 1782 sq.), 1, 554,590; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 7:309-313; *Leben d. Cardinale d. 18. Jahrh.* 3, 260. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s.v.

Traveling

(prop. some form of *j rā*; *arach*, especially *j rāporach*, a traveler; fem. *h j rāporechah*, a “traveling company” [^{<0375>}Genesis 37:25; ^{<2913>}Isaiah 21:13], i.e. *caravan*) in the East is still much more cumbersome than with us, since it is almost exclusively undertaken solely on errands of business, and rarely for purposes of pleasure. Its laboriousness is partly occasioned by the sandy and desert nature of the country, which often requires way-marks to be set up for guidance (Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* 5, 26); partly by the bad and neglected roads (comp. Philo, *Opp.* 2, 578), especially in winter, **SEE ROAD**; partly by the general absence of proper hotels, **SEE INN**; and partly by the bands of robbers who infest the country in general (comp. ^{<0125>}2 Corinthians 11:26). **SEE ROBBER**. Commerce (q.v.) is carried on by means of caravans (q.v.), which carry all necessaries with them, and are often so large as to seem like a considerable army (see Wellsted, *Reisen*, p. 227). Part of the company is always armed, and constitutes the van and rear guard (see Olivier, *Voyage*, 6:329 sq.). In the desert a local guide is usually employed (comp. ^{<0481>}Numbers 10:31), and a beacon-fire as a standard by night (see, generally, Jahn, *Archaeol.* I, 2, 17 sq.). Single travelers in the interior of the well-inhabited country, or in Palestine proper, usually ride upon asses (^{<0251>}1 Samuel 25:20, 42; ^{<0173>}2 Samuel 17:23; ^{<1024>}1 Kings 2:40; ^{<1285>}2 Chronicles 28:15; comp. ^{<2184>}Luke 10:34); tourists, however, and sheiks, upon horses; and in some instances wagons were anciently used as vehicles (^{<1128>}1 Kings 12:18; ^{<1292>}2 Kings 19:21; ^{<4188>}Acts 8:28) in certain parts of the country. Most persons went on foot (comp. John. 4:6) and carried their most essential supplies with them

(^{<079B>}Judges 19:18 sq., i.e. **πήρα**, ^{<0100>}Matthew 10:10), likewise a tent (q.v.) under which to encamp if in a solitary region (Dionys. Hal. 8:3). Gloves are mentioned in the Mishna (*Chelimu*, 16:6) as travelling apparatus. The Jews journeyed to the great festivals in caravans (^{<079D>}Luke 2:42, 44) with song and rejoicing. Single travelers usually found a ready hospitality (except among the Samaritans towards Jews), and eventually khans (q.v.) were established along the highways, especially for non-Israelites (see Reisegger, *Reisen*, 3, 62 sq.). Travelers of distinction were often welcomed with torch lights and great ceremony (2 Macc. 4:22), and for princes the roads were frequently repaired (^{<088B>}Psalms 68:5; ^{<240B>}Isaiah 40:3; Diod. Sic. 2, 13; Arrian, *Alex.* 4:30; Josephus, *War*, 3, 6, 2). Also on departing they were dismissed with an honorary procession (**προπέμπειν**, ^{<421B>}Acts 21:5; *deducere*, Cicero, *Cat. Maj.* 18) and many ceremonious attentions (^{<445B>}Acts 15:3; ^{<6124>}Romans 15:24; ^{<6166>}1 Corinthians 16:16; 3 John 6). Samaria was avoided as a route by the Jews. The Galileans, in visiting the festivals at Jerusalem, usually went along the Jordan or through Perteia (^{<071B>}Luke 17:11; ^{<8404>}John 4:4; Josephus, *Ant.* 20:6, 1). **SEE SAMARITAN**. Journeying on the Sabbath was forbidden in post-exilic times (see Josephus, *Ant.* 13:8, 4). **SEE SABBATH-DAYS JOURNEY**. On account of the heat travel was sometimes pursued by night. (See, generally, Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 12-16.) **SEE JOURNEY**.

Travis, George

all English clergyman, was a native of Royton, Lancashire, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford. He became vicar of Eastham and rector of Hendley, Cheshire; prebendary of Chester in 1783; and archdeacon of Chester in 1786. He died Feb. 24, 1797. He published, *Letters to Edward Gibbon*, etc., in defense of ^{<6117>}1 John 5:7 (Chester, 1784, 4to; corrected and enlarged, 1794, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Treasure

(prop. **τρεα**; to hoard, **θησαυρός**, in Scripture signifies anything collected together in stores, e.g. a treasure of corn, of wine, of oil; treasures of gold, silver, brass; treasures of coined money. Snow, winds, hail, rain, waters, are in the treasures of God (Psalm 135:7; ^{<4516>}Jeremiah 51:16). We read also of a treasure of good works, treasures of iniquity, to lay up treasures in heaven, to bring forth good or evil out of the treasures of the heart.

Joseph told his brethren, when they found their money returned in their sacks, that God had given them treasures (^{<40423>}Genesis 43:23). The kings of Judah had keepers of their treasures, both in city and country (^{<43275>}1 Chronicles 27:25; ^{<44227>}2 Chronicles 32:27, etc.), and the places where these magazines were laid up were called treasure-cities. Pharaoh compelled the Hebrews to build him treasure-cities, or magazines (^{<40111>}Exodus 1:11). The word treasures is often used to express anything in great abundance, “In Jesus Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (^{<51113>}Colossians 2:3). The wise man says that wisdom contains in its treasuries understanding, the knowledge of religion, etc. Paul (^{<45115>}Romans 2:5) speaks of heaping up a treasure of wrath against the day of wrath; and the prophet Amos says (^{<3110>}Amos 3:10) they treasure up iniquity, they lay up iniquity as it were in a storehouse, which will bring them a thousand calamities. The treasures of impiety or iniquity (^{<3102>}Proverbs 10:2) express ill-gotten riches. The treasures of iniquity, says the wise man, will eventually bring no profit; and, in the same sense, Christ calls the riches of iniquity mammon of unrighteousness, an estate wickedly acquired (^{<4149>}Luke 16:9). Gospel faith is the treasure of the just; but Paul says, “We have this treasure in earthen vessels” (^{<4047>}2 Corinthians 4:7). Isaiah says of a good man, “The fear of the Lord is his treasure” (33, 6). On the Scripture allusions to “hidden treasures” see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 195 sq.; Freeman, *Hand-book of Bible Manners*, p. 350 sq. **SEE STORE.**

Treasurer

(technically Heb. and Chald. **rBzlag** *gizbar*, ^{<4508>}Ezra 1:8; 7:21; Chald. also **rBdlag** *gidbar*, Daniel 3, 2, 3; impropr. **ksosoken**, ^{<2215>}Isaiah 22:15, an *associate*, i.e. the king’s intimate friend), an important officer in all Oriental courts. **SEE KING.** In ^{<2713>}Daniel 3:2,3, the Chald. **rzerda** *adargazer* (Sept. **τύραννος**, A.V. “judge”), occurs among the titles of Babylonian royal officers, and has (perhaps from the resemblance of the word to the Greek **γάλα**) been thought by some to mean the officers of the Turkish court and government, now called *defenders*, who have the charge of the receipts and disbursements of the *public* treasury. Gesenius and others conceive that the word means *chief judges* (from **rda**, *magnificent*, and **yrzg**, *deciders*); but Dr. Lee seems to prefer seeking its meaning in the Persian *adar*, fire, and *gazar*, passing; arid hence concludes that the *adargazerin* were probably officers of state who presided over the ordeals

by fire, and other matters connected with the government of Babylon. *SEE JUDGE.*

Treasurer, Ecclesiastical

the keeper of the treasures, e.g. the monuments, sacred vessels, relics, and valuables of a church, cathedral, or religious house. He was known by different names; *sacrist*, from having charge of the sacristy, *cellarer*, as providing the eucharistic elements and canonical bread and wine; *matricular*, as keeper of the inventory; *constre* in France and Germany; *custos* and *cimeliarch* in Italy; and in the Greek *scenophylax*. The *custos* had charge of all the contents of the Church, but at length became superintendent of deputies, discharging his personal duties, and at last took the title of treasurer, as having charge of the relics and valuables of the Church. He is the Old-English *cyrcward* and mediaeval perpetual *sacristan*, and now represented by the humbler *sexton*. Every necessary for the Church and divine service was furnished by him. The old title of *custos* descended before the 13th century to his church-service.

In order the treasurer usually succeeded the chancellor, and had a stall appointed to himself. His dignity was founded at York in the 11th century; at Chichester, Lichfield, Wells, Hereford, St. Paul's, in the 12th; and at St. David's and Llandaff in the 13th. It has been commonly preserved and exercised since the Reformation, both in English colleges and cathedrals, but has fallen into disuse at York, Lincoln, and Lichfield, and at Exeter, Llandaff, and Amiens is held by the bishop.

The monastic treasurer, or *bursar*, received all the rents, was auditor of all the officers accounts, paymaster of wages, and of the works done in the abbey. — Lee, *Gloss. of Liturg. Terms*, s.v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archceöl.* s.v.

Treasury

(usually $\Gamma\chi\omega\alpha$, *otsar*, a collection, often rendered “treasure;” sometimes Heb. $\mu\gamma\alpha\zeta\alpha\iota\mu$ *genazain* [^{<1710>} Esther 3:9; 4:1], or Chald. $\gamma\alpha\zeta\alpha\iota\mu$ *ginzin* [^{<1517>} Ezra 5:17; 6:1; 7:20, “treasure-house”], a store or deposit). *SEE ASUPPIM.* In [^{<1381>} 1 Chronicles 28:11, the treasury of the Temple is called עֲזָרָה *ganzak*; and means substantially the same as the $\kappa\omicron\rho\beta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ of [^{<1276>} Matthew 27:6, namely, the hoard of money contributed towards the expenses of that edifice. The same thing, or perhaps rather the place where the contribution-boxes for this purpose were kept, is designated in the New

Test. as the γαζοφυλάκιον (^{<4124>}Mark 12:41; ^{<210>}Luke 21:1; ^{<483>}John 8:20), and so likewise Josephus (*Ant.* 19:6,1; *War.* 5, 5, 2), after the Sept. (^{<1617>}Nehemiah 10:37; 13:4, 5, 8; ^{<178>}Esther 3:9). According to the rabbins this treasury was in the court of the women, where stood thirteen chests called *trumpets* from their form or funnel-shaped mouth, into which the Jews cast their offerings (comp. ^{<203>}Exodus 30:13 sq.). *SEE TEMPLE.*

Treat, Samuel

a Congregational minister, was born at Milford, Conn., in 1647 (or 1648), and graduated at Harvard College in 1669. He was ordained and settled at Eastham, Plymouth Colony, in 1672. Soon after his settlement he studied the Indian language, and devoted to the Indians-in his neighborhood much of his time and attention. Through his labors many of the savages were brought into a state of civilization and order, and not a few of them were converted to the Christian faith. In 1693 he wrote a letter to Increase Mather, in which he states that there were within the limits of Eastham five: hundred adult Indians, to whom he had for many years imparted the Gospel in their own language. He had under him four Indian teachers, who read in separate villages on every Sabbath, excepting every fourth, when he himself preached the sermons which he wrote for them. He procured schoolmasters, and persuaded the Indians to choose from among themselves six magistrates, who held regular courts. In 1700 he began to serve the new settlement of Truro, and performed parochial duties until a church was established. After having passed near half a century in the most benevolent exertions as a minister of the Gospel, he died, March 18, 1717. He published the *Confession of Faith* in the Nauset Indian language, and an *Election Sermon* (1713). See Sprague, *Annals of Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 183.

Treaty

SEE ALLIANCE.

Trecanum

an anthem sung after the communion, before the 6th century, in honor of the Holy Trinity; called by this name in Gaul. Some think it was the Apostles Creed. In the Greek Church there is a confession of the Holy Trinity sung after the *Ilagia Hagiois*. The latter form is mentioned by Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, and the Mozarabic and Gallican liturgies.

Tredischi, Nicholas

an eminent ecclesiastic, was a native of Sicily, born towards the close of the 14th century, and became one of the most celebrated canonists of his time. He was present at the Council of Basle, in which he took a prominent part, and was made a cardinal by Felix V in 1440.

Tree

Picture for Tree

prop. / [ʔets (δέσδρον), which also signifies *wood* (ξύλον); in ^{<2406>}Jeremiah 6:6, the fern. hx [ʔetsah, is used. Besides this generic term, there also occur peculiar words of a more distinct signification, e.g. **I vaē eshel** (^{<0216>}1 Samuel 22:6; 31:13; “grove” [q.v.] in ^{<0213>}Genesis 21:33), which is thought to denote the *tamarisk* or else the *terebbinth*; **I yaēyl** (^{<2613>}Isaiah 61:3; ^{<2514>}Ezekiel 31:14); Chald, **ʿl yaēdan** (^{<2700>}Daniel 4:10 sq.), prob. the *oak* (q.v.); **rdh; / [ʔets hadar** (“goodly tree,” ^{<0230>}Leviticus 23:40), **tba; / [ʔenis aboth** (“thick tree,” ver. 40; ^{<1685>}Nehemiah 8:15), and **I ax, tsel** (“shady tree,” ^{<1802>}Job 40:21, 22), which designate rather vigorous trees in general than specific varieties. **SEE TABERNACLES, FESTIVAL OF**. For a list of all the kinds of trees (including shrubs, plants, fruits, etc.) mentioned in the Bible, **SEE BOTANY**. See Taylor, *Trees of Scripture* (Lond. 1842).

In Eastern countries trees are not only graceful ornaments in the landscape, but essential to the comfort and support of the inhabitants. The Hebrews were forbidden to destroy the fruit-trees of their enemies in time of war, “for the tree of the field is man’s life” (^{<0309>}Deuteronomy 20:19, 20). Trees of any kind are not now very abundant in Palestine. Some trees are found, by an examination of the internal zones, to attain to a very long age. There are some in existence which are stated to have attained a longevity of three thousand years, and for some of them a still higher antiquity is claimed. Individual trees in Palestine are often notable for historical and sacred associations (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 151). **SEE ALLON-BACHUTH; SEE MEONENIM**.

Tree Of Life

etc. Whatever may have been the frame and texture of Adam's body while in Eden, it is certain that, being "of the earth, it was earthy," and was thus liable to disease and exposed to decay; just as his soul; at the same time, was liable to the greater evil of temptation by being exposed to the power of the tempter. Hence, while "every tree of the garden was given for food," the tree of life, in the midst of the garden, was provided by Infinite Wisdom as the appointed antidote of disease or decay of the body while, at the same time, the enjoyment of spiritual life, or the indwelling of the spirit of God, and the right of access to the tree of life, thus securing immortality, were conditioned on our first parents not eating the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge (~~(GEN)~~ Genesis 2:9-17). The various references to the "tree of life" evidently consider it to have been the divinely appointed medium for securing the immortality of our first parents (~~(PROV)~~ Proverbs 3:18; 11:30; ~~(EZEK)~~ Ezekiel 47:12; ~~(REV)~~ Revelation 2:7; 22:2,14). See Reineccius, *De Arbore Vitae* (Weissenf. 1722). **SEE LIFE.**

The *tree of the knowledge of good and evil*, of which they were forbidden to eat under penalty of excision from the tree of life, and consequent death, which also occupied a conspicuous place in the garden, was the divinely appointed test of good and evil, the means whereby God would try and prove the faithfulness and obedience of our first parents. It was the test of moral' good and evil, i.e. of holiness and sin, and of consequent happiness or misery (~~(GEN)~~ Genesis 3:1-24). When, through the instigation of the tempter, the first human pair disregarded the command of their Creator and partook of the fruit of the prohibited tree, they lost the indwelling of the spirit of God, and forfeited the right of access to the tree of life. On that day the sentence of death was awarded to the guilty pair. They were now dead in the eve of the divine law, and the same condemnation passed upon the whole race of man. By partaking of the forbidden tree, they obtained an experimental sense of the distinction between good and evil. Hence their expulsion from Eden and removal from the tree of life was an act of mercy as well as of justice; for, had they been allowed to retain the use of the tree of life, it would, in their condition, have sustained them in an immortality of guilt and misery. See Miller, *De Abode Boni et Mali, et Arb. Vitae* (Lips. 1755); *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1862; Jan. and Oct. 1864. **SEE EDEN.**

Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux, LL.D.

an eminent English Biblical scholar, was born at Falmouth, Jan. 30, 1813. After receiving an education at the Falmouth Classical School, he was employed in the iron-works at Neath Abbey, Glamorganshire, 1828-34, and became, in 1836, a private tutor in Falmouth. Devoting himself to the study of the Scriptures, he visited the Continent several times for the purpose of collating the principal uncial MSS. At Rome he was permitted to see the Vatican MS., but not to copy it. He received his degree of LL.D. from St. Andrew's University in 1850, and in 1863 received an annual pension of one hundred pounds. Of Quaker parentage, he became associated with the Plymouth: Brethren was an active philanthropist, and was appointed a member of the company on the revision of the A. V. of the Old Test. Dr. Tregelles died at Plymouth, April 24, 1875. He published, *Englishman's Greek Concordance to the New Test.* (1839, imp. 8vo; 2d ed. 1844, imp. 8vo; *Index to*, 1845, imp. 8vo): — *Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance to the Old Test.* (1843, 2 vols. imp. 8vo): — *Book of Revelation in Greek*, etc. (1844, 8vo): — *Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old-Test. Scriptures*, etc. (1847, 4to; last ed. 1857, 4to): — *Remarks on the Prophetic Visions of the Book of Daniel* (1847, 8vo; 4th ed. with notes, and *Defense of the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel*, also published separately, 1852, 8vo): — *Book of Revelation, Translated from the Ancient Greek Text* (1848, 12mo; 1858, 12mo): — *Prospectus of a Critical Edition of the Greek New Test.*, etc. (Plymouth, 1848, 12mo): *On the Original Language of St. Matthew's Gospel* (Lond. 1850, 8vo): — *The Jansenists: their Rise*, etc. (1851, 8vo): *Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the Authorship*, etc., *of the Books of the New Test.* (1852, small 8vo): *Heads of Hebrew Grammar* (1852, 8vo): — *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Test.* etc. (1854, 8vo): — *The Greek New Test. Edited from Ancient Authorities*, etc. (1857-72); this last is considered his most important work: — *Codex Zacynthius* (1861, small foil.): *Canon Muratorianus*, earliest catalogue of books of the New Test. (Camb. and Lond. 1868, 4to). For full description of works, see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Trelawney, Sir Harry

an English baronet, was born in 1756, and was educated at Christ Church College, Oxford. He was in succession a preacher among the Methodists, then served a Presbyterian congregation at West Loo, Cornwall, and

afterwards seceded to the Rational Dissenters; Returning to the Church of England, he obtained a rectory in the west of England, and was made prebendary of Exeter in 1789. According to Allibone, he died a Roman Catholic, at Laverno, Italy, in 1834. He published a sermon on ~~1~~1 Corinthians 3:9, *Ministers Laborers together with God* (Lond. 1778, 4to). See *Lond. Gent. Mag.* 1834, 1, 652; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.*, s.v.

Trelawney, Sir Jonathan

an English baronet and prelate, born in 1648, was ordained bishop of Bristol in 1685, translated to Exeter in 1689, and to Winchester in 1707. He was one of the seven bishops committed to the Tower in the reign of James II. His death occurred in 1721. He published a sermon on ~~628~~Joshua 23:8, 9, *Thanksgiving for Victory* (Lond. 1702, 4to): *Caution against False Doctrine* (1704, 12mo). See *Lond. Gent. Mag.* 1827, 2, 409; *State Trials* (Howell's ed.), 12:182, 187; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.

Tremellius, Emmanuel

a learned Protestant divine, was born at Ferrara in 1510. By birth a Jew, he was educated in the Jewish faith; but he was converted to Christianity by the teaching, it is said, of cardinal Pole and M. A. Flaminio. Through the influence of Peter Martyr he soon after joined the Reformation party, and became an active propagator of their views. Having left Italy, he visited Germany and England, where he lived in intimacy with archbishops Cranmer and Parker, and for some time supported himself by teaching Hebrew at Cambridge. On the death of Edward VI he returned to Germany, where he remained teaching Hebrew at Hornbach and Heidelberg. He was next invited to occupy the Hebrew chair at Sedan, where he died in 1580. His works are: *Rudimenta Lig. Heb.* (Wittenb, 1541): — **hy yryj b wnh**, *Initiatio Electorum Domini*, a catechism in Hebrew (Par. 1551, 1552; Strasb. 1554; Leyd. 1591): — *Gam. Chald. et Syr.*, prefixed to *Interpretatio 'Syr. N.T. Hebraicis Typis Descripta* (Par. 1569): — *Biblia Sacra, sive Libb. Canon. Latini recens ex leb. Facti* (Francof. 1579; Lond. 1580). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 443; Kitto, *Cyclop.* . 5.; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 140; Kalkar, *Israel und (lie Kirche*, p. 73 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* I, 3, 4, No. 1797; Butters, *Emmanuel Tremellius* (Zweibrücken, 1859); Delitzsch, *Saat auf Hoffnung* (Erlangen,

1865), 4:28 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 469 sq.; Adams, *History of the Jews*, 2, 71. (B. P.)

Trench

(prop. **hl f; Tæ** *æalah*, ^{<1182>}1 Kings 18:32, 35, 38, a *channel*, or “conduit,” as elsewhere), a kind of ditch cut into the earth for the purpose of receiving and draining the water from adjacent parts. Something of this kind was the trench cut by the prophet Elijah to contain the water which he ordered to be poured on his sacrifice (ver. 32), and which, when filled to the brim with water, was entirely exhausted, evaporated, by the fire of the Lord which consumed the sacrifice. *SEE ELIJAH.*

Trench

(**l yj** *æcheyl*, ^{<1005>}2 Samuel 20:15, a wall, rampart, or bulwark, as elsewhere rendered; **l G; mi** *magal*, ^{<1215>}1 Samuel 26:5, 7; or **hl G; m** *magaldh*, 17:20, a wagon-rut, hence a defense formed by the vehicles of an army; **χάρξ**, ^{<1218>}Luke 19:43, a *mound* [Lat. *vallum*] for blockading a besieged city, formed of the earth thrown out of a moat and stuck with sharp sticks or palisades) is also a military term, and denotes one description of the approaches to a fortified town. They were anciently used to surround a town, to enclose the besieged, and to secure the besiegers against attacks from them. Trenches could not be cut in a rock; and it is probable that, when our Lord says of Jerusalem (^{<1218>}Luke 19:43), Thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee, meaning, “they shall raise a wall of enclosure,” he foretold what the Jews would barely credit from the nature of the case; perhaps what they considered as impossible: yet the providence of God has so ordered it that we have evidence to this fact in Josephus, who says that Titus exhorting his soldiers, they surrounded Jerusalem with a wall in the space of three days, although the general opinion had pronounced it impossible. This circumvolution prevented any escape from the city, and deterred from all attempts at relief by succors going into it. *SEE SIEGE.*

Trendelenburg, Friedrich Adolf

a German philosopher, was born at Eutin, near Lubeck, Nov. 30, 1802; and was educated at the gymnasium of his native town, and at the universities of Kiel, Leipsic, and Berlin. From 1826 to 1833 he was private tutor in the family of postmaster-general Von Nagler, and in the latter year

was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy at Berlin. This position was exchanged, in 1837, for that of professor in ordinary. He was elected a member of the Berlin academy in 1846, and was its secretary in the "historico-philosophical" section from 1847 until his death, Jan. 24, 1872. "On that very day the journals announced his decoration by the king as a knight of the Order of Merit, for his eminence in science and art." "The foundation of Trendelenburg's doctrine is essentially Platonic and Aristotelian." He terms his philosophy the "organic view" of the world; and according to it each lower stage in existence is the basis of the higher stages, and necessarily involved in the higher. The soul is the self-realizing idea of man. God is the unconditioned, not directly demonstrable, but implied, with logical necessity, in the whole fabric of the universe and of human thought. Among Trendelenburg's works are, *Elementa Logices Aristotelice* (Berlin, 1837; 6th ed. 1868): — *Logische Untersuchungen* (ibid. 1840; 3d ed. 1870): — *Erläuterungen zu den Elementen der aristotelischen Logik* (2d ed. 1861): — *Naturrecht auf dem Grunde der Ethik* (2d ed. 1868). See Bonitz, *Zur Erinnerung an F. A. Trendelenburg* (Berlin, 1872); Bratuschek, *Adolf Trendelenburg* (ibid. 1873); Prantl, *Gedächtnissrede auf F. A. Trendelenburg* (Munich, 1873); Ueberweg, *Hist. of Modern Phil.* (see Index).

Trendelenburg, Johann Georg

a German professor of ancient languages, was born Feb. 22, 1757. For a number of years he was professor of languages at the academic gymnasium in Dantzig, where he died March 11, 1825. He published, *Primi Libri Maccabaeorum Graeci, Textus cum Veissione Syriaca Collatio Instituta* (reprinted in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, 15:59): — *Chrestomathia Flaviana, sive Loci Illustres ex Flavio Josep̄ho Delecti et Aniadversionibus Illustrati* (Lips. 1789): — *Chrestomachia Hexaplaris* (ibid. 1794) — *Commentatio in Veba Novissima Davidis* ¹⁰²⁰2 Samuel 23:1-7 (Gött. 1779): — *Die ersten Azirnungsgründe der hebr. Sprache* (Dantzig, 1784). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 443; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur.*, 2, 807. (B.P.)

Trent, The Council Of (Concilium Tridentinum)

was held in Trent, a city of Tyrol, Austria, on the left bank of the Adige. It has a cathedral built entirely of marble in the Byzantine style. In the Church of St. Maria Maggiore are the portraits of the members of the council,

which was held in this building. This council was first convoked June 2, 1536, by pope Paul III, to be held at Mantua, May 23, 1537. Subsequently, the duke of Mantua having refused to permit the assembling of the council in that city, the pope prorogued the meeting to November, without naming any place. Afterwards, by another bull, he prorogued it till May, 1538, and named Vicenza as the place of assembly; nominating in the meantime certain cardinals and prelates to look into the question of reform, who, in consequence, drew up a long report upon the subject, in which they divide the abuses needing correction into two heads:

1. Those concerning the Church in general.
2. Those peculiar to the Church of Rome. When the time arrived, however, not a single bishop appeared at Vicenza; whereupon the pope again prorogued the council to Easter, 1539, and subsequently forbade its assembling until he should signify his pleasure upon the subject. At last, at the end of three years, in the year 1542. after much dispute between the pope, the emperor, and the other princes in the Roman communion as to the place in which the council should be holden, the pope's proposition that it should take place at Trent was agreed to; whereupon the bull was published, May 22, convoking the council to Trent on Nov. 1 in that year. Subsequently he named, as his legate in the council, cardinal John del Monte, bishop of Palestina; the cardinal-priest of Sainte-Croix, Marcellus Cervinus; and the cardinal-deacon Reginald Pole. However, difficulties arose, which caused the opening of the council to be further delayed, and the first meeting was not held until December, 1545. The great importance of this council in the history of the Reformation, and in Roman Catholic doctrine since, justifies an unusually full treatment of it here.

Session I (Dec. 13, 1545). When the council was opened there were present the three legates, four archbishops, and twenty-two bishops, in their pontifical vestments. Mass was said by the cardinal del Monte, and a sermon preached by the bishop of Bitonte; after which the bull given Nov. 19, 1544, and that of February, 1545, were read, and cardinal del Monte explained the objects which were proposed in assembling the council, viz. the extirpation of heresy, the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline, the reformation of morals, and the restoration of peace and unity.

On Dec. 18 and 22 congregations were held, in which some discussion arose about the care and order to be observed by prelates in their life and behavior during the council.

On Jan. 5 another congress was held, in which cardinal del Monte proposed that the order to be observed in conducting the business of the council should be the same with that at the last Council of Lateran, where the examination of the different matters had been entrusted to different bishops, who for that purpose had been divided into three classes; and when the decrees relating to any matter had been drawn up, they were submitted to the consideration of a general congregation; so that all was done without any disputing and discussion in the sessions. A dispute arose in this congregation about the style to be given to the council in the decrees. The pope had decreed that they should run in this form, "The Holy (Ecumenical and General Council of Trent, the Legates of the Apostolic See presiding;" but the Gallican bishops, and many of the Spaniards and Italians, insisted that the words "representing the Universal Church" should be added. This, however, the legates refused, remembering that such had been the form used in the councils of Constance and Basle, and fearing lest, if this addition were made, the rest of the form of Constance and Basle might follow, viz., "which derives its power immediately from Jesus Christ, and to which every person, of whatever dignity, not excepting the pope, is bound to yield obedience."

Session 11 (Jan. 7, 1546). — At this session forty-three prelates were present. Abul was read prohibiting the proctors of absent prelates to vote; also another, exhorting all the faithful then in Trent to live in the fear of God, and to fast and pray. The learned were exhorted to give their attention to the question how the rising heresies could be best extinguished. The question about the style of the council was again raised.

In the following congregation, Jan. 13, the same question was again debated. Nothing was settled in this matter, and they then proceeded to deliberate upon which of the three subjects proposed to be discussed in the council (viz. the extirpation of heresy, the reformation of discipline, and the restoration of peace) should be first handled. Three prelates were appointed to examine the procuration papers and excuses of absent bishops.

In the next congregation the deliberations on the subject to be first proposed in the council were resumed. Some wished that the question of reform should be first opened; others, on the contrary, maintained that questions relating to the faith demanded immediate notice. A third party, among whom was Thomas Campeggio, bishop of Feltri, asserted that the

two questions of doctrine and reformation were inseparable, and must be treated of together. This latter opinion ultimately prevailed, but at the moment the sense of the assembly was so divided that no decision was arrived at.

In the congregation held Jan. 22, the party in favor of entering at once upon the subject of reform was much increased, but the three legates continued their opposition to their scheme. Subsequently, however, they proposed that they should always take into consideration together one subject relating to the faith and one relating to reform, bearing one upon the other.

On the 24th a curious dispute arose about the proper seal for the use of the council. Some desired that a new seal should be made; but the legates succeeded in having the seal of the first legate attached to the synodal letters.

Session III (Feb. 4, 1546). — In this session nothing was done except to recite the Creed, word for word.

In a congress held Feb. 22, the legates proposed that the council should enter upon the subject of the Holy Scriptures; and four doctrinal articles were presented, extracted by the theologians from the writings of Luther upon the subject of Holy Scripture, which they affirmed to be contrary to the orthodox faith.

- 1.** That all the articles of the Christian faith necessary to be believed are contained in Holy Scripture; and that it is sacrilege to hold the oral traditions of the Church to be of equal authority with the Old and New Test.
- 2.** That only such books as the Jews acknowledged ought to be received into the canon of the Old Test.; and that the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse should be erased from the canon of the New Test.
- 4.** That Holy Scripture is easy to be understood, and clear, and that no gloss or commentary is needed, but only the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

The first two articles were debated in the four following congregations. As to the first article, the congregation came to the decision that the Christian

faith is contained partly in Holy Scripture and partly in the traditions of the Church. Upon the second article much discussion arose. All agreed in receiving all the books read in the Roman Church, including the Apocryphal books, alleging the authority of the catalogues drawn up in the councils of Laodicea and Carthage, and those under Innocent I and Gelasius I; but there were four opinions as to the method to be observed in drawing up the catalogue. One party wished to divide the books into two classes—one containing those which have always been received without dispute, the other containing those which had been doubted. The second party desired a threefold division: 1. Containing the undoubted books; 2. Those which had been at one time suspected, but since received; 3. Those which had never been recognized, as seven of the Apocryphal books, and some chapters in Daniel and Esther. The third party wished that no distinction should be made; and the fourth that all the books contained in the Latin Vulgate should be declared to be canonical and inspired.

The discussion was resumed on March 8, but not decided; the members, however, unanimously agreed that the traditions of the Church are equal in authority to Holy Scripture.

In the following congregation it was decided that the catalogue of the books of Holy Scripture should be drawn up without any of the proposed distinctions, and that they should be declared to be all of equal authority.

The authority of the Latin Vulgate (declared in the third article to be full of errors) came under consideration in subsequent congregations, and it was almost unanimously declared to be authentic. With regard to the fourth article, it was agreed that in interpreting Scripture men must be guided by the voice of the fathers and of the Church.

Session IV (April 8, 1546). — Between sixty and seventy prelates attended this session. Two decrees were read: 1. Upon the canon of Scripture, which declares that the holy council receives all the books of the Old and New Test. as well as all the traditions of the Church respecting faith and morals, as having proceeded from the lips of Jesus Christ himself, or as having been dictated by the Holy Spirit and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continued succession; and that it looks upon both the written and unwritten Word with equal respect. After this the decree enumerates the books received as canonical by the Church of Rome, and as they are found in the Vulgate, and anathematizes all who refuse to acknowledge them as such. The second decree declares the authenticity of the Vulgate,

forbids all private interpretation of it, and orders that no copies be printed or circulated without authority, under penalty of fine and anathema.

In another congregation the abuses relating to lecturers on Holy Scripture and preachers were discussed; also those arising from the non-residence of bishops. After this the question of original sin came under consideration, and nine articles taken from the Lutheran books were drawn up and offered for examination, upon which some discussion took place. Ultimately, however, a decree was drawn up upon the subject, divided into five canons.

1. Treats of the personal sin of Adam.
2. Of the transmission of that sin to his posterity.
3. Of its remedy, i.e. holy baptism.
4. Of infant baptism.
5. Of the concupiscence which still remains in those who have been baptized.

A great dispute arose between the Franciscans and Dominicans—concerning the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin. The Franciscans insisted that she should be specially declared to be free from the taint of original sin; the Dominicans, on the other hand, maintained that, although the Church had tolerated the opinion concerning the immaculate conception, it was sufficiently clear that the Virgin was not exempt from the common infection of our nature. A decree of reformation, in two chapters, was also read.

Session V (June 17, 1546). — In this session the decree concerning original sin was passed, containing the five canons mentioned above, enforced by anathemas. Afterwards the fathers declared that it was not their intention to include the Virgin in this decree, and that upon this subject the constitutions of pope Sixtus IV were to be followed, thus leaving the immaculate conception an open question.

In a congregation held June 18, they proceeded to consider the questions relating to grace and good works. Also the subject of residence of bishops and pastors was discussed. The cardinal del Monte and some of the fathers attributed the heresies and disturbances which had arisen to the non-residence of bishops, while many of the bishops maintained that they were

to be attributed to the multitudes of friars and other privileged persons whom the pope permitted to wander about and preach in spite of the bishops, who, in consequence, could do no good even if they were in residence.

In the congregation held June 30, twenty-five articles, professedly drawn up from the Lutheran writings on the subject of justification, were proposed for examination. Some of these articles seem well to have merited the judgment passed upon them; thus, among others,

5. Declares that repentance for *past* sin is altogether unnecessary if a man lead a new life.

7. The fear of hell is a sin, and makes the sinner worse.

8. Contrition arising from meditation upon, and sorrow for, past sin makes a man a great sinner.

11. Faith alone is required; the only sin is unbelief; other things are neither commanded nor forbidden.

12. He who has faith is free from the precepts of the law, and has no need of works in order to be saved; nothing that a believer can do is so sinful that it can either accuse or condemn him.

13. No sin separates from God's grace but want of faith.

14. Faith and works are contrary to one another; to teach the latter is to destroy the former, etc. At this time the three ambassadors of the king of France arrived—viz. Durse, LigniBres, and Pierre Danez. The last mentioned delivered a long discourse, in the course of which he entreated the council to suffer no attack to be made upon the privileges of the kingdom and Church of France.

In a congregation held Aug. 20, the subject of justification was again warmly discussed, as well as the doctrine of Luther concerning free-will and predestination. Upon this latter subject nothing worthy of censure was found in the writings of Luther or in the Confession of Augsburg; but eight articles were drawn up for examination from the writings of the Zwinglians. Upon some of these there was much difference of opinion. By the advice of the bishop of Sinagaglia, the canons drawn up embodying the decrees of the council were divided into two sets — one set, which they called the *decrees of doctrine*, contained the Catholic faith upon the

subjects decided; the others, called *canons*, stated, condemned, and anathematized the doctrines contrary to that faith. These decrees were mainly composed by cardinal SainteCroix, who bestowed infinite pains upon them; at least one hundred congregations were held upon the subject. Afterwards they returned to the consideration of the reform of the Church, and to the question about episcopal residence. Most of the theologians present, especially the Dominicans, maintained that residence was a matter not merely canonically binding, but of divine injunction. The Spaniards held the same opinion. The legates, seeing that the discussion tended to bring the papal authority and power into question, endeavored to put a stop to it.

Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547). — In this session the decree concerning doctrine was read; it contained sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons against heretics.

These chapters declare that sinners are brought into a state to receive justification when excited and helped by grace, and, believing the word of God, they freely turn to God, believing all that he has revealed and promised, especially that the sinner is justified by the grace of God, given to him through the redemptions of Jesus Christ; and when, acknowledging their sinfulness and filled with a salutary fear of God's justice, yet trusting to his mercy, they conceive hope and confidence that God will be favorable to them for the sake of Jesus Christ, and thereupon begin to love him as the only source of all righteousness, and to turn from their sins through the hatred which they have conceived against them, i.e. through that repentance which all must feel before baptism; in short, when they resolve to be baptized, to lead a new life, and to follow the commandments of God.

After this the decree explains the nature and effects of justification, saying that it does not consist merely in the remission of sin, but also in sanctification and inward renewal. That the *final* cause of justification is the glory of God and of Jesus Christ and eternal life; the *efficient* cause is God himself, who, of his mercy, freely washes and sanctifies by the seal and unction of the Holy Spirit, who is the pledge of our inheritance; the *meritorious* cause is our Lord Jesus Christ, his beloved and only Son; the *instrumental* cause is the sacrament of baptism, without which no one can be justified; and, finally, the *formal* cause is the righteousness of God given to each, not that righteousness by which he is righteous in himself, but that by which he makes us righteous; i.e. with which being endued by him, we

become renewed in our hearts, and are not merely accounted righteous, but are made really so by receiving, as it were, righteousness in ourselves, each according to the measure given to us at the will of the Holy Spirit and in proportion to the proper disposition and co-operation of each. Thus the sinner, by means of this ineffable grace, becomes truly righteous, a friend of God, and an heir of everlasting life; and it is the Holy Spirit who works this marvelous change in him by forming holy habits in his heart-habits of faith, hope, and charity — which unite him closely to Jesus Christ and make of him a lively member of his body; but no man, although justified, is to imagine himself exempt from the observation of God's commandments. No man may dare, under pain of anathema, to utter such a rash notion as that it is impossible for a man, even after justification, to keep God's commandments; since God commands nothing impossible, but with the commandment he desires us to do all that we can, and to seek for aid and grace to enable us to fulfill that which in our natural strength we cannot do.

The decree further teaches upon this subject that no man may presume upon the mysterious subject of predestination so as to assure himself of being among the number of the elect and predestined to eternal life, as if, having been justified, it were impossible to commit sin again, or, at least, as if falling into sin after justification, he must of necessity be raised again; that, without a special revelation from God, it is impossible to know who are those whom he has chosen. It also teaches the same of perseverance, concerning which it declares that he who perseveres to the end shall be saved; that no one in this life can promise himself an absolute assurance of perseverance, although all ought to put entire confidence in God's assistance, who will finish and complete the good work which he has begun in us by working in us to will and to do, if we do not of ourselves, fail of his grace.

Further, they who by sin have fallen from grace given, and justification, may be justified again when God awakens them; and this is done by means of the sacrament of *penance*, in which, through the merits of Jesus Christ, they may recover the grace which they have lost; and this is the proper method of recovery for those who have fallen. It was for the benefit of those who fall into sin after baptism that our Lord Jesus Christ instituted the sacrament of penance, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained. Hence it follows that the repentance of a Christian fallen into sin after baptism is to be clearly distinguished from the

repentance required at holy baptism; for it not alone requires him to cease from sin, and to view his vileness with horror— i.e. to have all humble and contrite heart-but it also implies the sacramental confession of his sin, at least in will, and the absolution of the priest, together with such satisfaction as he can make by means of fasting, alms-giving, prayer, etc. Not that anything that he can do can help towards obtaining the remission of the *eternal* punishment due to sin, which is remitted together with the sin by the sacrament of penance (or by the desire to receive that sacrament where it cannot be had), but such satisfaction is necessary to attain remission of the *temporal* penalties attached to sin, which are not always remitted in the case of those who, ungrateful to God for the blessing which they have received, have grieved the Holy Spirit and profaned the temple of God. This grace of justification may be lost, not only through the sin of infidelity, by which faith itself is lost, but also by every kind of mortal sin, even though faith be not lost.

These chapters were accompanied by thirty-three canons, which anathematize those who hold the opinions specified in them contrary to the tenor of the doctrine contained in the chapters.

Besides this decree, another was published in this session, relating to the Reformation, containing five chapters upon the subject of residence.

It renews the ancient canons against non-resident prelates, and declares that every prelate, whatever be his dignity, being absent for six months together from his diocese, without just and sufficient cause, shall be deprived of the fourth part of his revenue;. and that if he remain away during the rest of the year, he shall lose another' fourth; that if his absence be prolonged beyond this, the metropolitan shall be obliged, under pain of being interdicted from entering the church, to present him to the pope, who shall either punish him for give his church to a more worthy shepherd; that if it be the metropolitan himself who is in fault, the oldest of his suffragans shall, be obliged to present him.

The decree then goes on to treat of the reform of ecclesiastics, both secular and regular; of the visitation of chapters by the ordinary; and declares that bishops may not perform any episcopal function whatever out of their own dioceses without the consent of the bishop of the place.

Before the seventh session a congregation was held, in which it was agreed to treat in the next, place of the sacraments; and thirty-six articles, taken

from the Lutheran books, were proposed for examination, after which thirty canons on the subject were drawn up— viz. thirteen on the sacraments in general, fourteen on baptism, and three on confirmation. They relate to their number, their necessity, excellence, the manner in which they confer grace, which they declared to be *ex opere operato*, i.e. that the sacraments confer grace upon all those recipients who do not, by mortal sin, offer a bar to its reception; e.g. grace is conferred by baptism upon infants, although they bring with them no pious affections. They also drew up a decree declaring that the sacraments ought always to be administered gratuitously.

After this the question of reformation was discussed; among other things, it was debated whether a plurality of benefices requiring residence is forbidden by the divine law.

Session VII (March 3, 1547). — In this session the thirty canons above noted relating to the sacraments were read, together with the accompanying anathemas. Among the thirteen on the sacraments in general were the following:

- 1.** Anathematizes those who maintain that the seven sacraments were not all instituted by Jesus Christ.
- 3.** Anathematizes those who maintain that any one sacrament is of more worth than another.
- 8.** Anathematizes those who deny that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*, i.e. by their own proper virtue.
- 9.** Anathematizes those who deny that baptism, orders, and confirmation imprint an ineffaceable character.
- 10.** Anathematizes those who maintain that all Christians, male and female, may preach God's word and administer the sacraments.
- 11.** Anathematizes those who deny that the intention of the minister to do what the Church does is necessary to the effectual administration of the sacraments.
- 12.** Anathematizes those who maintain that the sin of the minister invalidates the sacrament,

13. Anathematizes those who maintain that the minister may ‘change the prescribed form.

Among the fourteen canons on baptism:

2. Anathematizes those who assert that real and natural water is not necessary in baptism.

3. Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church of Rome does not teach the true doctrine on the subject of baptism.

4. Anathematizes those who deny the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, in the name of the blessed Trinity, and with the intention to do what the Church does.

5. Anathematizes those who maintain that baptism is not necessary to salvation.

7. Anathematizes those who maintain that the baptized need only believe, and not keep the law of God.

10. Anathematizes those who maintain that sin after baptism is remitted by faith.

11. Anathematizes those who maintain that apostates from the faith should be again baptized.

12. Anathematizes those who maintain that no one ought to be baptized until he is of the age at which our Lord was baptized, or at the point of death.

13. Anathematizes those who deny that baptized infants are not to be reckoned among the faithful.

14. Anathematizes those who maintain that persons baptized in infancy should, when they come of age, be asked whether they are willing to ratify the promise made in their name.

Secondly, the decree of reformation, containing fifteen chapters, relative to the election of bishops, pluralities, etc., was passed.

In a congregation which followed, the question of transferring the council to some other place was discussed, a report having been circulated that a contagious disease had broken out in Trent.

Session VIII (March 11, 1547). — In this session a decree was read transferring the council to Bologna, which was approved by about two thirds of the assembly; the rest, who were mostly Spaniards or other subjects of the emperor, strongly opposed the translation. The emperor complained much of the transfer of the council, and ordered the prelates who had opposed it to remain at Trent, which they did.

Session IX (April 21, 1547). — In the first session held at Bologna, the legates and thirty-four bishops were present. A decree was read postponing all business to the next session, to be held on June 2 ensuing, in order to give time for the prelates to arrive.

Session X (June 2, 1547). — At this session, however, there were but six archbishops, thirty-six bishops, one abbot, and two generals of orders present; the rest continuing to sit at Trent. It was deemed advisable to prorogue the session to Sept. 15 ensuing; but the quarrel between the pope and the emperor having now assumed a more serious aspect, the council remained suspended for four years in spite of the solicitations. made by the German bishops to the pope that the sessions of the council might continue.

In 1549, Paul III died, and the cardinal del Monte having been elected in his place, under the name of Julius III, he issued a bull, dated March 14, 1551, directing the re-establishment of the Council of Trent, and naming as his legates, Marcellus Crescentio; cardinal; Sebastian Pighino, archbishop of Siponto; and Aloysijus Lipomanes, bishop of Verona.

Session XI (May 1, 1551). — The next session was held at Trent, when cardinal Crescentio caused a decree to be read to the effect that the council was reopened, and that the next session should be held on Sept. 1 following—

Session XII (Sept. 1, 1551). — In this session, an exhortation was read in the name of the presidents of the council, in which the power and authority of ecumenical councils were extolled; then followed a decree declaring that the subject of the Eucharist should be treated of in the next session. Afterwards, the earl of Montfort, ambassador from the emperor, demanded to be admitted to the council, which was agreed to. James Amyot, the ambassador of Henry II of France, presented a letter from his master, which, after some opposition, was read; it explained why no French bishop had been permitted to attend the council. Afterwards, Amyot, on the part

of Henry, made a formal protest against the Council of Trent, in which he complained of the conduct of Julius III.

In the congregation following, the question of the Eucharist was treated of, and ten articles selected from the doctrine of Zwingli and Luther were proposed for examination.

1. That the body and blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist only in a figure, not really.
2. That the Lord's body is eaten, not sacramentally, but only spiritually and by faith.
3. That no transubstantiation takes place in the Eucharist, but a hypostatic union of the human nature of Christ with the bread and wine.
4. That the Eucharist was instituted for the remission of sins only.
5. That Jesus Christ in the Eucharist is not to be adored, and that to do so is to commit idolatry.
6. That the holy sacrament ought not to be kept; and that no person may communicate alone.
7. That the body of Christ is not in the fragments which remain after communion; but it is so present only during the time of receiving, and not afterwards.
8. That it is sin to refuse to the faithful the communion in both kinds.
9. That under one species is not contained the same as under both.
10. That faith alone is required in order to communicate; that confession ought to be voluntary, and that communion at Easter is not necessary.

In another congregation the question of reform was discussed, the subject of episcopal jurisdiction was brought forward, and a regulation drawn up concerning appeals. No appeal from the judgment of the bishop and his officials was allowed, except in criminal cases, without consulting with civil judgments; and even in criminal cases it was not permitted to appeal from interlocutory sentences until a definitive sentence had been passed. The ancient right of the bishops to give sentence in the provincial synods was not, however, restored. The power was left to the pope of judging *by* means of commissioners delegated *in partibus*.

Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551). — The decree concerning the Eucharist was read Sept. 13, and was contained in eight chapters.

1. Declares that after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, very God' and very again, is verily, really, and substantially contained under the species of these sensible objects; that it is a sin to endeavor to put a metaphorical sense upon the words in which our Lord instituted the holy sacrament; that the Church has always believed the actual body and the actual blood, together with his soul and his divinity, to be present under the species of bread and wine after consecration.

3. That each kind, contains, the same as they both together do, for Jesus Christ is entire-under the species of bread, and under the smallest particle of that species, as also under the species of wine, and under the smallest portion of it.

4. That in the consecration of the bread and wine there is made a conversion and change of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of our Lord's body, and a change of the whole substance of the wine into that of his blood, which change has been fitly and properly termed "transubstantiation."

5. That the worship of Latria is rightly rendered by the faithful to the holy sacrament of the altar.

8. That there are three modes of communication- (1) sacramentally, as in the case of sinners; (2) spiritually, as they do who receive only in will and by faith; (3) both sacramentally and spiritually, as they do who actually receive, and with faith and proper dispositions. To this decree there were added eleven canons, anathematizing those who held certain heretical doctrines on the subject of the holy Eucharist, and especially those contained in the ten articles proposed for examination in the congregation held Sept. 2.

Thus, can. 1 condemns the opinion contained in the first of those articles; can. 2, that contained in art. 3; can. 3, that contained in art. 9; can. 4, that contained in art. 7; can. 5, that contained in art. 4; can. 6, that contained in art. 5; can. 7, that contained in art. 6; can. 8, that contained in art. 2; can. 9, that contained in art. 10; can. 10 condemns those who deny that the priest may communicate alone; and can. 11 condemns those who maintain that faith alone, without confession, is a sufficient preparation for the

communion.' Afterwards, a decree of reformation, containing eight chapters, was read; the subject of it was the jurisdiction of bishops.

In a congregation held after this session, twelve articles on the subjects of penance and extreme unction were examined, taken from the writings of Luther and his disciples. In a subsequent congregation the decrees and canons upon the subject were brought forward, together with a decree in fifteen chapters on reform.

Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551). — In this session the decree upon penance; in nine chapters, was read.

- 1.** States that our Lord chiefly instituted the sacrament of penance when he breathed upon his disciples, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," etc.; and the council condemns those who refuse to acknowledge that by these words our Lord communicated to his apostles and to their successors the power of remitting or retaining sins after baptism.
- 2.** That in this sacrament the priest exercises the function of judge.
- 3.** That the form of the sacrament, in which its force and virtue resides, is contained in the words of the absolution pronounced by the priest, "Ego te absolvo," etc.; that the penitential acts are contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are, as it were, the matter of the sacrament.
- 4.** The council defines contrition to be an inward sorrow for, and hatred of, the sin committed, accompanied by a firm resolution to cease from it in future. With respect to imperfect contrition, called attrition, arising merely from the shame and disgracefulness of sin, or from the fear of punishment, the council declares that if it be accompanied by a hope of forgiveness, and excludes the desire to commit sin, it is a gift of God and 'a motion of the Holy Spirit; and that,' fair from rendering a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, it disposes him (*disponit*) to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of penance.
- 5.** The decree then goes on to establish the necessity of confessing every mortal sin which, by diligent self-examination, can be brought to remembrance. With regard to venial sins, it states that it is not absolutely necessary to confess them, and that they may be expiated in many other ways.

6. As to the minister of this sacrament, it declares that the power of binding and loosing is, by Christ's appointment, in the priest only; that this power consists not merely in *declaring* the remission of sins, but in the judicial act by which they are remitted.

7. As to the reserved cases, it declares it to be important to the maintenance of good discipline that certain atrocious crimes should not be absolved by every priest, but be reserved for the first-order.

9. That we can make satisfaction to God by self-imposed inflictions, and by those which the priest prescribes, as well as by bearing patiently and with a penitential spirit the temporal sorrows 'and afflictions which God sends to us. In conformity with this decree, fifteen canons were published, condemning those who maintained the opposite doctrines. After this, the decree upon the subject of extreme unction, in three chapters, was read.

It stated that this unction was appointed by our Lord Jesus Christ as a true sacrament of the New Test.; that it is plainly recommended to the faithful by James, and that the use of it is insinuated by Mark. That the matter of the sacrament is the oil consecrated by the bishop, and that its form consists in the words pronounced when the unction is applied; that its effect is to wipe out the remains of sin, and to reassure and comfort the soul of the sick person by exciting within him a full confidence in God's mercy, and sometimes to restore the health of the body, when such renewed health can advantage the salvation of the soul. That bishops alone may administer this sacrament. That this sacrament ought to be given to those who are in danger of death; but that if they recover, they may receive it again. The council then agreed upon four canons on the subject, with anathemas.

1. Anathematizes those who teach that extreme unction is not a true sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ.

2. Anathematizes those who teach that it does not confer grace, nor remit sin, nor comfort the sick.

3. Anathematizes those who teach that the Roman rite may be set at naught without sin.

4. Anathematizes those who teach that the *πρεσβύτεροι*, of whom James speaks, are old persons, and not priests.

After this the question of reform came before them, and fourteen chapters upon the subject of episcopal jurisdiction were published.

- 1.** Forbids the granting of dispensations and permissions by the court of Rome to the prejudice of the bishop's authority.
- 2.** Forbids bishops *in partibus infidelitum*, upon the strength of their privileges, to ordain any one under any pretext without the express permission of, or letter dismissory from, the ordinary.
- 3.** Gives bishops power to suspend clerks ordained without proper examination or without their license.
- 4.** Orders that all secular clerks whatever, and all regulars living out of their monasteries, shall be always, and in all cases, subject to the correction of the bishop in whose diocese they are, notwithstanding any privileges, exemption, etc., whatsoever.
- 5.** Relates to the conservators.
- 6.** Orders all clerks, under pain of suspension and deprivation, to wear the habit suited to their order, and forbids them the use of short garments and green and red stockings.
- 7.** Enacts that a clerk guilty of voluntary homicide shall be deprived of all ecclesiastical orders, benefices, etc.
- 8.** Checks the interference of prelates in the dioceses of others.
- 9.** Forbids the perpetual union of two churches situated in different dioceses.
- 10.** Directs that benefices belonging to the regulars shall be given to regulars only.
- 11.** Directs that no one shall be admitted to the religious life who will not promise to abide in the convent in subjection to the superior.
- 12.** Declares that the right of patronage can be given only to those who have built a new church or chapel, or who endow one already built.
- 13.** Forbids all patrons to make their presentation to any one but to the bishop, otherwise the presentation to be void.

In a congregation held Dec. 23 the sacrament of orders was considered, and twelve articles taken from the Lutheran writings were produced for examination. Subsequently eight canons were drawn up condemning as heretics those who maintained the following propositions:

1. That orders is not a true sacrament.
2. That the priesthood is the only order.
3. That there ought to be no hierarchy.
4. That the consent of the people is necessary to the validity of orders.
5. That there is no visible priesthood.
6. That unction is unnecessary.
7. That this sacrament does not confer the Holy Spirit.
8. That bishops are not by divine appointment nor superior to priests.

Session XV (Jan. 25, 1552). — In this session a decree was read to the effect that the decrees upon the subject of the sacrifice of the mass and the sacrament of orders, which were to have been read in this session, would be deferred until March 19 under the pretence that the Protestants, to whom a new safe-conduct had been granted, might be able to attend.

In the following congregation the subject of marriage was treated of, and thirty-three articles thereon were submitted for examination.

The disputes which arose between the ambassadors of the emperor and the legates of the pope produced another cessation of the council. The Spanish bishops and those of the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, as well as all who were subjects of the emperor, wished to continue the council; but those, on the other hand, who were in the interests of the court of Rome did all they could to prevent its continuance, and were not sorry when the report of a war between the emperor and Maurice, elector of Saxony, caused most of the bishops to leave Trent. In the meantime some Protestant theologians arrived, and urged the ambassadors of the emperor to obtain from the fathers of the council an answer to certain propositions, and to induce them to engage in a conference with them; both of which, however, the legates, upon various pretexts, eluded.

Session XVI (May 28, 1552). — The chief part of the prelates having then departed, the pope's bull declaring the council to be suspended was read in this session. This suspension lasted for nearly ten years; but on Nov. 29, 1560, a bull was published by Pius IV (who succeeded to the papacy: upon the death of Julius III, in 1555) for the reassembling of the council at Trent on the following Easter-day; but from various causes the reopening of the council did not take place until the year 1562.

Session XVII (Jan. 18, 1562). — One hundred and twelve bishops and several theologians were present. The bull of convocation and a decree for the continuation of the council were read; the words "proponentibus legatis" inserted in it passed in spite of the opposition of four Spanish bishops, who represented that the clause, being a novelty, ought not to be admitted, and that it was, moreover, injurious to the authority of ecumenical councils.

In a congregation held Jan. 27 the legates proposed the examination of the books of heretics and the answers to them composed by Catholic authors, and requested the fathers to take into their consideration the construction of a catalogue of prohibited works.

Session XVIII (Feb. 26, 1562). — In this session the pope's brief was read, who left to the council the care of drawing up a list of prohibited books. After this a decree upon the subject of the books to be prohibited was read, inviting all persons interested in the question to come to the council, and promising them a hearing.

In congregations held on March 2, 3, and 4, they deliberated about granting a safe-conduct to the Protestants, and a decree upon the subject was drawn up.

On March 11 a general congregation was held, in which twelve articles of reform were proposed for examination, which gave rise to great dispute and were discussed in subsequent congregations.

Session XIX (May 14, 1562). — In this session nothing whatever passed requiring notice, and the publication of the decrees was postponed to the following session. Immediately after this session the French ambassadors arrived, and their instructions were curious, and to the following effect:

That the decisions which had taken place should not be reserved for the pope's approval, but that the pope should be compelled to submit to the

decision of the council. That they should begin with the reform of the Church in its head and in its members, as had been promised at the Council of Constance, and in that of Basle, but never completed. That annates should be abolished; that all archbishops and bishops should be obliged to residence; that the council should make arrangements with respect to dispensations, so as to remove the necessity of sending to Rome. That the sixth canon of Chalcedon should be observed, which prohibits bishops to ordain priests without appointing them to some specific charges, so as to prevent the increase of useless ministers, etc.

On May 26 a congregation was held to receive the ambassador of France. The Sieur de Pibrac, in the name of the king his master, in a long discourse, exhorted the prelates to labor at the work of reformation, promising that the king would, if needful, support and defend them in the enjoyment of their liberty.

Session XX (June 4, 1562). — In this session the promoter of the council replied to the discourse delivered by Pibrac in the last congregation; after which a decree was read proroguing the session to July 16.

In the following congregation five articles upon the subject of the holy Eucharist were proposed for examination.

- 1.** Whether the faithful are, by God's command, obliged to receive in both kinds?
- 2.** Whether Jesus Christ is received entire under one species as under both?
- 3.** Whether the reason which induced the Church to, give the communion to the laity under one kind only still obliged her not to grant the cup to any one?
- 4.** Upon what conditions the cup should be permitted to any persons, supposing it to be advisable to grant it?
- 5.** Whether the communion is necessary to children under years of discretion? The question about the obligation of residence was also again mooted; but the cardinal of Mantua objected to its discussion as entirely alien from the subject before them, promising, at the same time, that it should be discussed at a fitting season.

In subsequent congregations held from the 9th to the 23d of June the subject of the five articles was discussed.

In a congregation held July 14 the decree in four chapters on the communion was examined.

Session XXI (July 16, 1562). — The four chapters on doctrine were read, in which the council declared:

That neither laymen nor ecclesiastics (not consecrating) are bound by any divine precept to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds; that the sufficiency of communion in one kind cannot be doubted without injury to faith. Further, that the Church has always possessed the power of establishing and changing in the dispensation of the sacraments (without, however, interfering with essentials) according as she has judged to be most conducive to the honor due to the holy sacrament, and to the good of the recipients, taking into account the diversities of place and conjuncture that, although Jesus' Christ instituted and gave to his apostles the sacrament under two kinds, it is necessary to believe that under either kind Jesus Christ is received whole and entire; and that no diminution is experienced in any of the graces conveyed by the sacrament. Lastly, that children not arrived at years of discretion are not obliged to receive the Eucharist.

Four canons in conformity with this doctrine were then read:

- 1.** Against those who maintain that all the faithful are under obligation to receive in both kinds.
- 2.** Against those who maintain that the Church has not sufficient grounds for refusing the cup to the laity.
- 3.** Against those who deny that our Lord is received entire under each species.
- 4.** Against those who maintain that the Eucharist is necessary to children before they come to the exercise of their reason. Subsequently nine chapters on reform were read, having regard to the duties of bishops, education of clerks, etc.

A few days after this session the Italian bishops received a letter from the pope, in which he declared that he was far from wishing to hinder the discussion of the question concerning the nature of the obligation to residence; that he desired the council to enjoy entire freedom, and that every one should speak according as his conscience directed him; at the

same time, however, he wrote to his nuncio, Visconti, bidding him take secure measures for stifling the discussion, and for sending it to the holy see for decision.

In the congregations held after the twenty-first session, the question was concerning the sacrifice of the mass; and all the theologians agreed unanimously that the mass ought to be regarded as a true sacrifice under the new covenant, in which Jesus Christ is offered under the sacramental species. One of their arguments was this, that Jesus Christ was priest after the order of Melchizedek; the latter offered bread and wine; and that, consequently, the priesthood of Jesus Christ includes a sacrifice of bread and wine.

In a congregation held about Aug. 18, the archbishop of Prague presented a letter from the emperor, in which he made earnest entreaties that the cup might be conceded to the laity. This delicate subject was reserved for special consideration in a subsequent congregation.

The decree on the subject of the sacrifice of the mass being now completed, the members began next to consider the subject of communion in both kinds. Three opinions principally prevailed among the prelates:

1. To refuse the 'cup' entirely;
2. To grant it upon certain conditions to be approved of by the council;
3. To leave the settlement of the matter to the pope.

The Spanish and Venetian bishops supported the first opinion. Among those who were inclined to grant the cup were cardinal Madrucio, the bishop of Modena, and Gaspard Capal, bishop of Leira. But among the strongest advocates for granting the petition was the bishop of the Five Churches, who implored the prelates to have compassion on the churches, and to pay some regard to the pressing entreaties of the emperor. On the other hand, the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, and the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, were in favor of refusing; the latter maintained that by giving way to them the people would be rather confirmed in the error of supposing that the body only of our Lord is contained under the species of bread, and the blood only under that of wine; that if they gave way now, other nations would require the same, and they would go further, and would next require the abolition of images, as being an occasion of idolatry to the people. Other bishops, supporting this opinion, reminded the

assembly that the Church had been led to forbid the use of the cup from a fear lest the consecrated wine should be spilled or turn sour, and that the former accident could hardly be prevented when the holy sacrament was carried long distances and by bad paths. The archbishop of Rossano, the bishops of Cava, Almeria, Imola, and Rieti, with Richard, abbot of Preval, at Genoa, were also among those who spoke in favor of absolutely refusing the cup. On the eve of the twenty-second session a decree passed by which it was left to the pope to act as he thought best in the matter, the numbers being ninety-eight for the decree and thirty-eight against it. The discussion lasted altogether from Aug. 15 to Sept. 16.

Session XXII (Sept. 17, 1562). — One hundred and eighty prelates, with the ambassadors and legates, were present at this session. The doctrinal decree touching the sacrifice of the mass, in nine chapters, was published. It was to the following effect:

1. Although our Lord once offered himself to God the Father by dying upon the altar of his cross, in order to obtain thereby eternal redemption for us, nevertheless, since his priesthood did not cease at his death, in order that he might leave with his Church a visible sacrifice (such as the nature of man requires), by means of which the bloody sacrifice of the cross might be represented at the last supper, on the same night that he was betrayed, in the execution of his office as a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek, he offered his body and blood to the Father under the species of bread and wine, and gave the same to his apostles; and by these words, "This do in remembrance of me," he commanded them and their successors to offer the like sacrifice, as the Catholic Church has always believed and taught.

2. As the same Jesus Christ who once offered himself upon the cross with the shedding of his blood is contained and immolated without the effusion of blood in the holy sacrifice of the mass, this latter sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by it we obtain mercy and forgiveness; since it is the same Jesus Christ who was offered upon the cross who is still offered by the ministry of his priests, the only difference being in the *manner* of offering. And the mass may be offered, not only for the sins and wants of the faithful who are alive, but also for those who, being dead, are not yet made pure.

- 3.** Although the Church sometimes celebrates masses in honor and ill memory of the saints, the sacrifice is still offered to God alone, for she only implores their protection.
- 4.** The Church for many ages past has established the sacred canon of the mass, which is pure and free from every error, and contains nothing which is not consistent with holiness and piety, being in truth composed from our Lord's words, the traditions of the apostles, and the pious institutions of the holy popes.
- 5.** The Church, in order the better to set forth the majesty of so great a sacrifice, has established certain customs-such as saying some things at mass in a low voice, others aloud; and has introduced certain ceremonies-as the benediction, lights, incense, ornaments, etc., after the tradition of the apostles.
- 6.** Although it is to be desired that at every mass all the faithful should communicate, not only spiritually, but also sacramentally, nevertheless the council does not condemn private masses in which the priest only communicates, but, on the contrary, approves and authorizes them, for they are celebrated by the proper minister in behalf of himself and the faithful.
- 7.** The Church has ordained that the priest shall mix water with the wine, because there is reason to believe that our blessed Lord did so, and because both blood and water issued from his side; which sacred mystery, by the use of this mixture, is remembered.
- 8.** Although the mass contains much to edify the people, the fathers did not judge it right that it should be celebrated in the vulgar tongue, and the Roman Church has preserved the use; nevertheless, the clergy should at times, and especially on festivals, explain to the people some part of what they have read to them.
- 9.** Anathematizes, in nine canons, all those who deny the affirmative of twelve of the thirteen articles proposed in the congregation following the twenty-first session, viz. the 1st, 3rd, 13th, and 4th, 2nd, 10th, 7th, 11th, 5th, 8th, 9th, and 6th (which see). Then followed a decree concerning what should be observed or avoided in the celebration of mass:

Bishops were ordered to forbid, and abolish everything which had been introduced through avarice, irreverence, or superstition, such as pecuniary

agreements for the first masses, and forced exactions made under the name' of alms; vagabond and unknown priests were forbidden to celebrate, also those who were notorious evil livers; no masses were to be said in private houses; all music of an impure and lascivious character was forbidden in churches, and all Worldly conversation, profane actions, walking about, etc. Priests were forbidden to say mass out of the prescribed hours, and otherwise than Church form prescribed. It was also ordered to warn the people to come to church on Sundays and holidays at least. In the third place, the decree of reformation was read, containing eleven chapters:

- 1.** Orders that all the decrees of the popes and the councils relating to the life, morals, and acquirements of the clergy should be in future observed, under the original and even greater penalties.
- 2.** Enacts that bishoprics shall be given only to those persons who possess the qualifications required by the canons, and who have been at least six months in holy orders.
- 3.** Permits bishops to appropriate the third part of the revenue of the prebends-in any cathedral or collegiate church for daily distributions.
- 4.** Declares that no one under the rank of subdeacon shall have any voice in the chapter; that all the members shall perform their proper offices.
- 5.** Enacts that dispensations *extra curium* (i.e. granted anywhere out of the court of Rome) shall be addressed to the ordinary, and shall have no effect until he shall have testified that they have not been obtained surreptitiously.
- 6.** Treats of the care to be observed in proving wills.
- 7.** Orders that legate's, nuncios, patriarchs, and other superior judges shall observe the constitution of Innocent IV beginning "*Romona*," whether in receiving appeals or granting prohibitions.
- 8.** Orders that bishops, us the delegates of the holy see, shall be the executors of all pious gifts, whether by will or otherwise; that to them it appertains to visit hospitals and other similar communities, except those under the immediate protection of the king.
- 9.** Directs that those to whom the care of any sacred fabric is entrusted whether laymen or clerks, shall be held bound to give account of their

administration yearly to the ordinary, unless the original foundation require them to account to any other.

10. Declares that bishops may examine notaries, and forbid them the exercise of their office in ecclesiastical matters.

11. Enacts penalties against those who usurp or keep possession of the property of the Church, and pronounces anathemas against them.

With respect to the concession of the cup to the laity, the council declared, by another decree, that it judged it convenient to leave the decision to the pope, who would act in the matter according as his wisdom should direct him.

In a congregation certain articles relating to the reformation of morals were discussed, and the theologians were instructed to examine eight articles on the subject of the *sacrament of orders*. This occupied many congregations, in one of which a large number of the prelates, chiefly Spaniards, demanded that there should be added to the seventh canon, concerning the institution of bishops, a clause declaring the episcopate to be of divine right. An attempt was made to stifle the discussion, but John Fonseca, a Spanish theologian, among others entered boldly upon the subject, declaring that it was not, and could not be, forbidden to speak upon the matter. He maintained that bishops were instituted by Jesus Christ, and thus by divine right, and not merely by a right conferred by the pope. The discussion of this question proved highly disagreeable at Rome, and the legates received instructions on no account to permit it to be brought to a decision. However, in subsequent congregations the dispute was renewed with warmth; in the congregation of Oct. 13, the archbishop of Granada insisted upon the recognition of the institution of bishops, and their superiority to *priests, jure divino*. The same view was taken in the following congregation by the archbishop of Braga and the bishop of Segovia; and no less than fifty-three prelates, out of one hundred and thirty-one present, voted in favor of the recognition of the divine institution and jurisdiction of bishops. According to Fr. Paolo, the number amounted to fifty-nine. The dispute was, however, by no means ended. On the 20th the Jesuit Lainez, at the instigation of the legates, delivered a powerful speech in opposition to the view taken by the Spanish bishops, denying altogether that the institution and jurisdiction of bishops were of divine right. However, powerful as was his speech, he was answered by the bishop of Paris so effectually that the legates, to their great discomposure,

saw the views of the Spanish prelates gain ground. The latter then declared formally that unless their demand were granted, and the order and jurisdiction of bishops declared in the canon to be *jure divino*, they would thenceforth absent themselves from all the congregations and sessions.

In the meantime the cardinal of Lorraine arrived at Trent with several French prelates, and was received with honor. In a congregation held Nov. 23, he read the letter of the king of France to the council, in which he strongly urged them to labor sincerely to bring about a sound reformation of abuses, and to restore its pristine glory to the Catholic Church by bringing backs all Christian people to one religion. After the letter was finished the cardinal delivered a speech, strongly urging: the necessity of proceeding speedily with the work of reformation, in which he was followed by Du Ferrier, the king's ambassador, who spoke his mind freely.

All this time so little progress had been. made with the canons and decrees that when Nov. 26, the day fixed for holding the twenty-third session, arrived, it was found necessary to prorogue it. After this, in the following congregations, the subject of the divine right of bishops was again discussed, when the French bishops declared in favor of the views held by the Spaniards.

At the beginning of the year 1563 the French ambassadors presented their articles: of reformation under thirty-two heads. Their principal demands were as follows:

- 6.** That no person should be appointed bishop unless he were of advanced age, and of good character and capacity.
- 7.** That no curates should be nominated unless they were of good character and abilities.
- 9.** That bishops, either personally or by deputy should preach on every Sunday and festivals, besides Lent and Advent.
- 10.** That all curates should do the same when they had a sufficient audience.
- 12.** That incapable bishops, abbots, and curates should resign their benefices, or appoint coadjutors.
- 14.** That all pluralities whatever should be abolished, without any consideration of compatibility or incompatibility.

- 16.** That steps should be taken to provide every beneficed clerk with a revenue sufficient to maintain two curates and to exercise hospitality.
- 17.** That the gospel should be explained to the people at mass, and that after mass the priest should pray with the people in the vulgar tongue.
- 18.** That the ancient decretals of pope Leo and Gelasius on communion in both kinds should be re-established.
- 19.** That the efficacy of the sacraments should also be explained to the people before their administration.
- 20.** That benefices should be conferred by bishops within six months; after which time they should devolve to the immediate superior, and so gradually to the pope.
- 21.** That they should abolish, as contrary to the canons, all expectatives, regressions (returning to a benefice which has been once resigned), resignations, etc.
- 23.** That simple priories should be reunited to the cure of souls, originally intended by the foundation, which had been separated from them, and assigned to perpetual vicars with miserable pittances.
- 27.** That bishops should take in hand no matter of importance without the advice of their chapters; and that canons should be compelled to continual residence.
- 31.** That no sentence of excommunication should be passed until three monitions had been issued, and then only for grievous faults. That bishops should be desired to give benefices rather to those who drew back from receiving than to such as sought for them.
- 32.** That diocesan synods should be assembled at least once a year, provincial synods every three years, and general councils every ten years.

The pope, in order to elude the difficulty in which he was placed by the demand of the Spanish and French bishops that the divine right of bishops should be inserted in the seventh chapter, sent a form for the approval of the council, in which it was declared that “bishops held the principal place in the Church, but in dependence upon the pope.” This, however, did not meet with approval, and, after a long contest, it was agreed to state it thus, that “they held the principal place in the Church *under the pope*,” instead

of in dependence upon him. However, a still warmer contest arose upon the chapter in which it was said that the pope had authority to feed and govern the Universal Church. This the Gallican and Spanish bishops would by no means consent to, alleging that the Church is the first tribunal under Christ. Accordingly, they insisted that the words *universas ecclesias*, “all churches,” should be substituted for *Universam Ecclesiam*. The Gallicans even more strenuously denied that “the pope possessed all the authority of Jesus Christ,” notwithstanding all the limitations and explanations which were added to it.

On Feb. 5 the legates proposed for consideration eight articles on the subject of marriage, extracted from so-called heretical books:

1. That marriage is not a sacrament instituted by God.
2. That parents may annul marriages contracted by their children clandestinely.
3. That a man may marry again during the life of his first wife, divorced on account of fornication.
4. That polygamy is allowed to Christians, and that to forbid marriages at certain seasons is a heathen superstition.
5. That marriage is to be preferred to the state of virginity.
6. That priests in the Western Church may marry, notwithstanding their vow.
7. That the decrees of consanguine down in Leviticus 18 are to be observed, and no others.
8. That the cognizance of causes relating to marriages belongs to the secular princes. These articles were discussed in several congregations. The sixth article came under consideration March 4; all agreed in condemning it as heretical, but they were divided upon the grounds of their opinion. The question was afterwards discussed whether it was advisable, under the circumstances of the times, to remove the restriction laid upon the clergy not to marry; this was in consequence of a demand to that effect made by the duke of Bavaria. Strong opposition was made to this demand, and many blamed the legates for permitting the discussion, and maintained that if this license were granted the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy would fall to pieces, and the pope be reduced to the simple condition of bishop of Rome,

since the clergy, having their affections set upon their families and country, would be inevitably detached from that close dependence upon the holy see in which its present strength mainly consists.

In the meantime, the cardinal of Mantua had died, and the pope dispatched two new legates to the council cardinal Morone and cardinal Navagier. The French continued their importunities on the subject of reformation, and were as constantly put off upon one pretext or another by the legates, and, thus much time was wasted.

In a congregation held May 10, a letter from the queen of Scots was read, in which she expressed her sorrow that she had not one Catholic prelate in her dominions whom she could send to the council, and declared her determination, should she ever attain to the crown of England, to do all in her power to bring that kingdom, as well as Scotland, back to the Roman obedience.

All this time the contests about the institution and jurisdiction of bishops, and the divine obligation of residence, continued; and at last, in order to accommodate matters, and bring things to an end, it was resolved to omit altogether all notice of the institution of bishops and of the authority of the pope, and to erase from the decree concerning residence whatever was obnoxious to either party. They then fell to work upon the decree concerning the reformation of abuses.

Session XXIII (July 15, 1563). — At this session 208 prelates, besides the legates and other ecclesiastics, were present, with the ambassadors of France, Spain, Portugal, etc. The sermon was preached by the bishop of Paris, who seems to have contrived in it to give offence to all parties. After the sermon, the bulls authorizing Morone and Navagier to act as legates for the pope were read, together with the letters of the king of Poland, the duke of Savoy, and the queen of Scotland. Lastly, the decrees and canons drawn up during the past congregation were brought before the council. The decree upon the sacrament of orders, in four chapters, was read, and eight canons on the sacrament of orders were published, which anathematized,

1. Those who deny a visible priesthood in the Church.
2. Those who maintain that the priesthood is the only order.
3. Those who deny that ordination is a true sacrament.

4. Those who deny that the Holy Spirit is conferred by ordination.
5. Those who deny that the unction given at ordination is necessary.
6. Those who deny that there is a hierarchy composed of bishops, priests, and ministers in the Catholic Church.
7. Those who deny the superiority of bishops to priests, or that they alone can perform certain functions which priests cannot, and those who maintain that orders conferred without the consent of the people are void.
8. Those who deny that bishops called by the authority of the pope (*qui auctoritate Romani pontificis assumuntur*) are true and lawful bishops. After this the decree of reformation was read, containing eighteen chapters, on the residence of bishops, and on other ecclesiastical affairs.

In the following congregations the decrees concerning marriage were discussed, and it was unanimously agreed that the law of celibacy should be continued binding upon the clergy.

Moreover, twenty articles of reformation, which the legates proposed, were examined; and during the discussion letters were received from the king of France, in which he declared his disappointment at the meager measure of ecclesiastical reform proposed in these articles, and his extreme dissatisfaction at the chapter interfering with the rights of princes. Shortly after, nine of the French bishops returned home, so that fourteen only remained.

On Sept. 22 a congregation was held, in which the ambassador Du Ferrier spoke so warmly of the utter insufficiency of the articles of reform which the legates had proposed, and of their conduct altogether, that the congregation broke up suddenly in some confusion.

To fill up the time intervening before the twenty-fourth session, the subjects of indulgences, purgatory, and the worship of saints and images were introduced for discussion, in order that decrees on these matters might be prepared for presentation in the twenty-fifth session.

Session XXIV (Nov. 11, 1563). — In this session the decree of doctrine and the canons relating to the sacrament of marriage were read.

After establishing the indissolubility of the marriage tie by Holy Scripture, it adds that Jesus Christ by his passion, merited the grace necessary to

confirm and sanctify the union betwixt man and wife. That the apostle means us to understand this when he says, “Husbands, love your wives, as Jesus Christ loved the Church;” and, shortly after, “This sacrament is great: I speak of Jesus Christ and the Church.” Marriage, under the Gospel, is declared to be a more excellent state than that of marriage under the former dispensation, on account of the grace conferred by it, and that, accordingly, the holy fathers, councils, and universal tradition rightly teach us to reckon marriage among the sacraments of the new law. There are twelve canons, with anathemas, upon the subject.

- 1.** Anathematizes those who maintain that marriage is not a true sacrament.
- 2.** Anathematizes those who maintain that polygamy is permitted to Christians.
- 3.** Anathematizes those who maintain that marriage is unlawful only within the degrees specified in Leviticus.
- 4.** Anathematizes those who deny that the Church has power to add to the impediments to marriage.
- 5.** Anathematizes those who maintain that the marriage tie is broken by heresy, ill-conduct, or voluntary absence on either side.
- 6.** Anathematizes those who deny that a marriage contracted, but not consummated, is annulled by either of the parties taking the religious vows.
- 7.** Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church errs in holding that the marriage tie is not broken by adultery.
- 8.** Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church errs in separating married persons for a time in particular cases.
- 9.** Anathematizes those who maintain that men in holy orders, or persons who have taken the religious vow, may marry.
- 10.** Anathematizes those who maintain that the married state is preferable to that of virginity.
- 11.** Anathematizes those who maintain that it is superstitious to forbid marriages at certain seasons.
- 12.** Anathematizes those who maintain that the, cognizance of matrimonial causes does not belong to the ecclesiastical authorities.

After this a decree of reformation was published relating to the same sacrament, containing ten chapters.

1. Forbids clandestine marriages; orders curates to publish the names of the parties about to contract marriage on three consecutive festivals in church during the solemn mass; orders that two or three witnesses be present at the marriage, and declares all marriages to be null which are not solemnized in the presence of the clergyman of the parish, or of some other priest, having his permission or that of the ordinary.

2. Treats of the impediments to marriage, which were in some respects relaxed, i.e. the impediments to marriage between a godparent and godchild and the parents of the godchild was removed; also that between the person administering baptism and the person baptized, or his or her parents.

3 and 4. Also refer to the relaxation of the impeders.

5. Those who willfully contract marriage within the prohibited degrees are sentenced to be separated without any hope of obtaining a dispensation.

6. No marriage to be allowed between a ravisher and the woman ravished while she remains in his power; if, however, when at liberty, she consents, they may be married, the ravisher, and all aiding and abetting, to be nevertheless excommunicated.

7. Care to be used in permitting wanderers to receive the sacrament of marriage.

8. Fornicators, whether married or single, to be excommunicated, unless they will put away their mistresses after three monitions. The women, after three monitions, to be driven out of the diocese unless they obey.

9. Forbids all masters, magistrates, etc., under anathema, to compel those under their control to marry against their own inclinations.

10. Confirms the ancient prohibitions to celebrate marriages between Advent and Epiphany, and between Ash Wednesday and the octave of Easter. After this a decree containing twenty-one articles, upon the reform of the clergy was read, setting forth the duty of bishops to visit their dioceses; to preach in person or by deputy; relating to dispensations, sacraments, visitations, pluralities, etc.

Session XXV and last (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563). — At this session the decrees concerning purgatory, the invocation of saints, and the worship of images and relics were read.

1. *Of Purgatory.* Declares that the Catholic Church, following Holy Scripture and tradition has always taught, and still teaches, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls which are detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful and by the sacrifice of the mass. Orders all bishops to teach, and to cause to be taught, the true doctrine on this subject.

2. *Of the Invocation of Saints.* Orders bishops and others concerned in the teaching of the people to instruct them concerning the invocation of saints, the honor due to their relics; and the lawful use of images, according to the doctrine of the Church, the consent of the fathers, and the decrees of the councils; to teach them that the saints offer up prayers for men, and that it is useful to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers and help. It further condemns those who maintain that the saints in rest ought not to be invoked, that they do not pray for men, that it is idolatry to invoke them; that it is contrary to Holy Scripture, etc., and that their relics and their tombs ought not to be venerated.

On the subject of images, the council teaches that those of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and of the saints are to be placed in churches; that they ought to receive due veneration, not because they have any divinity or virtue in them, but because honor is thus reflected upon those whom they represent. By means of these representations the people are instructed in the mysteries of the faith, and, by thus seeing the good deeds of the saints, are led to bless God, and endeavor themselves to do likewise.

The council then proceeds to anathematize all who hold or teach any contrary doctrine.

Lastly, in order to remedy abuses, it declares that if in any scriptural painting the Divinity is represented under any figure, the people should be warned that it is not intended that the Divinity can be seen by mortal eyes; further, that all things tending to superstition in the invocation of saints, the worship of their relics, and the right use of images should be done away with; that care should be taken not to profane the festivals of the saints, etc.; that no new miracles or relics should be admitted without the bishop's consent, and that any other abuses should be rectified by the bishop and provincial council.

These decrees were followed by one of reformation, consisting of twenty-two chapters, which relate to the regular clergy. After this another decree, in twenty-one chapters, on general reformation, was read.

A decree was also published upon the subject of indulgences to this effect, that the Church, having received from Jesus Christ the power to grant indulgences, and having, through all ages, used that power, the council declares that their use shall be retained as being very salutary to Christian persons and approved by the holy councils. It then anathematizes all who maintain that indulgences are useless, or that the Church has no power to grant them. At the same time, it desires that the ancient custom of the Church be adhered to, and that they be granted with care and moderation, forbidding all trafficking in them.

Further, the council exhorted all pastors to recommend to the observance of all the faithful whatever had been ordered by the Church of Rome, established in this or in any one of the ecumenical councils, and to impress upon them especially the due observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church.

The list of books to be proscribed was referred to the pope, as also were the catechism missal, and breviaries.

Then the secretary, standing tip in the midst of the assembly, demanded of the fathers whether they were of opinion that the council should be concluded, and that the legates should request the pope's confirmation of the decrees, etc. The answer in the affirmative was unanimous with the exception of three. The cardinal president Morone then dissolved the assembly amid loud acclamations.

In a congregation held on the following Sunday, the fathers affixed their signatures to the number of two hundred and fifty-five-viz. four legates, two cardinals, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight bishops, thirty-nine proctors, seven abbots and several generals of orders.

The acts of the council were confirmed by a bull bearing date Jan. 6, 1564. The Venetians were the first to receive the Tridentine decrees. The kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Poland also received them in part; and they were published and received in Flanders, in the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, in part of Germany, in Hungary, Austria, Dalmatia, and some part of, South America, also among the Maronites. The Churches of England,

Ireland, Scotland, Russia, Greece, Syria, Egypt, etc., reject the authority of this council.

In France the Council of Trent is received generally as to doctrine, but not altogether as to discipline. Various regulations which were deemed incompatible with the usages of the kingdom, the liberties of the Gallican Church, the concordat, and the just authority of the king, were rejected (see Mansi, *Concil. 14*, 725; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v.).

Literature. — The history of the Council of Trent was written chiefly by two able and learned Catholics — Fra Paolo Sarpi, of Venice, an almost semi-Protestant monk, *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino* (Lond. 1619; translations in French and German; Engl. transl. by Brent, *ibid.* 1676), in opposition to the papal court, and (against him) cardinal Sforza Pallavicino, *Istoria del Concilio di Trento* (Rome, 1656-57, 2 vols. fol.).

The canons and decrees of the council were first published by Paul Manutius (Rome, 1564), and often since in different languages. The best Latin edition is by Le Plat (1779), and by Schulte and Richter (Leips. 1853); and the best English edition is by Rev. J. Waterworth, with a *History of the Council* (Lond. 1848). The *Catechism*, an authorized summary of the faith drawn up by order of the council, appeared at Rome in 1566. The original acts and debates of the council, as prepared by its general secretary, bishop Angelo Massarelli (6 vols. large fol.), were deposited in the Vatican Library, and remained there unpublished for more than three hundred years, until they were brought to light, though only in part, by Aug. Theiner, in *Acta Genuina SS. AECum. Concilii Tridentini nunc primum integre edita* (Lips. 1874. 2 vols.). The most complete collection of the official documents and private reports bearing upon the council is that of Le Plat, *Monum. ad Histor. Cone. Trident.* (Lovan. 1781-87, 7 vols.). New materials were brought to light by Mendham (1834 and 1846) from the MS. history by cardinal Paleotto; by Sickel, *Actensthücke aus oesterreichischen Archiven* (Vienna, 1872); and by Dr. Döllinger, *Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Cone. von Trient* (Nordlingen, 1876, 2 pts.). Among Protestant historians of the Council of Trent are Salig (1741-45, 3 vols.); Danz (1846); Buckley (Lond. 1852); and Bungener (Paris, 1854; Engl. transl. N. Y. 1855). On the Tridentine standards see Schaff, *History of the Creeds of Christendom* (1876), 1, 90 sq. See, in general, also Cunningham, *Hist. Theol.* (see Index); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*

vol. 3 (Index). In particular see. *The Council of Trent and its Proceedings* (Presb. Board of Publication, Phila. 1835, 18mo); Pallavicino, *Hist. du Cone de Trente* (Montrouge, 1844, 3 vols. 8vo); Dupin, *Hist. dui Conc. de Trente* (Brussels, 1721, 2 vols. 4to); Salig, *Vollst. Hist. des Tr. Cone.* (Halle, 1741, 3 vols. 4to); Courayer. *Hist. de la Reception du Cone. de Trente* (Amst. 1756). **SEE COUNCILS.**

Trental

an office for the dead in the Latin Church consisting of thirty masses on thirty consecutive days.

Trepalium

a name given to the rack used for examining witnesses by torture. According to canon 33, Council of Tarragona, presbyters and deacons were forbidden to stand at the Trepalium while persons were tortured. See Bingham, *Christ. Anti.* bk. 18:ch. v, § 34.

Trespas

(*μνα*; *guilt*; *παράπτωμα*) is an offence committed, a hurt, or wrong done to a neighbor; and partakes of the nature of an error or slip rather than of deliberate or gross sin. Under the law, the delinquent who had trespassed was of course bound to make satisfaction; but an offering or oblation was allowed him to reconcile himself to the Divine Governor (^{<R065>}Leviticus 6:15). Our Savior teaches us that whoever does not forgive the trespasses of a fellow-man against himself is not to expect that his Father in heaven will forgive his trespasses (^{<R064>}Matthew 6:14,15).

Trespas-offering

(*μνα*; *asham*, once [^{<R065>}Leviticus 6:5] fern. *hmvāi* which properly denotes the *act* of trespass, as elsewhere). This sacrifice was offered for individuals only, and chiefly for such transgressions as were not punishable by the laws of the State (^{<R079>}Leviticus 7:19). The victim sacrificed was different on different occasions.

1. A trespass-offering was brought when a person did not inform of a crime committed by another (^{<R061>}Leviticus 5:1); when a person had touched any unclean object, and had omitted the sacrifice of purification (ver. 2, 3); when a person had, through forgetfulness, neglected to fulfill his rash vow.

In each of these cases the offering was a ewe or a she-goat; or, if the sacrificer were poor, it might consist of doves or fine flour, without oil and incense (ver. 4-13).

2. When a person had, through mistake, applied to a common purpose anything which had been consecrated to a holy use (ver. 10, 16; 22:14), or had in any way violated an engagement, or denied stolen property, or concealed any lost thing which he had found. In these cases the offering was a ram, and the restoration of the alienated property, with one fifth of the value; in the former case to the priest, in the latter to the owner or his heirs (^{<RB12>}Leviticus 6:2-7).

3. When any person had, through ignorance, done something forbidden, the victim was a ram (^{<RB17>}Leviticus 5:17, 18).

4. When a man had a criminal connection with a betrothed female slave (^{<RB10>}Leviticus 19:20 22), or had, in later times, contracted an idolatrous marriage, the victim was a ram (^{<RB19>}Ezra 10:19). So also a Nazarite who had contracted defilement by touching a dead body (^{<RB13>}Numbers 6:9-12), and a leper who had been healed, were to bring a lamb for a trespass-offering (^{<RB12>}Leviticus 14:12, 24). In this offering the victim was slain on the north side of the altar, the blood sprinkled round it, and the pieces of fat burned upon it. *SEE SIN-OFFERING.*

Among the Hebrews trespass-offerings, like all other expiatory sacrifices, were symbolical representations of the great work, for the effecting of which the Messiah was promised to fallen man (^{<RB16>}Psalms 40:6, 8; ^{<RB18>}Hebrews 8:3; 9:14, 26, 28; 10:5, 10). As it was the design of the Mosaic law to remind the Hebrews that they were guilty of sin and liable to death, so every sacrifice was a memorial of this mournful truth, as well as a type of the work of our Redeemer. When a Hebrew had committed a trespass against the divine law, providing the transgression: was such as admitted an expiation, he had to offer the requisite sacrifices before he could be restored to his civil privileges. With this a mere worldly-minded Hebrew was content; but, as no mere animal sacrifice could make atonement for sin, to the sincere believer the sacrifice was only the symbol and type of something spiritual. It reminded him that his sins had not only excluded him from the divine favor, but that he deserved death and subsequent agony; it directed him to the need of a sacrifice for sin ere God would forgive his transgression; and it assured him that, just as by sacrifice he had been restored to his civil and political rights, so by faith in the great

sacrifice for sin on the part of the lamb of God might he be restored to the divine favor, and to a place in that spiritual kingdom of which the Hebrew nation was the type. *SEE PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES.*

Treuenfels, Abraham

a Jewish rabbi and doctor of philosophy of Germany, was born at Detniold in the year 1818. After visiting the gymnasium of that place, lie went, in 1837, to Hanover, where he studied under Dr. Adler (now chief rabbi of England). In 1839 he pursued a course of studies at the Bonn University, and completed his Rabbinical education at Frankfort. In 1844 he was appointed rabbi at Weilburg, in Nassau, and in 1860 he was called to Stettin, where he died, Jan. 30, 1879. He published, *afwz tyçarb, oder die leine Genesis und die noch vorhandenen Bruchstücke derselbean griechisch und deutsch, end mit Amerkungen*, in the *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1846, No. 129: — *Ueber den Bibelcanon des Flavius Josephus* (1849). But his literary activity was chiefly displayed in the *Israelitische Wochenschr-iJt*, which he published in connection with Dr. M. Rahmer. (B. P.)

Treves, Councils Of (Concilium Trevirense)

take their name from Treves, a town of Rhenish Prussia, in which they were held. The town is situated on the right bank of the Moselle, and had in 1871 a population of 21,442. It is a decayed place, noted for its ultramontanism. The cathedral contains many relics—the principal one being the Holy Coat of Treves—and Roman remains. It has a priestly seminary, a gymnasium, a library of 100,000 volumes, a museum full of valuable antiquities—including the famous *Codex Aureus*, or MS. of the Gospel in gold letters, presented to the Abbey of St. Maximin by Ada, sister of Charlemagne.

I. The First Council was held in 948. The legate Marinus, the archbishop of Treves, and several bishops here excommunicated Hugo, count of Paris, and two pretended bishops, made by Hugo, the pseudo-archbishop of Rheims. See Mansi, *Concil.* 9:632. *SEE INGELHEIM.*

II. The Second Council was held in 1548 by John, count of Isembourg, archbishop of Treves, who presided. Ten chapters, and a decree against the concubinary clergy, were published. See Mansi, *Concil.* 14:606.

III. The Third Council was held by John, archbishop of Treves, in 1549. Twenty canons were published.

1. Forbids to believe, hold, or teach any other than the Roman doctrine.
- 2, 3, 4. Of preachers.
6. Orders that the hours be duly said by clerks, and that those who cannot attend at the time in the choir shall say them privately.
9. Of the celebration of the mass.
10. Provides for lessening the number of festivals, and gives a list of those which shall in any case be retained.
- 11,12. Of the religions and their houses.
15. Of schools.
- 17,-18. Of the immunity of churches.
19. Of the life and deportment of the clergy.
20. Provides that, the heads of monasteries and colleges, and others of the clergy, shall be supplied with a copy of these canons. See Mansi, 14:705.

Treves, Holy coat of

SEE HOLY COAT OF TREVES.

Trevett, Russell, D.D.

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was a native of New York. He was ordained in 1841, became professor of languages in St. James's College, Maryland, in 1843, and occupied the same position in St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., being elected thereto in 1855. Subsequently he became rector of St. James's Church, North Salem, N.J., a position which he held at the time of his death, March 8, 1865. See *Amer. Quar. Church Rev.* July, 1865, p. 321.

Trial

a term used in Scripture only in the sense of *testing* (usually some form of ἵψ B; δοκιμή or δοκίμιον; but once ἡσμί ^{<892>} Job 9:23, elsewhere “temptation” [q.v.]; and so πείρα, ^{<813>} Hebrews 11:36; πύρωσις, “fiery

trial,” ^{<0012>}1 Peter 4:12, lit. *burning*, as elsewhere rendered), to denote painful circumstances into which persons are brought by divine Providence with a view to illustrate the perfections of God, bring to light the real character of those who are thus tried, and by the influence of temporal suffering, which shows the transitory nature and uncertain tenure of all earthly advantages, to promote their eternal and spiritual interests. *SEE TEMPT.*

Trial, Church.

SEE EXCOMMUNICATION.

Trial, Forensic

(denoted in Heb. by ^{<0012>}יָדָא *to hold a court*, while ^{<0012>}פְּרִימָה *is the sentence* rendered by the judge, whether favorable or adverse, both terms being usually rendered “judgment” in the A. V.; Gr. κρίσις) Originally the head of the family was the umpire among the Hebrews, with the power of life and death (comp. ^{<0016>}Deuteronomy 1:16). Later the elders (q.v.) succeeded to a similar authority. According to the Mosaic law, there were to be judges in all the cities, whose duty it was to exercise judicial authority over the surrounding neighborhood. Weighty causes were submitted to the supreme ruler. Originally trials were everywhere summary. Moses, in his laws, did not establish any more formal or complicated method of procedure. He was, nevertheless, anxious that strict justice should be administered, and therefore frequently inculcated the idea that God was a witness (^{<0221>}Exodus 20:21; 23:1-9; ^{<0016>}Leviticus 19:15; ^{<0014>}Deuteronomy 24:14, 15). In ancient times, the forum or place of trial was in the *gates* of cities (^{<0230>}Genesis 23:10; ^{<0219>}Deuteronomy 21:19). In the trial the accuser and the accused appeared before the judge or judges (25:1), and both the implicated parties stood up. The witnesses were sworn, and in capital cases also the parties concerned (^{<0047>}1 Samuel 14:37-40; ^{<0066>}Matthew 26:63). In order to establish the accusations, two witnesses were necessary, and, including the accuser, *three*. The witnesses were examined separately, but the accused person had the liberty to be present when they gave their testimony (^{<0050>}Numbers 35:30; ^{<0030>}Deuteronomy 13:1-15; Mark 26:59). The sentence was pronounced soon after the completion of the examination, and the criminal, without any delay, even if the offence was a capital one, was taken to the place of punishment (^{<0072>}Joshua 7:22; ^{<0028>}1 Samuel 22:8; ^{<0023>}1 Kings 2:23). See L’Empereur, *De Legibus Hebraeorum*

Forensibus (Lugd. 1637); Ziegler, *De Juribus Judaeorum* (Vitemb. 1684); Benny, *Criminal Code of Jews* (Lond. 1880, 12m-o). **SEE JUDGE.**

The following remarks respecting certain special instances of judicial proceedings in the New Test. are calculated to set them in their true legal light.

- 1.** The trial of our Lord before Pilate was, in a legal sense, a trial for the offence *esce majestatis* one which, under the Julian law, following out that of the twelve tables (*Digest*, 4:1,3), would be punishable with death ^{<4221>}Luke 23:2. 38; ^{<4392>}John 19:12, 15). **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**
- 2.** The trials of the apostles, of Stephen, and of Paul before the high-priest were conducted according to Jewish rules (Acts 4; 5, 27; 6:12; 22:30; 23:1). **SEE STEPHEN.**
- 3.** The trial, if it may be so called, of Patil and Silas at Philippi was held before the duumviri, or, as they are called, **στρατηγοί**, permetors, on the charge of innovation in religion—a crime punishable with banishment or death (^{<4463>}Acts 16:19, 22). **SEE SERGEANT.**
- 4.** The interrupted trial of Paul before the proconsul Gallio was an attempt made by the Jews to establish a charge of the same kind (^{<4482>}Acts 18:12-17, see Conybeare and Howson, 1, 492-496).
- 5.** The trials of Paul at Caesarea (Acts 24, 25, 26) were conducted according to Roman rules of judicature, of which the procurators Felix and Festus were the recognized administrators.

(1.) In the first of these, before Felix, we observe

- (a)** the employment by the plaintiffs of a Roman advocate to plead in Latin, **SEE ORATOR**;
- (b)** the postponement (*ampliatic*) at the trial after Paul's reply (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. "Judex");
- (c)** the free custody in which the accused was kept, pending the decision of the judge (^{<4423>}Acts 24:23-26).

(2.) The second formal trial, before Festus, was probably conducted in the same manner as the former one before Felix (^{<4437>}Acts 25:7, 8), but it presents two new features:

(a) the appeal, *appellatio* or *provocatio*, to Caesar by Paul as a Roman citizen. The right of appeal, *ad populum*, or to the tribunes, became, under the empire, transferred to the emperor, and, as a citizen, Paul availed himself of the right to which he was entitled, even in the case of a provincial governor. The effect of the appeal was to remove the case at once to the jurisdiction of the emperor (see Conybeare and Howson, 2, 360; Smith, *at s. . s., v.* “Appellatio;” *Digest*, 49:1, 4).

(b) The conference of the procurator with “the council” (^{4152}Acts 25:12). This council is usually explained to have consisted of the assessors, who sat on the bench with the praetor as consilarii (Sueton. *Tib.* 3?. Grotius,

On Acts 25; Conybeare and Howson, 2, 358, 361). Bat, besides the absence of any previous mention of any assessors (see below), the mode of expression *συλλαλήσας μετὰ τοῦ συμβουλίου* seems to admit the explanation of conference with the deputies from the Sanhedrim (*to < sub>*). Paul’s appeal would probably be in the Latin language, and would require explanation on the part of the judge to the deputation of accusers before he carried into effect the inevitable result of the appeal, viz. the dismissal of the case so far as they were concerned. *SEE PAUL.*

6. We have, lastly, the mention (^{4168}Acts 19:38) of a judicial assembly which held its session at Ephesus, in which occur the terms *ἀγοράῳ* (i.e. *ἡμέραι ἄγονται* and *ἀνθύπατοι*. The former denotes the assembly, then sitting, of provincial citizens forming the conventus, out of which the proconsul, *ἀνθύπατος*, selected “judices” to sit as his assessors. The *ἀνθύπατοι* would thus be the judicial tribunal composed of the proconsul and his assessors. In the former case, at Caesarea, it is difficult to imagine that there could be any conventus and any provincial assessors. There the only class of men qualified for such a function would be the Roman officials attached to the procurator; but in Proconsular Asia such assemblies are well known to have existed (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. “Provincia”).

Early Christian practice discouraged resort to heathen tribunals in’ civil matters (^{4181}1 Corinthians 6:1). *SEE PUNISHMENT.*

Trial Sermon

SEE TRIALS.

Trials

the name given in ecclesiastical diction to those discourses delivered before the presbytery by students who have finished their course, and are seeking to be licensed to preach. These discourses are a sermon, a lecture, a homily, an exegesis or exercise with additions, and a thesis. There are also examinations on systematic theology and practical piety, on Church history, and on the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures.

Triangle Controversy, the

was a dispute occasioned by *The Triangle*, a book by Samuel Whelpley (1816) against limited atonement, inability, and immediate imputation. The controversy led to the trial of Albert Barnes and of Lyman Beecher for alleged heresy and finally to the disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1837. See Hagelnbach, *Hist. of Doct.* 2, 442.

Tribe

(**hFmi** and **fbvɛ** both originally meaning a *rod* or branch. **φυλή**) is the name of the great groups of families into which the Israelitish nation, like other Oriental races, was divided. The modern Arabs the Bedawin, and the Berbers, and also the Moors on the northern shores of Africa, are still divided into tribes. The clans in Scotland are also analogous to the tribes of the ancient Israelites. The division of a nation into tribes differs from a division into castes, since one is a division merely according to descent, and the other super adds a necessity of similar occupations being prevalent among persons connected by consanguinity. There occurs, however, among the Israelites a caste also, namely, that of the Levites. In Genesis 49 the tribes are enumerated according to their progenitors; viz.

- 1 Reuben, the first-born;
- 2, Simeon, and
- 3, Levi, instruments of cruelty;
- 4, Judah, whom his brethren shall praise;
- 5, Zebulon, dwelling at the haven of the sea;
- 6, Issachar, the strong;
- 7, Dan, the judge;
- 8, Gad, whom a troop shall overcome, but who shall vanquish at last;
- 9, Asher, whose bread shall be fat;
- 10, Naphtali, giving goodly words;

11, Joseph, the fruitful bough;

12, Benjamin, the wolf: all these were originally the twelve tribes of Israel (see Allin, *Prophecies of the Twelve Tribes* Lond. 1855]).

In this enumeration it is remarkable that the subsequent division of the tribe of Joseph into the two branches of Ephraim and Manasseh is not yet alluded to. After this later division of the very numerous tribe of Joseph into the two branches of Ephraim and Manasseh had taken place, there were, strictly speaking, thirteen tribes. It was, however, usual to view them as comprehended under the number twelve, which was the more natural, since one of them, namely, the caste of the Levites, did not live within such exclusive geographical limits as were assigned to the others after they exchanged their nomadic migrations for settled habitations, but dwelt in towns scattered through all the other twelve tribes. It is also remarkable that the Ishmaelites, as well as the Israelites, were divided into twelve tribes; and that the Persians also, according to Xenophon (*Cyclopaedia*, 1, 2, 4 sq.), were similarly divided. Among other nations also occur ethnological and' geographical divisions, according to the number twelve. From this we infer that the number twelve was held in so much favor that, when possible, doubtful cases were adapted to it. An analogous case we find even at a later period, when the spiritual progenitors of the Christian **δωδεκάφυλον**, or the apostles, who were, after the death of Judas, the election of Matthias, and the vocation of Paul, really thirteen in number, were, nevertheless, habitually viewed as twelve; so that wherever, during the Middle Ages, any division was made with reference to the apostles, the number twelve, and not thirteen, was adopted, whether applied to the halls of theological libraries, or to the great barrels of costly wines in the cellar of the civic authorities at Bremen. Concerning the arrangement of these tribes on their march through the wilderness, in their encampments around the ark, and in their occupation of the land of Canaan, see the cognate articles, such as *SEE EXODE; SEE ENCAMPMENT; SEE GENEALOGIES; SEE LEVITES, SEE WANDERING*; and the names of the several tribes. We confine ourselves here to two points.

I. *The "Lost Tribes."* — This has been an inexhaustible source of theologico-historical charlatanism, on which there have been written so many volumes that it would be difficult to condense the contradictory opinions advanced in them within the limits of a moderate article. Suffice it to say that there is scarcely any human race so abject, forlorn, and dwindling, located anywhere between the Chinese and the American

Indians, who have not been stated to be the ten tribes which disappeared from history during and after the Babylonian captivity. If the books, written on the ten tribes contained much truth, it would be difficult to say where they are not.

The truth, however, of the matter seems rather to be as follows. After the division of the Israelites under Jeroboam and Rehoboam into the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, the believers in whom the feelings of ancient theocratic legitimacy and nationality predominated, and especially the priests and Levites, who were, connected by many ties with the sanctuary at Jerusalem, had a tendency to migrate towards the visible center of their devotions; while those, members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin who had an individual hankering after the foreign fashions adopted in Samaria, and the whole kingdom of Israel, had a tendency externally to unite themselves to a state of things corresponding with their individuality. After the political fall of both kingdoms, when all the principal families connected with the possession of the soil had been compelled to emigrate, most Israelites who had previously little feeling for theocratic nationality gradually amalgamated by marriages and other connections with the nations by which they were surrounded; while the former inhabitants of the kingdom of Judah felt their nationality revived by the very deprivation of public worship which they suffered in foreign lands. Many of the pious members of those tribes which had formerly constituted the kingdom of Israel undoubtedly joined the returning colonies which proceeded, by permission of the Persian monarchs, to the land of their fathers. However, these former members of the other tribes formed so decidedly a minority among the members of the tribe of Judah that henceforth all believers and worshippers of Jehovah were called μυδωχοι, 'oudaiōi, Judaei, Jews. Thus it came to pass that the best, although smaller, portion of the ten tribes amalgamated with the Jews, some of whom preserved their genealogies till after the destruction of Jerusalem; while the larger proportion of the ten tribes amalgamated with the Gentiles of Central Asia, to whom they probably imparted some of their notions and customs, which again were, in a state more or less pure, propagated to distant regions by the great national migrations proceeding from Central Asia. We are glad to find that this, our historical conviction, has also been adopted by the most learned among the Jews themselves (see Jost, *Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes* [Berlin, 1832], 1, 407 sq., 416 sq.). *SEE CAPTIVITY.*

II. Boundary-lines of the Tribes Identified. — This topic has usually been abandoned by commentators as hopeless. Keil (*Comment. on Joshua*) is really the only one who has seriously grappled with its difficulties, some of which even he is compelled to pronounce insoluble. See each tribe in its alphabetical place.

1. Reuben. — On the south, being the southern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes, beginning at the mouth of the river Arnon (Wady el-Mojeb) on the Dead Sea; thence along the Arnon to Aroer (Ariir) (^{<0136>}Joshua 13:16); thence along the south-eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (which extended as far as the “plain” or tableland stretching eastward from Jordan [12:1], being that containing Medeba and Dibon [13:9]) (north-easterly along the Wady Enkheileh to Leflm); thence along the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (east of the ruins of El-Herri); then with an inclination west of north so as to exclude Jazer (ver. 25) (Seir), also Rabbath-ammon (^{<0100>}2 Samuel 11:1) (to a point below Jebeihā which was excluded, probably being the Jogbehah of the Gadites, ^{<0135>}Numbers 32:35); thence entirely south of Gilead (^{<0135>}Joshua 13:25) (directly west, down the wadies Naur and Hesban), excluding Beth-haran (Beit-hatran) (ver. 27) and Atroth-shophau (near Merjakkeh) (^{<0135>}Numbers 32:35), but including Heshlon (Heshln), Elealeh (El-Ai), Bamoth (comp. 21:19, 20) (probably Jebel Humeh), and Nebo (now discovered in Jebel Neba) (32:37; ^{<0137>}Joshua 13:17); thence southerly along the Jordan to the place of beginning (ver. 23).

2. Gad. — On the south, following the northern line of Reuben from the Jordan to the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (at Jebeihā); thence north by east along the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (around the northern brow of Jebel Zerka) (to a point opposite Jerash [Gerasa] between Jebel Zerka and Jebel Kafkafka); thence in a north-westerly, direction across the region of Gilead (^{<0135>}Joshua 13:25, 31), passing near Mahajaimn (ver. 26, 30) (Mabneh), to the southern extremity of the sea of Cinllereth (sea of Galilee) (ver. 27), with the Jordan for the western boundary.

3. Manasseh East. — On the south, following the northern line of Gad to its intersection with the eastern boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (at the opening of the valley between Jebel Zerka and Jebel Katafkafka, with the plain lying east of the latter); thence north-easterly along the boundary of the trans-Jordanic tribes (in a direct line across the last-named plain,

over the northern end of Jebel es-Zumle, and partly across the plain of the Hanran), and again along the same boundary with a northerly and north-westerly curve through the plain of Bashan (^{<G33>}Joshua 13:30) (i.e. the Hauran), so as to include Edrei (which may be Draa or Dera) (ver. 31), and so on north-westerly to the vicinity of Mount Hermon (ver. 11) (i.e. Jebel eshSheikh, where the northern line probably followed the present boundaries of the Arab clans along the top of the Hermon range to its junction with Wady el-Teim at Hasbeiyah); where it joined the northern boundary of the cis-Jordanic tribes at the “entrance into Hamath” (^{<G48>}Numbers 34:8); thence southerly along the sources of the Jordan (down Nahr el-Banmias and its brook), through the lake of Merom, the upper Jordan, and the sea of Galilee, to the place of beginning (ver. 10-12).

4. Judah. On the south, the southerly boundary of Canan, beginning on the border of Edom, at the southern bay of the Dead Sea, southward (along the Ghor) past the ascent of Acrabbim, near the desert of Zin (the Wady el-Jeib or the Arabah), to the vicinity of Kradesh-barnea (Ain-weibeh or Ain-hasb) (^{<G51>}Joshua 15:1-3; ^{<G42>}Numbers 34:2-4); thence westward to Hezron, along the southern boundary of Canaan (perhaps through Wady Fikreh) (where we may assign a location) to Adar of Hazar-addar: thence westerly around (perhaps by wadies Maderah and Marreh) to:Karkaa (perhaps in this latter), then still westerly to Azmon (possibly in the vicinity south of the ancient Elisa); thence north-westerly (perhaps by Wady en-Abiya) to “the river of Egypt” (or El-Arish), and so on to the Mediterranean, which formed the western boundary of Palestine (^{<G55>}Joshua 15:3, 4, 12; ^{<G44>}Numbers 34:4, 6). See *Quar; Statement of “Pal. Explor. Fund,”* p. 68 sq.; April, 1874, p. 68, 82; July, 1874, p. 190.

On the north, beginning at the northern bay of the Dead Sea (which formed the eastern boundary), where the Jordan empties into it (see this whole line in ^{<G55>}Joshua 15:5-12, *ad* inversely in 18:14-20): obliquely across the plain of the Jordan to Beth-hoglah (Ainl-hajla), thence to Beth-arabah (at first included, but afterwards excluded) (hence situated probably at the present Kusr Hajla); thence to the stone of Bohan (apparently very near the last place, and on the eminences in tile side of Wady Dabus); thence (westerly) in the direction of Delbit (which must therefore be placed on the west side of Wady Dabus [near its head], which last the boundary crossed, as expressed by coming) from the valley of Achor, thence northward towards Gilgalor Geliloth (which is explained as being in front of the ascent to Adummim (apparently lying on the hills skirting the Jordan just west of

Gilgal, to which the access would be by the valley on the south side of Jebel el-Fasca; Adummim [probably at ed-Dem near es-Snmreh] being further described as lying on the south side of the “river,” probably Wady Kelt); thence to the waters of En-shemesh (probably the “fountain of the apostles,” on the road between Bethany and Jericho); thence (across the Mount of Olives by way of Bethany) to En-rogel (the well of Job near Jerusalem); thence around the valley of Hinnom (but at a later date across Mount Moriah, which David purchased, and north of Jebus, which he conquered, and thus acquired both for Judah), through the valley of Gihon to the hill at its northwestern end, bounding the plain or valley of Rephaim west of the city; thence along the ridge of this elevated plain or “hill” to the fountain of Nephtoah (probably Ain Yalo in Wady el-Werd, which last it probably followed after crossing the “giants’ plain;” for it must have bent considerably to the south, since it passed near Rachel’s sepulcher, now Kubbet Rahil, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem [~~1002~~ 2 Samuel 10:2]); thence in the direction of Mount Ephron (lying considerably northward of this vicinity, although among its “cities” may properly have been reckoned Kirjath-jearim; this line being probably carried through Wady Bittir, then by Wady Sataf, due north) to Kirjath-jearim (otherwise Baalah or Kirjathbaal) (now Kuiryet el-Enab); thence west (across the intervening valley occupied by the Beni-melik in the direction of Yalo) to the ridge of Seir (perhaps indicated by the modern Saris); thence (south-westerly along this mountain) to a more southern spur called Mount Jearim (just across Wady Ghurab), where is located (Kesla, the representative of) Chesalo (or Chesulloth); thence (still keeping south-westerly along the same range of hills, between Zanoah [Zanfiah], and Zorah [Sufra], the last of which was afterwards assigned to Dan, with several other cities on this part of the boundary [~~1094~~ Joshua 19:41 sq.]) to Enshemesh (or Ir-shemesh) (now Ainsheems); thence (a little south of Wady Surar) near Timnath (Tibneh. and Ekron (Akir) (the last three towns being finally reckoned as belonging to Dan), and so on to the Mediterranean, passing successively Shicron (perhaps Beit-sit), next Mount Baalah (possibly Tell Hermes), and finally Jabneel (elsewhere Jabneh [now Yebna]) (but eventually deserting the Nahr Rubin a little beyond its junction with Wady Marubah, and running thence south-west so as to include Gederah [Gheterah], but exclude Jal)neh and Bene-berak [Burka], reaching the sea by Wady Stimt).

Of Judah only are there any distinct and regular subdivisions given (for Keil’s arrangement of the towns of Simeon in four groups according to

Joshua 15:21-32 [*Comment. ad loc.*] is not justified by the parallel passage [Joshua 19:2-8], nor by the analogy of enumeration in the case of the other subdivisions of Judah [15:33-62] and Benjamin [18:21-28], nor with the Masoretic punctuation [“and” being omitted only between different designations of the *same* locality], nor, finally, with the actual juxtaposition of the sites). The southernmost section (stretching apparently entirely across from the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean) constituted the territory of Simeon, including (as appears from a comparison of Joshua 15:21-32 with 19:1-8) twenty-nine (strictly twenty-six) cities (namely, Kabzeel, Eder, Jagur, Kinah, Dinmonmah, Adadah, Kedesh [Kadesh-barnea], Hazor, the twofold town Ithnan-Ziph [Zephath] with its neighboring ruins, Hormah [?Hazar-addar], Telem, Shenma or Sheba [Hazar-shual], Moladah, Heshmon o[Azmon], Beth-palet, Beer-sheba, the twin-towns Bealoth or Balah [Ramath-nekeb] and Bizjothjah-baalath or Baalath-beer [Lehi], Iim, Azem, Eltolad, Chesil or Bethul, Ziklag, Madiannah or Beth-marcaboth, Sansannah or Hazar-suisah, Lebaoth or Beth-lebaloth, ShiThim or Sharuhem, and the double town Ain-rimmon or Enrimmon), besides three villages dependent upon two of these (namely, Hazor-hadattlah and Kerioth-hezron or Hazor-amam [belonging to Hazor proper], and Hazar-gaddah [to Hazar-shual]), and in addition two of the towns in the plain (namely, Ether and Ashan), with others doubtless not here enumerated. The plain district or “valley” was again subdivided into four sections—the first comprising (originally) fourteen towns (Gederah and Gederothaim being the same), situated in the north-western corner of the tribe; the second comprising sixteen towns, situated immediately south of this, in the western part of the tribe; the third comprising nine towns (two ‘of which,’ as above, were afterwards set off to Simeon, doubtless lying on the southern boundary between the tribes), situated east of the last group and south of the preceding, in the middle of the tribe, east of the road leading from Eleutheropolis to Jerusalem; the fourth comprising the five principal Philistine towns, situated on the extreme west of the tribe along the Mediterranean coast (Ekron being really in Dan, and Gath-mizpeh in the “valley”). The highland district, or “mountains,” was likewise subdivided into five groups—the first containing eleven chief towns, situated along the border of Simeon, in the middle: the second containing nine chief cities, situated immediately north of the foregoing in the southern part of the tribe around Helron: the third containing ten metropolitan towns, situated immediately east of the two preceding; the fourth embracing six principal cities, situated immediately north of the last two groups, as far as

Jerusalem, on the northern boundary; and the fifth containing only two metropolitan towns, situated in the northern medial angle between the last-named group and the valley district. The remaining districts embraced the desert tract or "wilderness" along the Dead Sea, and included six chief towns (Beth-arabah being in Benjamin). The remarkable addition in the Septuagint (at ver. 59) of eleven cities (namely, Tekoah, Bethlehem, Phagor, Etam, Kulon, Tatam, Saris, Iareli, Gallim, Bether, and Menuchah), probably real localities (see each in its place), is perhaps entitled to a place in the genuine text; and would indicate a group between the third land fourth above, reaching to Jerusalem (Kulon, Saris, and Gallim being in Benjamin).

5. Simeon. — This tribe had a portion set off from the above bounded territory of Judah (^{<690>}Joshua 19:1-8), embracing some seventeen or twenty cities (according as we make several in the list identical or different), of which only two or three have been located with any degree of definiteness, namely, Beer-sheba (probably Bir-es-Saba), Moladah (perhaps el-Miil), and Hormah (or Zephath, possibly represented by the pass es-Sutif); this much only is evident, that they all lay on the extreme south of Judah, and we shall therefore probably be not far from correct if we draw the dividing line between Judah and Simeon west by north from the Dead Sea at Massada, up Wady Sebbeh, thence cross in the same direction front Ehdeit, just south of Arad (Tell Arad) and Jattir (Attir), to the junction of Wady Khamleilifeh with Wady Khulil; thence still in the same direction up the former of these wadies to the summit of the mounts of Judah; thence west by south (along Wady Sheriah) to the Mediterranean, a short distance south of Gaza (Ghuzzeh).

6. Benjamin. — On the north, following the boundary of Ephraim (^{<690>}Joshua 16:1-3, 6; 18:11-13), beginning at the Jordan opposite Jericho (probably at the mouth of Wady Nuwaimeh); thence (across the plain of the Jordan along this wady) to the northward of Jericho (ver. 12) (so as to include Zemaraim [es-Surnrah], ver. 22); thence northward (ver. 12) by the water east (i.e. north-east) of Jericho (16:1) (perhaps Ras el-Ain, which discharges its water in that direction) through the mountainous (18:12) desert (26:1) of Beth-aven (Beni-salim) (18:12), that extends from Jericho to the hilly region of Beth-el (16:1)-a description that appears to apply as well as any to the plain northwest of Jebel Kurunntul (Mt. Quarantania), the northern part of which the line would partly traverse, so as to include (18:23, 24) Ophrah (perhaps et-Tayibeh) and Ojhni (probably Jifna)

(probably up Wady el-Anjeh) as it ascended Wady Habis, passing Natarah (16:7, Narath-Naaron) on the way, which lay east of Bethel (^{<13728>}1 Chronicles 7:28) (perhaps at el-Nejenieh); from Bethel (now Beitin) (which, being included in Benjamin, the expression “to the side of Luz southward” [^{<6883>}Joshua 18:13] must be interpreted as indicating that the line ran between Beth-el on the south and the ancient site of Luz a little to the north, the two spots being distinguished in ^{<6162>}Joshua 16:2, although occupying the same vicinity) the line passed (directly south-west naming the Nahlas road, west of Bireh [Beeroth]), passing Alchi (situated perhaps at the ruined Kefr-musr) (16:2) to Ataroth (called also Ataroth-adar or Ataroth-addarl), in a lower spot near the hill on the south side of Beth-horon the lower (18:13), yet with some interval to the east of this last place (16:3), and at the southern extremity of this part of the line I between Ephraim and Benjamin (that faced the east), not far from Beth-horon the upper (ver. 5), and west of Naiarah on that part of the same line near the Jordan (i.e. facing the south) (ver. 7); indications that all point to some site (for one place of the name seems to be designated, since these descriptions [ver. 5-6 last clause, 7] are all of parts of the same southern boundary of Ephraim [the first two clauses of ver. 6, and the whole of ver. 8, however, refer to the northern border as Keil, in his *Comment*, admits, although he confesses himself unable to clear up the difficulties of the passage], reckoned first [ver. 5, 6 last clause] westward to Beth-horon, and thence back again [ver. 7] more minutely over the same line and eastward to the Jordan) directly east of Beth-horon (doubtless the Atara, whose ruins are still found at this point, a little north of the road from Jaffa to Jerusalem; and in that case we must locate “the hill south of Beth-horon the nether” among the eminences opposite Belt Ur el-Tahta, on the south side of Wady Suleiman, through which this road runs); from Ataroth the line ran south-westerly along the Wady Suleiman, so as to include Chephirah (18:26) (probably Keftir, near this road), opposite the hill above described (ver. 14, where the expression rendered “compassed the corner of the sea” appears to signify [as some copies of the Sept. translate] a bend from a seaward [i.e. westerly] direction), and again south-easterly to Kirjathjearim (thus forming the western side), where it joined the boundary of Judah, which it followed back to the Jordan, and so up to the point of beginning.

The towns of this tribe enumerated in ^{<6182>}Joshua 18:21-28 appear to be classed under two general sections--the twelve in ver. 21-24 lying north and east of Jerusalem, while the fourteen others occupy the more southern

and western portion of the territory. At least one of these cities, Kiljath-jearim, was really (eventually) within the limits of the adjoining tribe, Judah (^{<07812>}Judges 18:12).

7. Dan. — This tribe was bounded by the Mediterranean on the west, and by the tribes of Judah on the south, Benjamin on the east, and Ephraim on the north. (The Danites also conquered from the Cananites Leshem or Laish, in the extreme northern part of Palestine, within the bounds of Manasseh east, and retained it under the name of Dan.) The only position unidentified is the northern boundary, which will be considered under *Ephraim*.

8. Ephraim. — The Mediterranean was the western and the Jordan the eastern boundary. The southern boundary has been already defined from the Jordan westward as far as Ataroth from this point it passed westward (to the Jaffa road), in the vicinity of Japhleti (perhaps situated at Beit-Unia; but this word should probably be rendered “the Japhletites,” i.e. family of Japhlet, a descendant of Asher [^{<13072>}1 Chronicles 7:32, 33], although it is difficult to explain their existence in this location), to Beth-horon the nether (^{<06163>}Joshua 16:3); thence more northerly (i.e. in a general north-westerly direction) to the Mediterranean (probably along the Jaffa road to Wady Budrfis, and thence north on the western brow of the hills to Wady el-Atnjeh, which it may naturally have followed westward to the sea; for it excluded Batlath [Balait], Jehnd [Yehudieh], and Japho [Joppa], 19:44, 45, but included Bethhorton and Gezer [Abu-churheb], 21:21, 22), passing on the way Gezer (16:3) west of Beth-el (^{<13072>}1 Chronicles 7:2S [the other passages where it is mentioned do not help to fix the locality more definitely]; lately thought to have been found in Tell Jazer). The remainder of the description of the southern boundary (^{<06163>}Joshua 16:5, last clause of 6, and whole of 7) is the same as that of Benjamin on the north.

The northern boundary (the account in ^{<06167>}Joshua 16:7, with the exception of the first name, must be transposed so as to connect immediately with the description of the south border in ver. 5), beginning at the Jordan (probably at the mouth of Wady Fusail), passed westward (up this wady, otherwise called Wady Mudadireh, or Burshek) to Taanath-shiloh (ver. 6) (probably the present Ain-Fhria); thence north-westerly to Tappulah (17, 7) (probably the Belad el-Taffne [or Atuf] mentioned by some travelers east of Shechem); thence northerly to Michmneah (16:61, 17:7) (apparently at the intersection of the line ‘with Wady Tubas); thence, with

a north-westerly curve, to Asher (ibid.) (probably represented by the modern Yasir) thence the line is only given in general terms as extending to the river Kanah on the Mediterranean (16:8; 17:9) (no doubt the present Nahr Falaik, which is the principal marshy stream in that region).

9. Manasseh West. — The boundaries of this tribe are given with great indistinctness, and must be in part collected from the contiguous portions of Ephraim, Asher, and Issachar, from which certain towns were set off in addition to its proper territory (^{<671>}Joshua 17:11). From the Mediterranean, the northern boundary, beginning at Carmel (for Dor, below Carmel, is included [ibid.; 19:26]), and following the edge of the mountain (probably along the Kishon [Nahr-el-Mukattah]) south-easterly (as far as Jokneam [Tell-el-Kamon], and thence keeping the mountain more closely so as to throw the plain of Esdraelim entirely within Issachar [^{<495>}Genesis 49:15]), so as to include (^{<671>}Joshua 17:11) Meriddu (Lejjun), Taanach (Ta'anuk), but so as to exclude (^{<692>}Joshua 19:21) En-gannim (Jenii); thence (with a sharp curve) due north (on the west brow of Mts. Gilboa and Little Hermon), so as to include En-dor (Endur) (^{<671>}Joshua 17:11), but not Jezreel (Zerin), nor Chesulloth (Iksal), nor Shunem (Solam) (^{<698>}Joshua 19:18), nor Tabor (vol. 21): thence (with another sharp curve) south-east (probably down Wady Oskeh), so as to include Beth-shean (Beisan) (^{<671>}Joshua 17:11), to the Jordan, which formed the eastern boundary.

10. Issachar. — This tribe was hemmed in on the south, by Manasseh West, on the west by Asher, and on the north by Zebulun, leaving, only the Jordan as a natural boundary on the east (^{<692>}Joshua 19:22).

11. Zebulun In Jacob's dying blessing (^{<493>}Genesis 49:13), the territory of this tribe is prophetically described as being suitable for maritime purposes, and as extending along a sea as far as Sidon, which must be explained as meaning that it reached Phoenicia, through which latter seafaring people a communication was kept up through the river Kishon and the harbor at Carmel. In (^{<690>}Joshua 19:10-15), the boundaries are definitely laid down thus: Beginning at a place called Sarid, which is nowhere else mentioned in Scripture, but which, is here described as situated eastward from the Mediterranean, with high country intervening, one or two stations distant from the river before Jokneam (doubtless the Kishon), also as situated west of Chesulloth-tabor, and beyond (i.e. south of) Daberath and Japhia, and finally on the southern boundary (for the northern line is subsequently

described); all which details point to some spot about midway on the northern side of the plain of Esdraelons (probably the ruins on the “Mount of Precipitation,” near el-Mezraah, on the north-west); thence westward (“towards the sea”), passing Maralah (perhaps at Mujeidil) and Dabbasheth (perhaps the present Jebuta), to the Kishon opposite Jokneam (probably Tell el-Kuurtn); then returning to Sarid, and passing northerly in the general direction of Chislou Tabor (Iksail) and Daberath (Debhfried) (leaving these ins Issachar), so as on the way to include Japhia (Yafa) (situated on higher ground); thence (northward) facing the east to Gittah-hepher (or Gath-hepher, ¹²⁴⁵2 Kings 14:25) (at el-Meshad) (included within Zebulun) and Ittah-kazin (perhaps the modern Kefr Kenna); finally (as regards the southern line) extending (due north) in the direction of *Rimmon that pertains to Neah* (“Rimmon-methoar to Neah”) (the former answering doubtless to Rumaneh and the latter possibly to Nirmin, the names apparently being associated as adjacent) (and excluding both these, as will appear presently), so as to meet the line of Naphtali in Aznoth-tabor (apparently Kurn Hattin) (⁶⁹³Joshua 19:34). After this the description applies to the northern boundary (for the expression “compasseth it [Rimmon] on the north side” cannot mean that the southern border passed to the north of Rimmon, as this place belonged to Zebulun [¹³⁶⁷1 Chronicles 6:17, which likewise includes Tabor, i.e. apparently Hattin, in the same tribe]), which does not appear to have extended to the Sea of Galilee (since the northern border of Issachar terminated at the Jordan [⁶⁹²Joshua 19:22], and the border of Naphiali, as it included various towns on the southern end of the shore [ver. 35; ⁴⁰⁴³Matthew 4:13], as well as Aznoth-tabor [⁶⁹³Joshua 19:34], must have passed up to this last point not far from the Wady Bestuin), turning (with a north-westerly sweep) “so as to exclude (ibid.) Hukkok (Yakufk), and, passing (apparently west) along Wady Selanmeh, so as to include Hunnethon (perhaps Deir Hlannali), and running (south-west) to the valley of Jiphthah-el (probably marked by the modern Jefat), where it met the border of Asher (ver. 27).

In the enumeration of the border and interior towns of this tribe (⁶⁹⁰Joshua 19:10-15), twelve metropolitan cities only are counted, six others (Maralah, Jokneam, Chislothtabor, Daberath, Ittah-kazin, and Jiphthah-el) being situated outside the boundary line.

12. Asher. — The description of the boundary (⁶⁹²Joshua 19:24-30) begins with a general statement of several towns Helkath (perhaps Ukreth), Hall (perhaps Alia), Beteni (perhaps el-Baneh), Achshaph (probably Kesaf),

Alamrimelech (probably some place on the Waidy el-Melek), Amad (perhaps Shefu-namar), and Mishal (probably Missalli)-as lying near the border, which, crossing Carmel, reached to Shihor-libnuath (perhaps Wady Milheh), just above Dor (see 17:11), leaving in Naphtali the city of Heleph (probably Beit lif); then returning: eastward the same line, passing Beth-dagon (probably Hajeb) and the city of Zebulun (now Alidin) as far as Jiphthah-el, pursued this last valley northward past Beth-eniek and Neiel, leaving Cabul (Kabul) on the north, and, including several cities generally described (Hebron [i.e. Abdon], Rehob, Hammomi, and Kanah), ran east of north (doubtless so as to strike the Litany), and then *was* continued as the northern boundary about opposite Sidon, where (without including the Philenician sea-coast): it turned south-westerly (as the western border) past Tyre as far as Achzib (Zib).

In the recapitulation of the cities of this tribe (⁶⁸²⁵Joshua 19:25-30), twenty-two metropolitan towns only are reckoned, three others (Jiphthah-el, Sidon, and Tyre) being outside the border, and two other names (Carmel and Shitior-libnath) it being towns.

13. *Naphtai* was bounded by Issachar, Zebulun, and Asher on the south and west, and extended as far as Mount Hermon on the north, and eastward by the sea of Galilee, the Jordan, sea of Merom, and the Damascus road, extending to Juduah-upon-Jordan (Tell Naby Sidihnda), and including, Beth-shemesh (Medjel es-Sheirns) (⁶⁸²²Joshua 19:22). The northerly limits of this tribe are stated in the general boundaries of Palestine (q.v.), laid down in ⁶⁸¹⁷Numbers 34:7-11, as follows: A line from the Mediterranean Sea crossing the mountain-range (Lebanon, or its offshoot Hermon), and intersecting the "entrance to Iiamath" (Coele-Syria or the valley of the Leontes) apparently at Zedad (perhaps the present Jedeimdeh); thence to Ziphrou (probably another place in the same valley [possibly Kankaha]), and so by way of Hazar-enan (perhaps Hasbeya) to the edge of the Hanuran. From Hazarenan, the southern boundary bent southward (so as to firm in part the eastern boundary), so as to follow substantially the eastern arm of the-upper Jordan, taking in successively Shepham (perhaps Caesare Philippi; comp. Baal-gad in ⁶⁸¹⁷Joshua 11:17) and Riblah (not the Iiblah of Hamath, but a much: more southerly place), east of Ain (perhaps the spring of Tell el-Kady), and so on down to the sea of Galilee. The account in ⁶⁸⁷⁴Ezekiel 47:14-17 (which is evidently a copy of that in Numbers) contains the following additional names: Hethlon, Berothah, Sibraim, and Hazar-hatticon, which (at least the middle two),

from their association with Hamath, appear (in this vague enumeration) to have been situated beyond the bounds of the Oriental Promised Land altogether.

In the sum of the cities enumerated in connection with this tribe, nineteen metropolitan towns only are included, five of the names (Allon-zaanaim, Adami-nekeb, Ziddimzer, Hammath rakkath, and Migdal el Horem) being double, and two others (Aznoth-tabor and Judah-upon Jordan) lying outside the border. *SEE PALESTINE.*

Tribolos

SEE THORN.

Tribulation

(*rx*; *θλίψις*, both literally signifying. *pressure* or *straits*) expresses in the A. V. much the same as *trouble* or *trial*, importing afflictive dispensations to which a person is subjected either by way of punishment (see ^{<7104>}Judges 10:14; ^{<4221>}Matthew 24:21, 29; ^{<4119>}Romans 2:9 ^{<5006>}2 Thessalonians 1:6) or by way of trial (see ^{<4163>}John 16:33; ^{<4119>}Romans 5:3; ^{<5004>}2 Thessalonians 1:4).

Tribur (Conciliunm Triburense), Councils Of

Tribur was a royal residence near Mayence, where several Church councils were held.

I. The first council was held in 895. Twenty-two bishops were present, including Hatto, archbishop of Mayence; Herman, archbishop of Cologne and Ratbode, archbishop of Treves. King Arnulphus also attended, with many of the chief lords of his kingdom. Fifty-eight canons were published.

3. Declares that, with the king's consent, it is ordered that all his nobles shall seize those who refuse to perform the penance due to their offences, and bring them before the bishop.

4. Regulates the manner of disposing of the pecuniary mulct inflicted for wounding a priest; if the latter survived, the whole belonged to him; if he died, it was to be divided into three parts, one for his church, one for his bishop, and one for his relations.

5. Imposes five years penance for killing a priest, during which time the penitent might not eat meat nor drink wine, except on Sundays and festivals. At the end of the five years he might be admitted into the Church, but not to communion, until the expiration of other five years, during which he was to fast three days in the week.

10. Renews the canon of the Council of Carthage which enacts-that a bishop shall not be deposed by fewer than twelve bishops; a priest by fewer than six; nor a deacon by fewer than three.

12. Restricts the solemn celebration of baptism to Easter and Whitsuntide.

13. Orders the division of tithe into four portions: 1, for the bishop: 2, for the clerk; 3, for the poor; and, 4, for the fabric.

15. Orders that the dead be buried, if possible, at the cathedral church; if not, at the church belonging to a monastery, in order that they might benefit by the prayers of the monks; otherwise in the church to which, they pay tithe.

16. Proves from Scripture that no fee may be taken for burials.

17. Forbids to bury laymen within the church.

18. Forbids chalices and panels of wood.

19. Orders that water be mixed with the wine in the chalice, but that there be twice as much wine as waiver.

30. Orders all due respect to the see of Rome, and enacts penalties against those who cause the death of Christians by enchantments. See Mansi, *Concil.* 9:438.

II. The second council convened in October, 1076, The pope's legates, with several German lords and some bishops, assembled in council, debated concerning the deposition of the emperor Henry IV in consequence of which he passed into Italy, and, after, the most, humiliating concessions, obtained absolution from the pope, Jan. 25, 1077. See Mansi, *Concil.* 10, 355.

Tribute

(prop. *smi φόρος*), an impost which one prince or state agrees, or is compelled, to pay to another, as the purchase of peace or in token of

dependence.. In the Scriptures we find three forms of this requirement.
SEE TAX.

I. Native. — The Hebrews acknowledged no other sovereign than-God; and in ^{<102>}Exodus 30:12, 15, we find they' were required to pay tribute unto the Lord, to give an offering of half a shekel to "make an atonement for their souls." The native kings and judges of the Hebrews did not exact tribute. Solomon, indeed, at the beginning of his reign, levied tribute from the Canaanites and others who remained in the land and were not of Israel, and compelled them to hard servitude (^{<102>}1 Kings 9:21-23; ^{<489>}2 Chronicles 8:9); but the children of Israel were exempted from that impost, and employed in the more honorable departments and offices of his kingdom. Towards the end of his reign, however, he appears to have imposed tribute upon the Jews also, and to have compelled them to work upon the public buildings (^{<103>}1 Kings 5:13,14; 9:15; 11:27). This had the effect of gradually alienating their minds, and of producing that discontent which afterwards resulted in open revolt under Jeroboam, son of Nebat. "Thy father made our yoke grievous," said the Israelites to Rehoboam; "now, therefore, make thou the grievous service of thy father and his heavy yoke which he put upon us lighter, and we will serve thee" (^{<104>}1 Kings 12:4). *SEE ASSESSMENT.*

II. Foreign. — The Israelites were at various times subjected to heavy taxes and tributes by their conquerors. After Judaea was reduced to a, Roman province, a new poll of the people and an estimate of their substance were taken, by command of Augustus, in order that he might more correctly regulate the tribute to be exacted (Joseph us, *Anq. 17:15*). This was a capitation-tax levied at so much a head, and imposed upon all males from fourteen, and all females from twelve, up to sixty-five years of age (*Ulpian, Digest. de Censib. lib. 3; Fischer, De Numism. Census*). *SEE TAXING.*

Picture for Tribute

To oppose the levying of this tribute, Judas the Gaulonite raised an insurrection of the Jews, asserting that it was not lawful to pay tribute to a foreigner, that it was a token of servitude, and that the Jews were not allowed to acknowledge any for their master who did not worship the Lord. They boasted of being a free nation, and of never having been in bondage to any man (^{<483>}John 8:33). These sentiments were extensively

promulgated, but all their efforts were of no avail in restraining or mitigating the exactions of their conquerors. *SEE JUDAS.*

The Pharisees, who sought to entangle Jesus in his talk, sent unto him demanding whether it was lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or not; but, knowing their wicked designs, he replied, “Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?” “Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.” *SEE PENNY.*

The apostles Peter and Paul severally recommended submission to the ruling powers, and inculcated the duty of paying tribute, “tribute to whom tribute is due” (^{<530>}Romans 13:1-8; ^{<1213>}1 Peter 2:13).

III. The Temple Tax. — The payment of the half shekel (*half statre* = two drachmae) was (as has been said above), though resting on an ancient precedent (^{<2013>}Exodus 30:13), yet, in its character as a fixed annual rate, of late origin. It was proclaimed, according to Rabbinic rules, on the 1st of Adar, began to be collected on the 15th, and was due, at latest, on the 1st of Nisan (*Mishna, Shekalim*, 1, 7; Surenhusins, p. 260, 261). It was applied to defray the general expenses of the Temple, the morning and evening sacrifice, the incense, wood, showbread the red heifers, the scape-goat, etc. (*Mishna, Shekal. loc. cit.*; in Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. on* ^{<1724>}*Matthew 17:24*). After the destruction of the Temple it was sequestrated by Vespasian and his successors, and transferred to the Temple of the Capitoline Jupiter (*Josephus, War*, 7, 6, 6). *SEE TEMPLE.*

The explanation thus given of the “tribute” of ^{<1724>}Matthew 17:24 is, beyond all doubt, the true one. To suppose, with Chrysostom, Augustine, Maldonatus, and others, that it was the same as the tribute (κῆνσοϛ) paid to the Roman emperor (^{<2217>}Matthew 22:17) is at variance with the distinct statements of Josephus and the Mishna, and takes away the whole significance of our Lord’s words. It may be questioned, however, whether the full significance of those words is adequately brought out in the popular interpretation of them. As explained by most commentators, they are simply an assertion by our Lord of his divine Sonship, an implied rebuke of Peter for forgetting the truth which he had so recently confessed (comp. Wordsworth, Alford, and others): “Then are the children (*uidi*) free;” Thou hast owned me as the Son of the Living God, the Son of the Great King, of the Lord of the Temple, in whose honor men pay the Temple-tribute; why, forgetting this dost thou so hastily make answer as if I were

an alien and a stranger? This explanation, however, hardly does justice to the tenor of the language. Our Lord had not been present at the preceding Passover, and had therefore failed to pay the tax at the regular time and place. Hence he was waited upon in Galilee for that purpose, with some apprehension, perhaps, on the part of the collectors, that he might excuse himself for some reason, or at least neglect to pay. In his reply he asserts his just claim to exemption, not as an alien, but precisely because he was a member of the theocratic family in the highest sense. He was exempt on the broad constitutional ground that a king's son belongs to the royal household *for* whom tribute is collected, and not *by* whom it is rendered. Inasmuch as the tax was for the Temple service, Jesus, who was the son of the Lord of the Temple, could not be required to contribute to that expense. Peter is coupled in the payment, but not in the exemption; at least, not on the same ground precisely, but, if at all, on the general principle of association with the royal family. *SEE TRIBUTE-MONEY.*

Tribute-money

(*didracmon*), the Temple-tax levied upon all Jews (^{<40724>}Matthew 17:24), and likewise (κῆνσοϛ) the money collected by the Romans in payment of the taxes imposed upon the Jews (^{<40219>}Matthew 22:19). The piece shown to our Savior at his own request (in the latter passage) was a Roman coin, bearing the image of one of the Caesars, and must have been at that time current in Judaea, and received in payment of the tribute, in common with other descriptions of money. There is no reason to suppose that the tribute was collected exclusively in Roman coins, or that the tribute-money was a description of coin different from that which was in general circulation. *SEE PENNY.*

As regards the half-shekel of silver paid to the Lord by every male of the children of Israel as a ransom for his soul (^{<40213>}Exodus 30:13, 15), Colonel Leake says "that it had nothing in common with the tribute paid by the Jews to the Roman emperor. The tribute was a denarius, in the English version a penny (^{<40217>}Matthew 22:17; ^{<40214>}Luke 20:24); the duty to the Temple was a didrachmon, two of which made a stater. It appears, then, that the half-shekel of ransom had in the time of our Savior been converted into the payment of a didrachmon to the Temple, and two of their didrachma formed a stater of the Jewish currency." He then suggests that the stater was evidently the extant "Shekel Israel," which was a tetradrachm of the Ptolemaic scale, though generally below the standard

weight, like most of the extant specimens of the Ptolemies; and that the didrachmon paid to the Temple was therefore of the same monetary scale. “Thus,” says he, “the duty to the Temple was converted from the half of an Attic to the whole of a Ptolemaic didrachmon, and the tax was nominally raised in the proportion of about 105 to 65; but probably the value of silver had fallen as much in the two preceding centuries. It was natural that the Jews should have revived the old name shekel, and applied it to their stater, and equally so that they should have adopted the scale of the neighboring opulent and powerful kingdom, the money of which they must have long been in the habit of employing” (Appendix, *Numismata Hellenica*, p. 2, 3). *SEE DIDRACHM.*

Tricerium

(*trikhḥsion*), a three-branched taper, so arranged that the wicks of each, though distinct, blend into one flame. With this the Oriental bishops sign the book of the gospels during, certain services of the Greek Church.

Trichotomy

(*threefold division*) is the theory according to which man is divided into three *parts*-*body*, *soul*, and *spirit*. This is thought by many to be the apostolic classification of our nature (~~1~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:23). Generally soul and body are opposed; but spirit, so contrasted, is the highest portion of our nature, allying it to God, and on which his Spirit works. Soul (in the German sense) is the lower portion, the region of appetite, instinct, and of much besides which we have in common with the lower creation. This idea throws light on many passages of Scripture. The body mediates between the soul and the external world, the soul between the spirit and body, and the spirit between both and God. This view of human nature would have prevailed, had it not been so keenly opposed by Tertullian, and so slighted even by Augustine, and had not Apollinaris adopted it to illustrate his erroneous view of our Lord’s nature. He denied spirit, in this human sense, to Christ, but held that its place was occupied by the Divine Spirit. It was held by Luther, as it still is by the more evangelical part of the Lutheran Church. The Reformers, however, did not consider spirit and soul as different substances, but only as different attributes or operations of the same spiritual essence. *SEE SOUL; SEE SPIRIT.*

Tridentine

(*of or belonging to Trent*). The term is applied to the celebrated council of the 16th century, and to that part of the Church Universal which accepts the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent (q.v.).

Tridentine Profession of Faith

or the *Creed of Pius IV*, is a summary of the doctrines of the Council of Trent, suggested by that council, prepared by a college of cardinals under the supervision of pope Pius IV, and issued by him, Nov. 13, 1564. It consists of twelve articles, including the Nicene Creed (q.v.), and is put in the form of an individual profession and solemn oath. It is required of all Roman Catholic priests, and public teachers in seminaries, colleges, and universities. It is also used for Protestant converts to the Roman Catholic Church, and hence called the "profession of converts." The 10th article reads, "I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and as the vicar of Jesus Christ." See Latin text in the two papal bulls of Nov. 13 and Dec. 9, 1564, and in Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, p. 292-294; also a history of this creed by Mohnike, *Urkundliche Geschichte der Professio Fidei Tridentince* (Greifswald, 1822). **SEE TRENT, COUNCIL OF.**

Triennial Visitation

a visitation which is held once in three years. In England it is the custom to hold episcopal visitations at such intervals.

Triers, Ecclesiastical

A parliamentary ordinance was passed in 1654 appointing thirty-eight commissioners to the office of *triers*; they were chosen by Cromwell, and sat at Whitehall. They were mostly Independents, though some Presbyterians were joined with them. They were appointed to try all ministers that came for institution and induction, and without their approval none were admitted. The opinion of Baxter is that they were of essential service to the Church. He says they saved many congregations from ignorant, ungodly, and intemperate teachers-men who designed nothing more in the ministry than to repeat a sermon as readers say their

prayers, and to patch up a few good words together to talk the people asleep on Sunday, and all the rest of the week go with them to the ale-house, and harden them in their sin; and that sort of ministers who either preached against a holy life, or preached as men that were not acquainted with it. They had power to eject scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient ministers and schoolmasters.

Trigland, Jacob

a Dutch theologian, was born at Harlem, May 8, 1652, and died at Leyden, Sept. 22, 1705. His writings are, *Dissertt. Theologico-philologica, Continens Defensionem Integritatis Codicis Sacri adversus Nuperas in eum Censuras* (Leyden, 1703): — *Diatribes de Secta Karceorum* (ibid. eod.; Germ. transl. by Fürst. in *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1843, c. 12, 23, 39, 763, 776, 794, 827): — *Dissertationes Theologicæ et Philologicæ, Sylloge ut et Orationum Acad.* (Delft, 1728): — *Trium Scriptorum illustr. de Tribus Judæorum Sectis Syntagma in quo N. Serarii* (Mayence, 1604), *Drusii* (Franecker, 1603-5), *Jos. Scaligeri* (ibid. 1605) *Opuscula, quæ eo Pertinent*, etc. (ibid. 1703): — *Disputt. II de Origine Sacrificiorum* (Leyden, 1692): — *De Josepho Patriarcha in Sacri Bovi Hieroglyph. ab Egypti's Adorato* (ibid. 1705). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 447; Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, 1, 29, 139, 442, 515, 823. (B. P.)

Triglaw

in Slavonic mythology, was the supreme god of the Servians, Wends, Poles, partly also of the Rigen islanders, Pomeranians, Prussians, and Lithuanians. He was, as his name indicates, triple-headed, and therefore represented the Slavonic trinity. The priests proclaimed Triglaw as the unseen supreme sovereign of heaven, earth, and the infernal regions. He was represented veiled, in the greatest temple at Stettin, as a celebrated man with three heads. A large army of priests served him, and taught that he, being long-suffering and kind-hearted, veiled his face so as not to see the evil deeds of men, and seldom made his appearance on earth, but taught his priests his will and commands, and by means of his holy black steed he distributed oracles, etc. This steed governed by his hoofs the whole population, and no one would have dared to do anything to which it did not give favorable signs. His temple, made of huge wooden posts covered with cloths, contained the largest part of all the spoils of war. Vast riches were heaped up here, and the superstitious dread of the people was a

surer protection than marble or granite, perhaps, would have been. The destructive campaigns of Henry the Lion were the means of destroying all these temples, and closed to the world the inspection of the idols of their gods.

Trim, Council of

Trim is the county town of Meath, situated on the river Boyne, about twenty-seven miles north-west of Dublin. It contains a national school, besides other public institutions; a handsome Roman Catholic chapel; the remains of Trim Castle; and the Yellow Tower, a part of St. Mary's Abbey, rebuilt by the De Lacys in the 13th century.

The council was held on the Sunday after St. Matthew's Day (1291). Nicholas M'Motissa, archbishop of Armagh, presided. The four archbishops, all the suffragan bishops, all the cathedral chapters, by their deputies, and the other orders and degrees of the clergy, unanimously agreed in this synod to maintain and defend each other in all courts, and before all judges, ecclesiastical or secular, against all lay encroachments upon, and violations of, their rights, liberties, or customs; and, further, amply to indemnify those of their messengers, executors of their orders, etc., who might receive loss or damage in the performance of their duty. Other articles of agreement were drawn up, pledging them to mutual cooperation in enforcing sentences of excommunication, etc. See Mant, *Hist. of the Irish Church*, p. 17..

Trimmer, Sarah

a zealous promoter of religious education in England, was born at Ipswich, Jan. 6, 1741. She was carefully educated, and while a resident of London passed her time in the society of Dr. Johnson, Dr. Gregory Sharpe, and other eminent persons in the literary world. In her reading she was directed by her father. Becoming a mother of a large family of children, her current of thought was turned to education. Having experienced great success in the plan of educating her own family, she naturally wished to extend that blessing to others, and this first induced her to become an author. She strenuously opposed the current of French and German infidelity and a lax education independent of the history and truths of revelation. She was also an early promoter and supporter of Sunday schools. She died Dec. 15, 1810. Of her works, we refer to the last London edition: *Abridgment of the New Test.* (1852, 18mo): — *Abridgment of the Old Test.* (1850,

12mo): — *Help to the Unlearned in the Study of the Holy Scriptures* (1805, 8vo; 2d ed. 1850, 2 vols. 12mo): *New and Comprehensive Lessons on the New Test.* (1849, 18mo): — *New and Comprehensive Lessons on the Old Test.* (1849, 18mo): — *Prayers and Meditations* (1842, 12mo; 2d ed. 1860): — *Sacred History* (1782-85, 6 vols. 12mo; 1841-49, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Scripture Catechism* (1851, 2 vols. 12mo): — *The Economy of Charity* (1786; revised 1801): — and many other works on history, education, etc. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Trimnell, Charles

bishop of Norwich and Winchester, was born at Ripton-Abbots, England, Dec. 27, 1663. He graduated with honor at Winchester College, and in 1688 was appointed preacher at Rolls. In 1691 he was installed prebendary of Norwich, in 1694 presented by the earl of Sunderland to the rectory of Bodington, and in 1698 installed archdeacon of Norfolk. About this time he was made chaplain in ordinary to queen Anne. Having no parochial duty in 1705, he for some time took charge of St. Giles's parish, Norwich; and in October, 1706, was instituted to St. James's, Westminster. In January, 1707, Mr. Trimnell was elected bishop of Norwich, and in August, 1721, he was transferred to the bishopric of Winchester. He died Aug. 15, 1723. He had a very serious turn of mind, and performed the duty of every station with the greatest exactness. His public life was characterized by great moderation and firmness of spirit. "He was a lover of peace and order both from judgment and inclination; and, being a sincere friend to the Church of England, he constantly avowed those principles of toleration and indulgence which make that Church the glory of the Reformation." Bishop Trimnell published fifteen single *Sermons, Letters, Charges*, etc. (1697-1715).

Trine Baptism

A mode of administering the sacrament, which was so universal in the primitive Church that some entertain no doubt of its being derived: from apostolic tradition. The person baptized was thrice immersed, or water was thrice poured on him, in the name of the three persons of the Godhead. The reason of trine baptism was manifest: the three immersions showed the distinction of the three divine Persons, although the baptism was only *one*, in the name of the undivided Godhead— "one baptism for the remission of

sins.” Thus in baptism the unity of the Divine Nature and the distinction of the three Persons are clearly implied and set forth. The first who departed from this usage was Eunomius the Arian. Trine baptism was according to the fiftieth apostolical canon, the bishop or presbyter who baptized with one immersion being ordered to be deposed. In the 6th and 7th centuries one immersion in baptism was substituted by some in Spain for the ordinary rule of the Church, the Council of Toledo (A.D. 633, canon 6) allowing single immersion in Spain, to avoid schism; but this innovation lasted for only a short period, the early usage being restored, and remaining the rule of the Western Church. Single immersion has never been authorized by the Eastern Church. See Blunt, *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol.* s.v.; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 582.

Trine-God Controversy

In the churches over which Hincmar (q.v.), archbishop of Rheims, presided, he forbade the singing of the last words of a very ancient hymn—*Te trina Deitas, unaque poscimus* (“Of thee, trine Deity, yet one, we ask”) on the ground that this phraseology subverted the simplicity of the Divine Nature, and implied the existence of *three Gods*. The Benedictine monks would not obey this mandate of Hincmar; and one of their number, Ratramnus, wrote in defense of a *trine Deity*. Godeschalcus, hearing of this dissension while in prison, sent forth a paper, in which he defended the cause of his fellow-monks. For this he was accused by Hincmar of Tritheism, and was confuted in a book written expressly for that purpose. But this controversy soon subsided; and, in spite of Hincmar’s efforts, the words retained their place in the hymn. See Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. 5, ch. 2, p. 94.

Trinitarian Brothers

Picture for Trinitarian

or ORDER OF THE MOST HOLY TRINITY *for the Redemption of Captives*, was founded by St. John of Matha, who was born at Faucon, Provence, in 1154. When he first celebrated divine service, after his ordination, he beheld a vision of an angel in white, having a cross of red and blue on his breast, and his hands, crossed over each other, rested on the heads of two slaves who knelt on each side of him. He, with another holy man, Felix de Valois, arranged the institution of a new order for the redemption of slaves. They went to Rome, and received the approval of

Innocent III in 1198. They assumed the white habit, having on the breast a Greek cross of red and blue. They returned to France, and received from Gaucher de Chatillon lands in the province of Valois. The pope also gave them at Rome the church and convent of S. Maria della Navicella, on the Monte Celio. Honorius III confirmed their rule, and in 1267 Clement IV approved of a change in their rules permitting them to purchase meat and own horses. They had at one time two hundred and fifty convents in France, three in Spain, forty-three in England, fifty-two in Ireland, besides others in Portugal, Italy, Saxony, Hungary, and Bohemia. In 1594 the Barefooted branch of this order was begun by Jean Baptiste de la Conception in the convent of Valde. Spain. He was granted a bull by Clement VIII in 1598 to establish a reform in his order and lead them back to the ancient practice. The founders of the Trinitarians placed themselves under the protection of St. Radegunda, queen of Clothaire V of France, who afterwards took the religious habit and founded a monastery at Poitiers.) See Jameson, *Leg. of Monastic Orders*, p.217 sq.; Migne, *Dict. des Ordres Relig.* s.v.

Trinitarian Sisters

Picture for Trinitarian

This order was founded at Valence in 1615, and constituted a convent in 1696. They received letters patent from Louis in 1712, and were registered in Parliament in January, 1728. They established two hospitals, which were in 1802 devoted to the care of aged men and women. They have been quite flourishing since 1837. See Migne, *Dict. des Ordres Relig.* s.v.

Trinitarians

A general name for all Christians who hold the doctrine of the divine Trinity (q.v.).

Trinity

The doctrine of the Trinity in the godhead includes the three following particulars, viz. (a) There is only one God, one divine nature; (b) but in this divine nature there is the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as three (subjects or persons); and (c) these three-have equally, and in common with one another, the nature and perfection of supreme divinity. It was the custom in former times for theologians to blend their own

speculations and those of others with the statement of the Bible doctrine. It is customary now to exhibit first the simple doctrine of the Bible, and afterwards, in a separate part, the speculations of the learned respecting it.

I. The Biblical Doctrine. — It has always been allowed that the doctrine of the Trinity was not fully revealed before the time of Christ, and is clearly taught only in the New Test. Yet, while it is true (1) that if the New Test. did not exist we could not derive the doctrine of the Trinity from the Old-Test. alone, it is equally true (2) that by the manner of God’s revelation of himself in the Old Test. the way was prepared for the more full disclosure of his nature that was afterwards made. But (3) respecting the intimate connection of these persons, or respecting other distinctions which belong to the doctrine of the Trinity, there is nothing said in the Old Test. While in each particular text allusion is made to a trinity or plurality in God, yet these texts are so many in number and so various in kind that they impress one with the opinion that such a plurality in God is indicated in the Old Test., though it is not fully developed or clearly defined.

(I.) The texts of the *Old Test.* may be arranged in the following classes:

1. Those giving the names of God in the plural form, and thus seeming to indicate a plurality of his nature, of which $\mu\eta\eta\alpha\epsilon\epsilon\ \text{ynda}\}\mu\eta\eta\alpha\epsilon\epsilon\}$ are cited as examples; but as these may be only the *pluralis majesticus* of the Oriental languages, they afford no certain proof.
2. Texts in which God speaks of himself in the plural. The plural in many of these cases can be accounted for from the use of the plural nouns $\mu\eta\eta\alpha\epsilon\epsilon\ \text{ynda}\}$ etc. Philo thinks (*De Opif. Mundi*, p. 17) that in the expression “Let us make man” (Genesis 1, 26), God addresses the angels. It is not uncommon in Hebrew for kings to speak of themselves in the plural (^{1113D}1 Kings 12:9; ^{410D}2 Chronicles 10:9; ^{1504B}Ezra 4:18). In ^{2308B}Isaiah 6:8 God asks, who will go for us (Wnl), where the plural form may be explained either as the *pluralis majesticus*, or as denoting an assembly for consultation.
3. Texts in which h/hy (Jehovah) is distinguished from $\mu\eta\eta\alpha\epsilon\epsilon\}$ (Elohim). These texts do not, however, furnish any decisive proof; for in the simplicity of ancient style the noun is often repeated instead of using the pronoun; and so, *from Jehovah* may mean *from himself*, etc. Further, the name $\mu\eta\eta\alpha\epsilon\epsilon\}$ (Elohim) is sometimes given to earthly kings, and does

not, therefore, necessarily prove that the person to whom it is given must be of the divine nature.

4. Texts in which express mention is made of the *Son of God* and of the *Holy Spirit*.

(a.) *Of the Son of God.* — The principal text of this class is ^{<1917>}Psalm 2:7, “Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee;” comp. ^{<1917>}Psalm 72:1; 89:27. This Psalm was understood by the Jews and by the writers of the New Test. to relate to the Messiah. But the name *Son of God* was not infrequently given to kings; it is not, therefore, *nomen essentice*, but *dignitatis Messiance*. The passage would then mean, “Thou art the king (Messiah) of my appointment; this day have I declared thee such.” In this psalm, therefore, the Messiah is rather exhibited as king, divinely appointed ruler and head of the Church, than as belonging to the divine nature.

(b.) *Of the Holy Spirit.* — There are many texts of this class, but none from which, taken by themselves, the personality of the Holy Spirit can be proved. In these texts the *term Holy Spirit* may mean (1) the divine nature in general; (2) particular divine attributes, as omnipotence, knowledge, or omniscience; (3) the divine agency, which is its more common meaning. ^{<2386>}Isaiah 48:16, “And now Jehovah (the Father) and his Spirit (Holy Ghost) hath sent me” (the Messiah), is supposed to teach the whole doctrine of the Trinity. But the expression “and his Spirit” is used by the prophets to mean the *direct, immediate command* of God. . To say, then, the Lord and his Spirit hath sent me is the same as to say, the Lord hath sent me by a direct, immediate command.

5. Texts in which *three* persons are expressly mentioned, or in which there is a clear reference to the number *three* (^{<1917>}Numbers 6:24; ^{<1917>}Psalm 33:6; ^{<2386>}Isaiah 6:3). But the repetition of the Word *Jehovah* in the one text is not an undeniable proof of the Trinity; and in the other, the *word of his mouth* means nothing more than his *command*; and in the last text the threefold repetition of the word *holy* may have been by three choirs, all uniting in the last words, “The whole earth is full of thy glory.”

Thus it appears that none of the passages cited from the Old Test. in proof of the Trinity are conclusive when taken by themselves; but, as was before stated, when they are all taken together, they convey the impression that at least a plurality in the godhead was obscurely indicated in the Jewish Scriptures.

(II.) Since we do not find in the Old Test. clear or decided proof upon this subject, we must now turn to the *New Test.* The texts relating to the doctrine of the Trinity may be divided into two classes — those in which the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are mentioned in connection, and those in which these three subjects are mentioned separately, and in which their nature and mutual relation are more particularly described.

1. The first class of texts, taken by itself, proves only that there are the three subjects named, and that there is a difference between them; that the Father in certain respects differs from the Son, etc.; but it does not prove, by itself, that all the three belong necessarily to the divine nature, and possess equal divine honor. In proof of this, the second class of texts must be adduced. The following texts are placed in this class:

◀1818▶ Matthew 18:18-20. This text, however, taken by itself, would not prove decisively either the *personality* of the three subjects mentioned, or their *equality* or *divinity*. For (a) the subject into which one is baptized is not necessarily a *person*, but may be a *doctrine* or *religion*. (b) The person in whom one is baptized is not necessarily God, as ▶4013▶ 1 Corinthians 1:13, “Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” (c) The connection of these three subjects does not prove their *personality* or *equality*. We gather one thing from the text, viz. that Christ considered the doctrine respecting Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as a fundamental doctrine of his religion, because he requires all his followers to be bound to a profession of it when admitted by baptism into the Church.

◀1002▶ 1 Peter 1:2: “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.” From what is here said of the Holy Spirit, it does not necessarily follow that he is a personal subject; nor, from the predicates here ascribed to Christ, that he is necessarily divine. This passage, therefore, taken by itself, is insufficient.

◀4734▶ 2 Corinthians 13:14, “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.” Here we might infer, from the parallelism of the third member of the passage with the two former, the *personality* of the Holy Spirit; but we could not justly infer that they possessed *equal authority*, or the same nature.

◀3445▶ John 14:26 offers three different personal subjects, viz. the Comforter, the Father, and Christ; but it is not sufficiently proven from this passage

that these three subjects have equal divine honor, and belong to one divine nature.

☞ Matthew 3:16, 17 has been considered a very strong proof-text for the whole doctrine of the Trinity. But though three personal subjects are mentioned, viz. the voice of the Father, the symbol of the Holy Spirit, and Christ, yet nothing is here said respecting their nature.

☞ 1 John 5:7, 8 are generally admitted to be spurious; and, even if allowed to be genuine, they do not determine the nature and essential connection of the three subjects mentioned.

2. We now turn to the second class of texts; viz. those in which the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are separately mentioned, and in which their nature and mutual relation are taught. These texts prove (*a*) that the Son and Holy Spirit, according to the doctrine of the New Test., are divine, or belong to the one divine nature; and (*b*) that the three subjects are personal and equal.

(**1.**) *The Deity of the Father.* — When the term *Father* is applied to God, it often designates the whole godhead, or the whole divine nature; as θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ,, ☞ 1 Corinthians 8:4-6; ☞ John 17:1-3. He is often called θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ, i.e. θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ, or θεὸς θεὸς οὗ ἐστὶ Πατήρ, as ☞ Galatians 1:4, All the arguments, therefore, which prove the existence of God prove also the deity of the Father.

(**2.**) *The Deity of Christ.* — To prove the deity of Christ we present three classes of texts.

(**a.**) The following are the principal texts in which divine names are given to Christ:

☞ John 1:1, 2. Christ is here called ὁ ὄλογος (the Word), which signified among the Jews and other ancient people, when applied to God, *everything by which God reveals himself to men*, and makes known to them his will. Hence those who made known the divine will to men were called by the Hellenists λόγοι. It was probably on this account that John declared Jesus to be the Logos which existed ἐν ἀρχῇ; that *the Logos was with God*, and *the Logos Was God*. In this passage the principal proof does not lie in the word ὄλογος, nor even in the word θεός, which in a larger sense is often applied to kings and earthly rulers; but to what is predicated of the ὄλογος,

viz. that he existed from eternity with God, that the world was made by him, etc.

<B12>John 20:28. Here Thomas, convinced at last that Christ was actually risen from the dead, thus addresses him, “My Lord and my God.” This must not be considered an exclamation of surprise or wonder, as some have understood it; for it is preceded by the phrase **ειπεν αὐτῷ**, he said this to him.” Thomas probably remembered what Jesus had often said respecting his superhuman origin (<B18>John 5:8,10,17), and he now saw it all confirmed by his resurrection from the dead.

<B16>Philippians 2:6, “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” There it is said of Christ that he is **ἴσα θεῷ**, *Deo cequalis*; not **ομοιος θεῷ, ἀντίθεος, θεοείκελος**, *similis Deo-terms* applied by Homer to kings and heroes. The term **ἴσος θεῷ**, on the contrary, is never applied to a finite or created being. Hence the Jews (John 18) considered it as blasphemy in Christ to make himself **ἴσον θεῷ**.

<B18>John 10:28-30, “I and my Father are one.” These words are not to be understood to denote so much an equality of nature as unanimity of feeling and purpose. Still the passage is quite remarkable; because Christ professes to do his work *in common with* his Father; and that is more than any man, prophet, or even angel is ever said in the Bible to do. That being one with God, therefore, which Jesus here asserts for himself is something peculiar, which belongs to him only as he is a being of a higher nature.

<B13>Titus 2:13, “We expect the glorious appearance,” etc. In this passage, since **τοῦ** is omitted before **σωτήρος**, both **μεγάλου θεοῦ** and **σωτήρος** must be construed in apposition with **ἡσοῦ ριστοῦ**. Moreover, **ἐπιφάνεια** is the word by which the solemn coming of Christ is appropriately designated.

In some of the texts in which Christ is called the *Son of God*, the name is used in three different senses [1] Messiah or king, a title very commonly given to the Messiah by the Jews (see <B16>Matthew 16:16; <B11>Luke 9:20; <B14>Matthew 27:40; <B23>Luke 23:35; see also <B13>Mark 13:32; <B15>1 Corinthians 15:28); [2] the higher nature of Christ (<B17>John 5:17 sq.; 10:30,33; 20:31; <B10>Romans 1:3,4); [3] he is also called the Son of God (<B15>Luke 1:35), to designate the immediate power of God in the miraculous production of his, human nature.

(b.) Texts in which divine attributes and works are ascribed to Christ. It is not necessary to find texts to prove that all the divine attributes are ascribed to Christ. These attributes cannot be separated; and if one of them is ascribed to Christ in the Bible, the conclusion is inevitable that he must possess all the rest. The following attributes and works are distinctly ascribed to Christ in the Scriptures:

[i.] *Eternity* (<4000>John 1:1; 8:58; 17:5; Colossians 1, 17).

[ii.] *Creation and preservation of the world* (<4000>John 1:1-3, 10; <5006>Colossians 1:16; <8010>Hebrews 1:10 [where <49226>Psalm 102:26 is quoted and applied to Christ]; 2:10).

[iii.] *Omnipotence* is ascribed to Christ (<30821>Philippians 3:21); *omniscience* (<40127>Matthew 11:27). He is described as the *searcher of hearts*, etc. (<40416>1 Corinthians 4:5).

(c.) Texts in which divine honor is required for Christ. The following are the principal texts of this class; <41623>John 5:23, All men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father;” <44124>Acts 1:24; 7:59; <47138>2 Corinthians 12:8, where Christ is approached in prayer; and those in which the apostles refer to Christ the texts of the Old Test. that speak of the honor and worship of God, e.g. <8006>Hebrews 1:6 from <49707>Psalm 97:7; also <61411>Romans 14:11 from <23413>Isaiah 45:3; <51940>Philippians 2:10; <47138>2 Corinthians 5:8-11; <50477>2 Timothy 4:17, 18.

(3.) The third point in the discussion of this doctrine is the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit; for a full discussion of which *SEE HOLY GHOST*.

II. History of the Doctrine. — Respecting the *manner* in which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost make one God, the Scripture teaches nothing, since the subject is of such a nature as not to admit of its being explained to us. It is therefore to be expected that theologians should differ widely in their opinions respecting it, and that in their attempts to illustrate it they should have pursued various methods.

1. As Held by the Primitive Christians. — For the first age the Scripture is sufficient evidence of the Christians’ practice. For, not to insist upon the precept of honoring the Son as they honored the Father; or the form of baptism, in which they were commanded to join the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in one act of worship; or the injunction to believe in the Son as they

believed in the Father, let reference be made only to their example and practice. Stephen, the protomartyr, when he was sealing his confession with his blood, prayed to Christ, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,” and “Lord, lay not this sin to their charge” (^{<4075>}Acts 7:59, 60). Paul asserts that he baptized only in the name of Christ (^{<4013>}1 Corinthians 1:13). Notice also his constant use of the name of Christ in invocation. There is the well known fact that the early believers were known as those who called on the name of Christ (^{<4014>}Acts 9:14,21; ^{<4010>}1 Corinthians 1:2; ^{<4012>}2 Timothy 2:22).

2. As Held in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries. — Towards the end of the 1st century, and during the 2d, many learned men came over both from Judaism and paganism to Christianity. These brought with them into the Christian schools of theology their Platonic ideas and phraseology, and they especially borrowed from the philosophical writings of Philo. As was very natural, they confined themselves, in their philosophizing respecting the Trinity, principally to the Logos; connecting the same ideas with the name *λόγος* as had been done before by Philo and other Platonists. Differing on several smaller points, they agreed perfectly in the following general views, viz.: the Logos existed before the creation of the world; he was begotten, however, by God, and sent forth from him. By this Logos the Neo-Platonists understood the infinite *understanding* of God, belonging from eternity to his nature as a *power*, but that, agreeably to the divine will, it began to exist out of the divine nature. It is therefore different from God, and yet, as begotten of him, is entirely divine. By means of this Logos they supposed that God at first created, and now preserves and governs, the universe. Their views respecting the Holy Spirit are far less clearly expressed, though most of them considered him *a substance* emanating from the Father and the Son, to whom, on this account, divinity must be ascribed. These philosophical Christians asserted rather the *divineness* of the Son and Spirit, and their divine origin, than their equal *deity* with the Father. Justin Martyr expressly declares that the Son is in God what the understanding (*νοῦς*) is in man, and that the Holy Spirit is that divine power to act and execute which Plato calls *ἀρετή*. With this representation Theophilus of Antioch, Clemens of Alexandria, and Origen substantially agree. According to Tertullian, the persons of the Trinity are *gradus, formae species unius Dei*. Thus we find that the belief in the subordination of the-Son to the Father, for which Arianism is the later name, was commonly received by most of those fathers of the 2d and

3d centuries who assented, in general, to the philosophy of Plato. Another class of learned, philosophizing Christians substituted another theory on the subject of the Trinity, which, however, was nonetheless formed rather from their philosophical ideas than from, the instructions of the Bible. Among the writers of this class was Praxeas, of the 2rd century, who contended that the Father, Son, and Spirit' were not distinguished from each other as individual subjects; but that God was called *Father*, so far as he was creator and governor of the world; *Son* (*ὁγος*), so far as he had endowed the man Jesus with extraordinary powers, etc. He, in accordance with this view, denied any *higher, preexisting* nature in Christ; and with him agreed Artemon, Noetus, and Beryllus of Bostra. Sabellius regarded the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as merely describing different divine *works*, and various modes of divine *revelation*.

In the following table the writers of the first three centuries on the subject of the Trinity are ranged according to their opinions:

Catholics

Justin Martyr
 Theophilus of Antioch
 Athenagoras
 Irenaeus
 Clemens Alexandrinus
 Tertullian
 Origen
 Dionysius Alexandrinus
 Cyprian
 Novatian
 Dionysius Romanus

Monarchians Unitarians

Theodotus
 Artemon
 Paul of Samosata

Monarchians Patripassians

Praxeas
 Noetus

Beryllus of Bostra
Sabellius

Among the terms introduced in the discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity during this period the following are the most common, viz.

(1.) **Τριάς**, introduced by Theophilus of Antioch in the 2d century, and often used by Origen in the 3d century. Tertullian translated it into Latin by the word *trinitas*, of which the English word is an exact rendering.

(2.) **ὕσία, ὑπόστασις**. These terms were not sufficiently distinguished from each other by the Greek fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, and were often used by them as entirely synonymous. By the word **ὑπόστασις**, the older Greek fathers understood only a really existing subject, in opposition to a nonentity, or to a merely ideal existence; in which sense they also not infrequently used the word **οὐσία**.

(3.) *Persona*. This word was first employed by Tertullian, and by it he means *an individual*, a single being; distinguished from others by certain peculiar qualities, attributes, and relations; and so he calls Pater, Filius, Spiritus Sanctus, *tres personae* (three persons), at the same time that he ascribes to them *unitas substantiae* (unity of substance), because they belong to the divine nature (**οὐσία**) existing from eternity.

We call attention to the following as shedding light upon the *practice* of the Church during this period. Pliny, a judge under Trajan, in the beginning of the 2d century took the confessions of some accused Christians, and says, "They declared that they were used to meet on a certain day before it was light, and, among other parts of their worship, sing a hymn to Christ as their God." Polycarp (*Ep. ad Philip.* n. 12) joins God the Father and the Son together in his prayers for grace and benediction upon men. Justin Martyr answering, in his *Second Apology*, the charge of atheism brought against them by the heathen answers. "That they worshipped and adored still the God of righteousness and his Son, as also the Holy Spirit of prophecy." Athenagoras answers the charge of atheism after the same manner. Similar testimony is afforded by the writings of Lucian the heathen, Theophilus of Antioch. Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Novatian, and others, illustrating the practice of the Church in paying divine honors to the Son and Holy Spirit.

3. The Trinity as Held in the 4th Century. — It had already been settled, by many councils held during the 3d century, and in the symbols which they had adopted in opposition to Sabellius and Paul of Samosata, that the Father must be regarded as *really* distinguished from the Son, and the Holy Spirit as distinguished from both; The relation, however, of the three persons of the Trinity, and the question in what the distinction between them properly consists, not having been discussed, these subjects were left undetermined by the decisions of councils and symbols. Different opinions prevailed, and learned men were left to express themselves according to their convictions.

Origen and his followers maintained, against the Sabellians, that there were in God **τρεις ὑποστάσεις** (three persons), but, **μία οὐσία** (one substance) common to the three. Few had as yet taught the entire *equality* of these three persons, but had allowed, in accordance with their Platonic principles, that the Son, though belonging to the divine nature, was yet subordinate to the Father. In the beginning of the 4th century, Alexander of Alexandria, and Athanasius, his successor, attempted to unite the hypotheses of Origen and Sabellius, thinking that the truth lay between the two extremes. Athanasius stated the personal distinction of the Father and the Son to be that the former was *without beginning* and *unbegotten*, while the latter was *eternally begotten* by the Father, and equally eternal with the Father and the Spirit.

Arius, about 320, disputed the doctrine taught by Alexander, viz. **ἐν τριάδι μονάδα εἶναι**, and so favored the Sabellian theory. As the controversy proceeded, Arius declared, in opposition to Sabellius, that there were not only three persons in God, but that these were unequal in glory (**δόξαις οὐχ ὁμοίαι**); that the Father alone was supreme God (**ἀγέννητος**), and God in a higher sense than the Son; that the Son derived his divinity from the Father before the creation of the world, and that he owed his existence to the divine will; and that the Holy Spirit was likewise divine in a sense inferior to that in which the Father is so. In opposition to all the Arian, and various other theories, Athanasius and his followers zealously contended. They succeeded, at a general council at Nice in 325, in having a symbol adopted which was designed to be thenceforward the only standard of orthodoxy. This symbol was confirmed by the council held at Constantinople in 381, under Theodosius the Great. The distinctions established at Nice and Constantinople were often reenacted at various succeeding councils. Many urged, in opposition, that *tritheism* (q.v.) was

the inevitable consequence of the admission of these distinctions, but they, nevertheless, remained in force. The council adopted the word **ὁμοούσιος** (consubstantiality), explaining themselves thus: The Son was not created, but eternally generated from the nature of the Father, and is therefore in all respects equal to him, and no more different, as to nature, from God than a human son is from his father, and so cannot be separated from the Father. All that they meant to teach by the use of this word was that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit had the divine nature and divine perfections so in common that one did not possess more and another less; without asserting, however, that there were three Gods; in short, that in the Godhead there were *tres distincti, unitate essentiae conjuncti*. **SEE CREED, NICENE.**

The *characteristics* by which the persons of the Trinity may be distinguished from each other under this view belong to two classes.

- (1.) Internal** (“*characteres interni*”). These are distinctive signs arising from the internal relation of the three persons in the Godhead to each other, and indicating the mode of the divine existence. The following distinctions are derived from the names Father, Son, and Spirit, and from some other Bible phraseology:
- (a.)** The Father *generates* the Son, and *emits* the Holy Spirit, *generat Filium, spirat Spiritum Sanctum*; and possesses, therefore, as his personal attributes, *generatio activa* and *spiratio activa*.
- (b.)** The Son is *generated* by the Father — *Filii est generari non generare*. The Son, therefore, possesses as his personal attributes *jiliatio, generatio passiva*; and also, as he is supposed to emit the Spirit in conjunction with the Father, *spiratio activa*.
- (c.)** The Holy Spirit neither generates nor is generated, but proceeds from the Father and the Son — *Spiritus Sanctus est, nec generare nec generari, sed procedere*. In regard to the Holy Spirit, there was nothing decided, during the first three centuries, by ecclesiastical authority respecting his nature, the characteristics of his person, or his relation to the Father and the Son. Nor was anything more definite, with regard to his nature and his relation to the other persons of the Trinity, than what has already been stated, established by the council at Nice, or even by that at Constantinople. To believe in the Holy Ghost — **τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ ἰῶ συμπροσκυνοῦμενον**, and **ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον** was all that was required in the symbol there adopted. But there were many, especially

in the Latin Church, who maintained that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but also from the Son. They appealed to ^{<B163>}John 16:13, and to the texts where the Holy Spirit is called the *Spirit of Christ*, e.g. ^{<B180>}Romans 8:9. To this doctrine the Greeks were, for the most part, opposed, because they did not find that the New Test. ever expressly declared that the Spirit proceeded from the Son. It prevailed, however, more and more in the Latin Church; and when in the 5th and 6th centuries the Arians urged it as an argument against the equality of Christ with the Father, that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father only, and not from the Son, the Catholic churches began to hold more decidedly that the Holy Spirit proceeded from both and insert the adjunct *Filioque* after *Patre* in the *Symbolism Nicceno-Constantinopolitaum*.

(2.) External (“characteres externi”). These are characteristics of the persons of the Trinity arising from the *works* of the Deity relating to objects extrinsic to itself, and called *opera externa, sive ad extra*. They are twofold:

(a.) Opera Dei aeconomica, those institutions which God has founded for the salvation of the human race. The *Father* sent his Son to redeem men (^{<B163>}John 3:16, 17), and gives or sends the Holy Spirit (^{<B145>}John 14:26). The *Son* is sent from the Father, etc., and sends the Holy Spirit from the Father (^{<B156>}John 15:26). The *Holy Spirit* formed the human nature of Christ (^{<B163>}Luke 1:35) and anointed it (^{<B108>}Acts 10:38), i.e. endowed it with gifts; and is sent into the hearts of men, and carries them forward towards moral perfection.

(b.) Opera Dei attributiva, such divine works as are common to the three persons, but which are frequently ascribed to one of the three. To the Father are ascribed the decree to create the world, the actual creation, and the preservation of it. To the Son, also, the creation, preservation, and government of the world are ascribed; also the raising of the dead and judgment. To the Holy Spirit are ascribed the immediate revelation of the divine will to the prophets, the continuation of the great work of salvation commenced by Christ, and the communication and application to men of the means of grace.

4. History of the Doctrine since the Reformation. Nearly all the writers upon the subject of the Trinity since the Reformation belong to some one of the general classes already mentioned. We present several theories.

(1.) Some have attempted to illustrate and explain this doctrine by philosophy; and not a few have gone so far as to think they could prove the Trinity *a priori*, and that reason alone furnishes sufficient arguments for its truth. Others, again, looked to reason for nothing more than an illustration of this factor of the divine existence. In the latter class may be placed Philip Melancthon, who, in his *Loci Theologici*, thus explained the Trinity: “God from his infinite understanding produces thought, which is the image of himself. To this thought he imparted *personal* existence, which, bearing the impress of the Father, is his likeness *and* resemblance: and hence called by John λόγος. This illustration of the Trinity was received without offence or suspicion, until the heresy, which lurks beneath it was detected and exposed by Flacius. The latest attempt to explain the Trinity in this manner may be found in *the Berliner Monatschrift*, Sept. 1790, § 280, in an article written by Schwab of Stuttgart, who refers to the accidents of space, viz. length, breadth, and thickness, as an illustration of the Trinity. Among those who supposed that the Trinity could be mathematically proved were Bartholomew Keckerman, in his *Systema Theologicum*; Peter Poiret, and Daries, who published an essay *In qua Pluralitas Personarum in Deitate Methodo Mathematicorum, Demonstratur* (Leovardiae, 1735, 8vo).

(2.) Others have expressed themselves so boldly on the subject of the Trinity that they have seemed to approximate towards *tritheism*; in which class we may mention Matthew Gribaldus of Padua, in the 16th century, who maintained that the divine nature consisted of three equally eternal spirits, between whom, however, he admitted a distinction in respect to rank and perfections.

(3.) Some modern writers have inclined to adopt the Sabellian theory, among whom were Servetus (q.v.), Grotius, *Silvae Sacrae*; Stephen Nye, *Doctrine of the Trinity* (Lond. 1701). In this class we place the hypothesis of Le Clerc, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit designate the different modifications of the divine understanding, and the plans which God forms. This is the error into which Weigel and Jacob Bohme fell. Many of the modern German theologians have so explained the Trinity as to lose the idea of three ‘divine persons, for which they have substituted either three distinct powers or attributes (as Meier, Seller, Claudius, and Tollner), or a threefold agency in God—three eternal actions distinct from each other (as S. G. Schlegel, Kant, Tieftrunk, Daub, Schelling, De Wette, and Fessler).

(4.) The *Aian* theory has also found advocates among Protestant theologians, especially those of the 18th century (e.g. Whiston, Harwood, and Wettstein); but the system which has met with the most approbation is that more refined subordinationism taught by Samuel Clarke, *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (Lond. 1712).

(5.) The *Socinians* or *Photinians*. The founders of this sect were Lelius Socinus and his nephew Faustus Socinus (q.v.), who brought over considerable numbers to their doctrine in Poland and Transylvania.

(6.) A new theory on the Trinity was proposed by Dr. *Urlsperger*, *Kurzgefasstes System seines Vortrags von Gottes Dreyeinigkeit* (Augsburg, 1777, 8vo). He endeavored to unite the three theories — the Arian, Sabellian, and Nicene — by making a distinction between *trinitas essentialis*, the internal threefold distinction necessarily belonging to the divine nature, and *trinitas aeconomica*, the three persons revealed to us in the work of redemption.

It is proper to say that “the conclusion is obvious that, while we are taught by the Scriptures to believe in three equal subjects in the Godhead, who are described as persons, we are still unable to determine in what manner or in what sense these three have the divine nature so in common that there is only one God” (Knapp, *Christ. Theology*, § 34-44). **SEE PERSON.**

III. *Practical Value of the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity.* — The idea of a triune being — Father, Son, and Holy Ghost — is not by any means to be considered as separate from that of the nature and attributes of God. This apparent tritheism can be considered as the conclusion of true deism, and as a safeguard in the most momentous questions. Polytheism, pantheism, and dualism have been to some extent employed to vivify and prove the truth of religion; but we would present the practical advantages of the doctrine of the Trinity in quite a different manner; not as serving merely to prove another proposition without being also true in itself, but as aiding us in arriving at the knowledge of God’s nature with an efficacy which is essentially inherent to its objective and permanent recognition. God may be considered either as not true or lofty enough, or not good and holy enough, or not essentially active enough; these may be considered the possible faults of a given system of deism. So long, then, as it distinguishes only between God and the world, and not between God himself, it retains always a tendency either to return to pantheism or to deny the existence of

an absolute being. An absolute safeguard against atheism, polytheism, pantheism, or dualism cannot be found except in the doctrine of the Trinity; for the distinction existing between the Divine Being and the world is better made and observed as an absolute one by those who worship the triune God than by those who do not. Those monotheistic systems which were the most strenuously opposed to the idea of a Trinity, such as Judaism and Mohammedanism, have, by reason of their dryness and emptiness, led to the grossest pantheism.

From the doctrine that the Word, who was God, became flesh, follows the necessity of considering God as personally united with sinless humanity, but at the same time, also, the necessity of drawing a clear distinction between the divine essence and mere human nature. Faith in the everlasting holy love, which is God, can only be rendered theoretically and practically perfect by the knowledge of the perfect, eternal object of the self-consciousness and love of God; i.e. by the thought of the love of God for his only begotten Son. Finally, the idea of the fullness of God's creative and imparting nature can only be preserved from diminishing by the Trinitarian doctrine of a Holy Ghost. Whatever difficulties may result from the Christian idea of different divine persons, when brought into connection with the personality of the divine essence, the apparent contradiction is yet susceptible of a solution; even when we do not consider that the Primitive Church did not, for a long time, recognize these three persons but as only *ἰδιότητες, ὑποστάσεις*, etc.

The Latin Church alone has, since Augustine, sanctioned the expression *personae* in the *Symbolum Quicumque*. Augustine himself said, yet, "Tres personae, si ita dicendae sunt." Some consider the Trinity as essential to constitute the perfect personality, and employ the metaphysics of consciousness as an analogical proof thereof (see Schneider, *Colestin, drei geistliche Gespräche i. d. Personen d. Gottheit* [1834], 1). Others refuse to recognize the real personality of God in any but one of the so-called hypostases: namely in the Logos, the Son. Such is Swedenborg. Others still hold peculiar opinions. At any rate, we are obliged, according to the clear sense of Scripture, to seek not only the Trias in the subjectivity of the representation, nor exclusively in the economy of revelation, but also recognize that immediate faith does here contain within itself the germ of endless speculation; not only because every theological system of antiquity, from the time when, as reflecting gnosis, it rose above the myths, shows certain higher theological ideas (in the sense in which Nitzsch has

presented it in a historical and critical manner in his *Theol. Stud.* ch. 1), nor merely because the Christian theologians of all times have made a certain rational understanding of this mystery possible and found it necessary. It is even essentially necessary for the Biblical theologian to recognize in the notion of the Logos—who is with God and is God, the procreative image of God, the inmost spirit of God who knew God—the elements of essential, immanent Trinity. For those only retain the trace of Biblical theology who, in all attempts at explaining it, keep in view the notion of the self-knowledge and self-love of God, or of the distinction between the self-concealing and self-revealing God. Twisten has latterly greatly perfected the philosophy of the doctrine of the Trinity, in its history and in its essence; first by placing the Trinity *κατὰ τὸν ἀποκαλύψεως τρόπον*, as subordinate to the analogical and philosophical interpretation; but then, again, *κατὰ τρόπον ὑπάρξεως*, and shows the connection between both interpretations. In the first case, he seeks a mediation between the *ens absolutum* and the finite world which yet reveals the infinite, and this he finds in the primordial, creative thought of God. But revelation cannot take place except towards discerning beings, and finite beings cannot know God save through God. This argument presents the three notions of God, Logos, and Spirit, yet forming still but one godhead. Such as God reveals himself, such, however, he is. This leads us to another consideration, viz. that the *ego*, in order to possess a real, living personality, must not only become dually contradistinguished within itself, but also, by a third process, reflectively act on itself as a third subject, and be conscious of itself as being a perfect image of self. This manner of treating this mystery, by analogy, is neither accidental nor gratuitous, since, according to Scripture, human nature is also analogous to the divine. Tertullian and Augustine had themselves established their theories already on this basis.

IV. Literature. — This is immensely copious. We can here refer only to a few leading authorities. See Baur, *Hist. of Doctrines*; Burris, *The Trinity* (Chicago, 1874); Cunningham, *Hist. Theology*, 1, 267; Lamson, *Origin of Trinity*; Lessing, *Das Christenthum und die Vernunft* (Berlin, 1784, 8vo); Marheinecke, *Grundlehren der christl. Dogm.* p. 129,370 (ibid. 1819); Mattison, *The Trinity and Modern Arianism* (18mo); Morus, *Commentary*; Mosheim, *Leben Servet's* (Helmst. 1748, 8vo); Meier, *Historical Development of the Trinity*; Neander, 2, 2, 891; Sailer, *Theorie des Weisen* (Spottes, 1781, 8vo); Walch, *Historia Controversice Graecorum Latinorumque de Processione Spiritus Sancti* (Jenae, 1751, 8vo); Ziegler,

Geschichtsentwicklung des Dogma vom heiligen Geist. For further literature see *Biblioth. Sac.* (184473), index to vol. 1-30; Dantz, *Wörterbuch der theol. Literatur*, s.v. "Trinitit;" Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* col. 268, 1446, 1719-1722; Poole, *Index to Period. Lit.* s.v. "Trinity."

Trinity, Heathen Notions Of.

In examining the various heathen philosophies and mythologies, we find clear evidence of a belief in a certain sort of trinity, and yet something very different from the Trinity of the Bible.

In the Egyptian mythology, the powers of the Supreme Being as the producer, the producing, and the produced were symbolized by deities who were respectively father, mother, and child of each other. Every Egyptian town had its local triad, but the most famous was the great Theban triad of Amen-ra, Maut, and Khousu. Sometimes the king himself, as a god, made the third member of the triad. These combinations of divine properties must not be confounded with the dogma of a trinity either of creator, preserver, and destroyer, as in Hindû mythology, or of Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of the Christian faith. The Babylonian mythology offers a trinity, each member of the triad having his own wife or consort. At the head of this trinity stands Ann, representing abstract divinity. He appears as an original principle; the primeval chaos, the god of time, and the world-uncreated matter issuing from the fundamental principle of all things. A companion deity with Anu is Hea, god of the sea and of Hades. He is lord of generation and of all human beings; he animated matter and rendered it fertile, and inspired the universe with life. The third member of this triad was Bel (Elu, Enu, Kaptu), the demiurges and ruler of the organized universe. There were also second and third trinities descending from the first, but becoming more and more defined in character, and assuming a decidedly sidereal aspect.

The system of Plato may be thus stated: God first produced the ideal world, i.e. his infinite understanding conceived of the existence of the world, and formed the plan of creation. The *real* world was then formed after this *ideal* world as its model; and this was done by uniting the soul of the world with matter, by which the world became an animated, sensitive, rational creature guided, pervaded, and held together by this rational soul. The three principles of Plato were (a) the Supreme God, whom he calls Πατήρ; (b) the divine understanding, which he calls νοῦς, λόγος, σωτήρ,

σοφία; and (c) the soul of the world. These views are developed in his *Timceus*, etc. The Neo-Platonists eagerly embraced these ideas of Plato, and during the 2nd and 3rd centuries seemed to labor to outdo one another in explaining, defending, and more fully developing them. They not only widely differ from Plato, but often disagree among themselves in their mode of thinking and in their phraseology.

While the Jews who resided in Palestine were satisfied with their Phariseo-Rabbinic theology, and looked for their Messiah as a religious reformer, this was not the case with those residing elsewhere, who had been educated under the influence of the Grecian philosophy. These abandoned the expectation of a future Messiah, or regarded his kingdom as entirely of a moral nature. Among them the theory of the λόγος is found as early as the 1st century. The λόγος they regarded as existing before the Creation, and as the instrument through whom God made all things. See Knapp, *Christ. Theol.* p. 145 sq.; Lenormant, *Chald. Magic*, ch. 9; Smith, *Chald. Account of Genesis*; Tholuck, *Die speculative Trinititslehre der neuern Orientalen* (Berlin, 1826,8vo).

Trinity, Fraternity of the

a religious society instituted at Rome by Philip Neri in 1548. They had charge of the pilgrims who were constantly coming to Rome from all parts of the world. Pope Paul IV gave them the Church of St. Benedict, near which they built a large hospital, and in which there was also a college of twelve priests for the instruction of pilgrims.

Trinity Sunday

the octave day of the feast of Pentecost. The introduction of this day into the calendar is of comparatively recent date, it being established by pope Benedict XI, A.D. 1305. It is probable that the zeal of many Christians against the use of images in the 8th and 9th centuries may have been the first cause of the appointment of a distinct day for meditating upon the nature of the Holy Trinity in unity, or the one true God, as distinguished from all idols. The reason for its late introduction is that in the creed of the Church, and in its psalms, hymns, and doxologies, great prominence was given to this doctrine, and it was thought that there was no need to set apart a particular day for that which was done every day.

Triphysites

(from **τρῆις**, *three*, and **φύσεις**, *natures*), those divines who, at the fourteenth and fifteenth councils of Toledo, A.D. 684, 688, carried their opposition to the Monophysites and Monothelites to such an extreme that they declared a belief not only in Christ's distinct divine and human natures, but also in a third nature resulting from the union of the two.

Triplet

a window of three lights. Many such occur in the First Pointed style, the center light being usually longer or more elevated than the two side lights.

Trip'olis

Picture for Tripolis

(ἡ **Τρίπολις**), the Greek name of a city of great commercial importance, which served at one time as a point of federal union for Aradus, Sidon, and Tyre (hence the name *the threefold city*), which each had here its special quarter. What its Phoenician name was is unknown; but it seems not impossible that it was *Kadytis*, and that this was really the place captured by Necho, of which Herodotus speaks (2, 159; 3, 5). Kadytis is the Greek form of the Syrian *Kedutha*, "the holy," a name of which a relic still seems to survive in the Nahr-Kadish, a river that runs through *Tarabalus*, the modern representative of Tripolis. All ancient federations had for their place of meeting some spot consecrated to a common deity, and just to the south of Tripolis was a promontory which went by the name of **εὐὸ πρόσωπον**.

It was at Tripolis that, in the year B.C. 351, the plan was concocted for the simultaneous revolt of the Phoenician cities and the Persian dependencies in Cyprus against the Persian king Ochus. Although aided by a league with Nectanebus, king of Egypt, this attempt failed, and in the sequel a great part of Sidon was burned and the chief citizens destroyed. Perhaps the importance of Tripolis was increased by this misfortune of its neighbor, for soon after, when Alexander invaded Asia, it appears as a port of the first order. After the battle of Issus, some of the Greek officers in Darius's service retreated thither, and not only found ships enough to carry themselves and eight thousand soldiers away, but a number over and above, which they burned in order to preclude the victor from an

immediate pursuit of them (Arrian, 2, 13). The destruction of Tyre by Alexander, like that of Sidon by Ochus, would naturally tend rather to increase than diminish the importance of Tripolis as a commercial port. When Demetrius Soter, the son of Seleucus, succeeded in wresting Syria from the young son of Antiochus (B.C. 161), he landed there and made the place the base of his operations. It is this circumstance to which allusion is made in the only passage in which Tripolis is mentioned in the Bible (2 Macc. 14:1). The prosperity of the city, so far as appears, continued down to the middle of the 6th century of the Christian aera. Dionysius Periegetes applies to it the epithet *λιπαρήν* in the 3rd century. In the *Peutinrge Table* (which probably was compiled in the reign of the emperor Theodosius), it appears on the great road along the coast of Phoenicia, and at Orthosia (the next station to it northwards) the roads which led respectively into Mesopotamia and Cilicia branched off from one another. The possession of a good harbor in so important a point for land traffic doubtless combined with the richness of the neighboring mountains in determining the original choice of the site, which seems to have been a factory for the purposes of trade established by the three great Phoenician cities. Each of these held a portion of Tripolis surrounded by a fortified wall, like the Western nations at the Chinese ports; but in A.D. 543 it was laid in ruins by the terrible earthquake which happened in the month of July of that year, and overthrew Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, and Byblus as well. On this occasion the appearance of the coast was much altered. A large portion of the promontory Theuprosopon (which in the Christian times had its name, from motives of piety, changed to Lithoprosopon) fell into the sea, and, by the natural breakwater it constituted, created a new port, able to contain a considerable number of large vessels. The ancient Tripolis was finally destroyed by the sultan El-Mansur in A.D. 1289, and the modern Tarabalus is situated a couple of miles distant to the east, and is no longer a port. El-Myna, which is perhaps on the site of the ancient Tripolis, is a small fishing village. Tarabalus contains a population of fifteen or sixteen thousand inhabitants, and is the center of one of the four pashalics of Syria. It exports silk, tobacco, galls, and oil, grown in the lower parts of the mountain at the foot of which it stands, and performs, on a smaller scale, the part which was formerly taken by Tripolis as the entry point for the productions of a most fertile region (Diod. Sic. 16:41; Strabo, 16:2; Vossius *ad Melam*, 1, 12; Theophalnes, *Chronographia*, sub anno 6043). For the modern place, see Pococke, 2, 146 sq.; Maundrell, p. 26;

Burckhardt, p. 163 sq.; Porter, *Handbook*, p. 542; Badeker, *Palestine*, p. 509 sq. (where a map is given). *SEE PHOENICIA*.

Triptych

Picture for Triptych

a picture with two folding-doors, set over altars. The center panel usually contains the chief subject. In the illustration (from the pencil of Mr. A. Welby Pugin) the triptych is a kind of cupboard with folding-doors, containing a throned figure of the Virgin Mary crowned, and holding her divine child in her lap. A figure of Peter on one side and of Paul on the other are painted on the inner panels of the doors.

Triquetral

(*three-cornered*), a censer use by Bishop Andrewes, in which the clerk put incense at the reading of the finite lesson.

Trisacramentarians

a controversial name given to those reformers who maintained that there are three sacraments necessary to salvation, viz. baptism, the Lord's supper, and absolution. This opinion was held by some Lutherans at, Leipsic, and was, authoritatively set forth as a doctrine of the Church, of England in the *Institution of a Christian Man* (1562).

Trisagion

(*τρίσαγιον*, *thrice holy*) was so called because of the thrice repeating "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts," in imitation of the seraphim in the vision of Isaiah. The original of this hymn was "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts! heaven and earth are full of thy glory, who art blessed forever. Amen." Thus it is in the *Constitutions*, and frequently in Chrysostom.

Afterwards the Church added some words to it, and sang it in this form:

Ἄγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς
 ("Holy God, holy Mighty, holy Immortal, have mercy upon us"). The hymn is attributed to the patriarch Proclus, in the 4th century. Theodosius the younger ordered it to be sung in the liturgy, after his vision of a child chanting it during an earthquake at Constantinople. Later still, by Anastasius the emperor, or by Peter Enapheus, bishop of Antioch, the following words were added: ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς, ("that was

crucified for us"). This was done to oppose the heresy of the Theopaschites (q.v.), which was, in effect, to say that the whole Trinity suffered, because this hymn was commonly applied to the whole Trinity. To avoid this inconvenience, Calandio, bishop of Antioch, in the time of Zeno the emperor, made another addition to it of the words "Christ our King" reading it thus: "Holy God, holy Mighty, holy Immortal, Christ our King, that wast crucified for us, have mercy on us." These additions occasioned much confusion in the Eastern Church, while the Constantinopolitans and Western Church stiffly rejected them. It was chiefly sung in the middle of the communion service, though sometimes it was used on other occasions. After the preface this hymn was always sung, and, according to Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and the second Council of Vaison, also at all masse mamain lenten, or of the dead. — Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 14 ch. 2, § 3.

Trisantia

a mediaeval term for (1) a cloister, or (2) a place of retreat for religious persons where meditations are made. — Lee. *Gloss. of Liturg. Terms*, s.v.

Triscilidee

a sect of Sabellian heretics mentioned by Philaster (*Hcer.* c. xciii), Augustine (*Hrer.* 100. 74), and Predestinatus (*Haer.* 100. 74) as maintaining the opinion that the divine nature is composed of three parts, one of which is named the Father, the second part the Son, and the third the Holy Ghost; and that the union of these three parts constitutes the Trinity. Philaster, in condemning this heresy, uses expressions very similar to some in the Athanasian hymn, "Ergo est vera persona Patris quae misit Filium, et est vera persona quae advenit de Patrae est vera persona Spiritus quae a Filio et Patre missa est."

Tritheim (Lat. Trithemius), Johann

a German historian and theologian, was born at Trittenheim, near Treves, Feb. 1, 1462, being the only son of John of Heidenberg and Elizabeth of Longway. His early education was conducted in a desultory manner, but in 1482 he entered the Benedictine abbey at Spanheim, where the next year he was elected abbot, and administered its affairs with great zeal. In 1506 he exchanged this position for a similar one in the abbey of Wiurzburg, where he remained till his death, Dec. 27, 1516. His many learned writings

are enumerated in Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v. The principal ones are, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiarstis* (1492): — *Polygraphia* (1518): — *Stenographia* (1531).

Tritheists

a sect which appeared in the 6th century, and which taught that the Father, Son, and Spirit were *three* coequal, distinct Beings, united by one common will and purpose. This sect was divided into the Philoponists and Cononites, according to the names of their respective leaders, who agreed in the doctrine of the three Persons in the Godhead, but differed in some opinions concerning the resurrection of the body. Having made this change in the doctrine of the Trinity, they made another change answerable to it in the form of baptism—baptizing in the name of three unoriginated principles, as three Sons; three Paracletes. As a consequence of asserting three unbegotten principles, they made three Fathers, three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts, which was a Trinity of trinities.

Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. c. 16*) attributes the origin of Tritheism in its broadest form to Marcion, and Hilary (*De Synod. 22:56*) associates it with the heresy of Photinus. The Tritheists of the 6th century did not hold the opinion in its broad form, and would have shrunk from any such statement as that there are three Gods. The Tritheism of the 6th century was revived by Roscelin in the 11th, and his Nominalistic opinion that the name God is the abstract idea of a genus containing the three Persons called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was opposed by Anselm (*De Fide Trinitat. etc.*), and was condemned by the Council of Sessions, A.D. 1092. In 1691 the heresy was revived by Dr. Sherlock (*A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever blessed Trinity*). In a sermon delivered before the University of Oxford (1695), the preacher maintained the theory of Dr. Sherlock that “there are three infinite distinct minds and substances in the Trinity,” and that “the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite minds or spirits, and three individual substances.” These propositions were condemned by the authorities of the university. The speculation of Hutchinson in the last century was very similar in its logical consequences to that of the older Tritheists. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 11:ch. 3, § 4; Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.

Triumph

Picture for Triumph 1

(usually $\alpha\lambda\iota$ [or / $\lambda\iota$ [; $\theta\rho\iota\alpha\mu\beta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$). Almost all ancient nations celebrated success in war by a triumph, which generally included a gorgeous procession, a display of captives and spoils, and a solemn thanksgiving and sacrifice to the gods. Among the Egyptians, the triumph of a king returning from war was a grand solemnity celebrated with all the pomp, which the wealth of the nation could command (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 277 sq.). The Assyrian sculptures abound with similar representations. *SEE SENNACHERIB.*

Picture for Triumph 2

The Hebrews, under the direction of inspired prophets, celebrated their victories by triumphal processions, the women and children dancing, accompanying their steps with various musical instruments (see ^{<07134>}Judges 11:34-37), and singing hymns of triumph to Jehovah, the living and true God. The song of Moses at the Red Sea, which was sung by Miriam to the spirited sound of the timbrel (^{<0100>}Exodus 4:1-21), and that of Deborah on the overthrow of Barak (^{<0781>}Judges 5:1-31), are majestic examples of the triumphal hymns of the ancient Hebrews. Triumphal songs were uttered for the living (^{<0986>}1 Samuel 18:6-8; ^{<1421>}2 Chronicles 20:21-28) and elegies for the dead (^{<1017>}2 Samuel 1:17-27; ^{<1455>}2 Chronicles 35:25). The conquerors were intoxicated with joy, and the shout of victory resounded from mountain to mountain (^{<2921>}Isaiah 42:11; 52:7, 8; 63:1-4; Jeremiah 1, 2; ^{<1077>}Ezekiel 7:7; ^{<3015>}Nahum 1:15). Monuments in honor of victory were erected, and the arms of the enemy were hung up as trophies in the temples (^{<0210>}1 Samuel 21:9; 31:10; ^{<1083>}2 Samuel 8:13; ^{<2110>}2 Kings 11:10). Indignities to prisoners formed a leading feature of triumphs among ancient nations generally; and among the Assyrians and Babylonians atrocities were frequently practiced, such as maiming, blinding, *SEE EYE*, and killing, especially in the case of rebel princes. *SEE CAPTIVE*. To put one's foot upon the head or neck of a conquered foe was an ancient, though somewhat barbarous, custom, marking the complete subjection of the vanquished party. Many representations of this custom appear among the monumental remains of antiquity; and, following the prevailing usage in this respect, we find Joshua ordering the five kings of the Canaanites, who had taken refuge in a cave, to be brought out that his captains might come

one after another and put their foot on the necks of the prostrate princes (~~600~~Joshua 10:24). Literally this usage does not appear to have been much practiced by the covenant people, but it forms the ground of many figurative representations in the prophetic Scriptures (~~600~~Psalm 110:1; Isaiah 110:14; ~~600~~1 Corinthians 15:26). *SEE FOOT; SEE NECK.*

Picture for Triumph 3

Among the Greeks, it does not appear that triumphs were accorded to victorious generals, but conquerors occasionally entered their native cities attended by their victorious soldiers bearing branches of palm. Such processions became very common under the successors of Alexander the Great, particularly the Seleucid of Syria and the Ptolemies of Egypt, who are generally believed to have been the inventors of the *toga palmata*, or robe adorned with representations of palm-trees interwoven into its fabric. It is clearly to the Graeco-Syrian form of triumph that the apostle John alludes in the Apocalypse, when he describes those who had overcome by the blood of the lamb standing “before the throne, clothed with robes, and palms in their hands” (~~600~~Revelation 7:9).

Picture for Triumph 4

Next to the Egyptians, the Romans were chief among ancient nations in attributing importance to a triumph, and exerting themselves to bestow a gorgeous brilliancy upon the triumphal procession. The highest honor which could be bestowed on a citizen or magistrate was the triumph or solemn procession in which a victorious general passed from the gate of the city to the Capitol. He set out from the Campus Martius, and proceeded along the Via Triumphalis, and from thence through the most public places of the city. The streets were strewn with flowers, and the altars smoked with incense. First went a numerous band of music, singing and playing triumphal songs; next were led the oxen to be sacrificed, having their horns gilt and their heads adorned with fillets and garlands; then followed the spoils taken from the enemy, carried in open wagons, or a on a species of bier *called feretrum*, around which were displayed the golden crowns sent by allied and tributary states. The titles of the vanquished nations were inscribed on wooden frames; and images or representations of the conquered countries and cities were exhibited. The captive leaders followed in chains, with their children and attendants; after the captives came the lectors, having their faces wreathed with laurel,

followed by a great company of musicians and dancers, dressed like satyrs, and wearing crowns of gold; in the midst of whom was a pantomime, clothed in a female garb, whose business it was with his looks and gestures to insult the vanquished. A long train of persons followed, carrying perfumes; after whom came the general, dressed in purple, embroidered with gold, wearing a crown of laurel on his head, holding a branch of laurel in his right hand, and in his left an ivory scepter with an eagle on the top, his face painted with vermilion, and a golden ball hanging from his neck on his breast. He stood upright in a gilded chariot adorned with ivory, drawn by four white horses, attended by his relations and a great crowd of citizens, all clothed in white. It was creditable to Roman morality that a public slave accompanied the conqueror in his chariot, to remind him of the vicissitudes of fortune, and to present to him, in the midst of all his glory, the remembrance of the varied changes and chances of mortality. The conqueror's children sometimes accompanied him, and sometimes rode in a second chariot, escorted by the lieutenants and military tribunes who had served in the war. The consuls, senators, and other magistrates followed the general's chariot on foot; and the whole procession was closed by the victorious army, drawn up in order, crowned with laurel, decorated with the gifts which they had received for their valor, and singing their own and their general's praises. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. **SEE TITUS** (*Emperor*).

Paul makes frequent allusions to such triumphal processions (Col. 2, 15; ~~408~~Ephesians 4:8), with which he compares the triumphs of Christ's followers in spreading abroad, in every place, the perfume of the gospel of salvation (2 Corinthians 2, 14-16). Our Savior's triumphal entry into Jerusalem (~~420~~Matthew 21:1-9) was a token of his royal character (see the monographs in Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 181).

Triumphus, Augustinus

an Augustinian hermit monk who was a native of Ancona, attended the University of Paris for a time, and was present at the Council of Lyons in 1274. He also sojourned at Venice while engaged in the publication of several small books in honor of the Virgin, and at Naples, where he became the favorite of kings Charles and Robert, and where he died in 1328, at the age of eighty-five years. A number of published and unpublished works from his pen are yet extant. We note one *On the Ecclesiastical Power*, addressed to pope John XXII (Augsburg, 1473): — *A Commentary on the*

Lord's Prayer: — *Comments on the Ave Maria and the Magnificat* (Rome, 1590, 1592, 1603): — a *Milleloquium* from the works of Augustine, unfinished by Triumphus, but completed by the Augustinian Bartholomew of Urbino (Lyons, 1555). Of unpublished writings we mention, *Four Books on the Sentences*: — *On the Holy Ghost*, a polemic against the Greeks: — *On the Spiritual Hymn*: — *On the Entrance into the Land of Promise*: — *On the Knowledge and Faculties of the Soul*: — *Theorems respecting the Resurrection of the Dead*: — *Expositions of Ezekiel and all New Test. Books*: — *Discourses of the Lord*: — *On the Saints*: — *On the Moralia of St. Gregory*. See Pamphilius, *Chronicles Eremit. S. August.* p. 46; Cave, *Script. Eccl. Hist. Lit.* (Gen, 1720). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Trivet, Nicholas

an English Dominican monk, was born at Norfolk about 1258. He was educated at Oxford and Paris, and became prior of English houses of his order. He died in 1328. He was the author of *Annales Sex Regum Anglice, cum Continuatione ut et A. Murimruthensis Chronicon*, etc. (Oxon. 1719-22, 2 vols. 8vo). He left many MSS. on various subjects of philosophy and theology, as well as a *Commentary on Seneca's Tragedies*, etc. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Trivulzi

the name of several cardinals of Italian extraction, but of French association in the diplomatic movements-of their age. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

1. AGOSTINO was the nephew of Antonio (1); became deacon in 1517, archbishop of Reggio in 1520, and successively bishop of Bobbio (1519-21), Toulon (1524), Asti (1528), Bayeux (1529), and Brugnato (1535); and died at Rome, March 30, 1548.
2. ANTONIO (1) was born at Milan in January, 1457, and after various diplomatic services was made bishop of Coma in 1487, and cardinal in 1501. He died at Rome, March 18, 1508.
3. ANTONIO (2), nephew of the following, was made successor of his uncle Agostino as bishop of Toulon in 1528, and cardinal in 1557. He died June 26, 1559.

4. SCARAMICCIO, a learned lawyer, was made professor of canon law at Pavia in 1491, and in 1499 counselor of Louis XII. He became cardinal in 1517, bishop of Coma in 1508, and afterwards of Piacenza (1522-26). He died at the monastery of Maguzzano, near Verona, Aug. 9, 1527.

Tro'as

Picture for Troas 1

(**Τρωάς**). The city from which Paul first sailed, in consequence of a divine intimation, to carry the Gospel from Asia to Europe (~~441B~~ Acts 16:8, 11) where he rested for a short time on the northward road from Ephesus (during the next missionary journey), in the expectation of meeting Titus (~~441B~~ 2 Corinthians 2:12,13); where, on the return southwards (during the same missionary journey), he met those who had preceded him from Philippi (~~441B~~ Acts 20:5, 6), and remained a week, the close of which (before the journey to Assos) was marked by the raising of Eutychus from the dead during the protracted midnight discourse; and where, after an interval of many years, the apostle left (during a journey the details of which are unknown) a cloak and some books and parchments in the house of Carpus (~~501B~~ 2 Timothy 4:13)-deserves the careful attention of the student of the New Test., and is memorable as a relic of the famous city of Troy.

The full name of the city was *Alexandria Troas* (Livy, 35:42), and sometimes it was called simply *Alexandria*, as by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 33) and Strabo (13, 593), sometimes simply *Troas* (as in the New Test. and the *Ant. Itin.* See Wesseling, p.334). The former part of the name indicates the period at which it was founded. It was first built by Antigonus, under the name of *Antigonia Troas*, and peopled with the inhabitants of some neighboring cities. Afterwards it was embellished by Lysimachus, and named *Alexandria Troas*. Its situation was on the coast of Mysia, opposite the south-east extremity of the island of Tenedos. The name *Troad* strictly belongs to the whole district around Troy.

Picture for Troas 2

Under the Romans it was one of the most important towns of the province of Asia. It was the chief point of arrival and departure for those who went by sea between Macedonia and the western Asiatic districts; and it was connected by good roads with other places on the coast and in the interior. For the latter see the map in Leake's *Asia Minor*, and in Lewin's *St. Paul*,

2, 81. The former cannot be better illustrated ‘than by Paul’s two voyages between Troas and Philippi (^{<4461>}Acts 16:11, 12; 20:6), one of which was accomplished in two days, the other in five. At this time Alexandria was a *colonia* with the *Justalicum*. This strong Roman connection can be read on its coins. The Romans had a peculiar feeling connected with the place, in consequence of the legend of their origin from Troy. Suetonius tells us that Julius Caesar had a plan of making Troas the seat of empire (*Caes.* 79). It may perhaps be inferred from the words of Horace (*Catrm.* 3, 3, 57) that Augustus had some such dreams. Even the modern name *EskiStambul* or *Eski-Istamboul* (“Old Constantinople”) seems to commemorate the thought which was once in Constantine’s mind (Zosim. 2, 30; Zonar. 13:3), who, to use Gibbon’s words, “before he gave a just preference to the situation of Byzantium, had conceived the design of erecting the seat of empire on this celebrated spot, from which the Romans derived their fabulous origin.”

Picture for Troas 3

The ruins at *Eski-Stambul* are considerable. The most conspicuous, however, especially the remains of the aqueduct of Herodes Atticus, did not exist when Paul was there. The walls, which may represent the extent of the city in the apostle’s time, enclose a rectangular space, extending above a mile from east to west, and nearly a mile from north to south. The harbor (Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1, 283) is still distinctly traceable in a basin about 400 feet long and 200 broad. — Smith.

Descriptions in greater or less detail are given by Poccocke, Chandler, Hunt (in Walpole’s *Memoirs*), Clarke, Prokesch, Richter (*Walfahrten*, p.462), Olivier, Fellows, and the later travelers mentioned in *Murray’s Handbook for Turkey in Asia*, p.153-159. The vicinity has recently become noted for the discovery of what are presumed to be the ruins of ancient Troy at Hisarlik by Sehliemann (*Troy and its Remains* [Lond. 1875]). See also Maclaren, *Plain of Troy* (Edinb. 1863); Meyer, *Gesch. von Troas* (Leips. 1877).

Trogyl’ium

Picture for Trogyllium

(**Τρωγύλλιον**, the rocky extremity of the ridge of Mycale, which is called thus in the New Test. (^{<4405>}Acts 20:15) and by Ptolemy (5, 2), and *Trogilium* (**Τρωγίλιον**) by Strabo (14, 636). It is directly opposite Samos

(q.v.). The channel is extremely narrow. Strabo (*loc. cit.*) makes it about a mile broad, and this' is confirmed by the Admiralty charts (1530 and 1555). Paul sailed through this channel on his way to Jerusalem at the close of his third missionary journey. (~~4015~~Acts 20:15). The navigation of this coast is intricate; and it can be gathered from ver. 6, with subsequent notices of the days spent on the voyage, that it was the time of dark moon. Thus the night was spent at Trogyllium. It is interesting to observe that a little to the east of the extreme point there is an anchorage which is still called *St. Paul's Port*. Pliny refers to three small islands lying about Trogyllium, and names them Sandalion, Psilon, and Argennon (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 37). The port where Paul anchored is generally considered to be that sheltered by Sandalion; but the port now known as the Port of St. Paul is that protected by the island of Nero, the ancient Argennon (Lewin, *St. Paul*, 2, 89). **SEE PAUL.**

Troil, Samuel

a. Swedish prelate, was born May 22, 1706 at Saint Schedwi (Dalecarlia), being the son of a pastor. He studied philosophy at the University of Stockholm, and became successively grand almoner of the king (April 22, 1740), president of the consistory (Jan. 2, 1742), bishop of Westeras (April 23, 1751), and archbishop of Upsala (Nov. 8, 1757), where he died, Jan. 18, 1764. He was a learned and eloquent preacher, and left many funeral discourses, etc.

Troil, Uno

a Swedish prelate, son of the foregoing, was born at Stockholm, Feb. 24, 1746. After a brilliant course of study at Upsala, and extensive travels in Germany, France, and England, he became successively almoner of the regiment (1773), preacher in ordinary to the king (1775), bishop of Linköping (1784), president of the consistory of Stockholm and archbishop of Upsala (Aug. 30, 1787), where he died, July 27, 1803. He wrote several historical sketches, for which see Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Troki, Isaac ben-Abraham

a Jewish scholar, who derived his name from his native place, Troki, a town in the Russian province of Wilna, was born in 1533. At the period in which this character lived, Poland was not only the seat of Jewish learning, but also the scene of action of the different sects to which the Reformation

gave rise. "In the earlier years of the religious Reformation of the 16th century, the skepticism which had prevailed so generally in Rome and the Italian states, chiefly among the higher clergy, and perhaps most intensely in the highest, tainted the Italian mind, and imparted a peculiar stamp of heterodoxy to the adherents of the Reformation in that country. The court of Rome had sagaciously put off the garb of pagan laxity, which it had worn so jauntily since the revival of letters. The Council of Trent, while reviewing every article of Roman theology, having stated in its canons the fundamental articles of Christian faith with a clearness that was indeed much needed, gave strict instructions to all the licensed preachers of their Church, and so enabled them to assume a new appearance of sound faith, at least in those particulars which would contrast not only with their former heterodoxy, now to be concealed, but with the open heterodoxy of certain fugitive Italian Protestants. These persons found congenial society among the Jews in Poland, who, while heroically adhering to the letter of the Mosaic law, had nevertheless not accepted the more fully unfolded verity of Christian revelation. Heretics they were in the eye of Rome, and the persecution that haunted them drove them at once into the arms of the Polish Karaites; for, like them, and even more than they, these protesters against Rome hated tradition and all human authority. Like the Karaites, they were sturdy Monotheists in the same narrow sense. They outran Arius in the race of unbelief. Their own Socino left his name to a sect just as Sadok had left his; and Socino, with his principal followers, chose Poland to be at once their asylum and their citadel. From that time it became the center of Socinianism in Europe. In Poland the Jew and the Christian both enjoyed religious liberty, and for once the most orthodox of the Israelites and the least orthodox of the Christians could fraternize on *one* point, and on only one. One of those Jews was Isaac. He was brought up in the study of Talmudism as a branch of Jewish learning, and in the faith of the Karaite, cold withal, until quickened and elevated under the impulse of persecution. Young Isaac, to whom Hebrew was vernacular, was also liberally educated in the Latin and Polish languages. In these languages he read the chief controversial writings, as they were issued by their eminent authors, against the Church of Rome. He carefully studied the Catholic-Polish version of the Bible, made by Leonard from the Vulgate, which appeared in Cracow in 1561, and again in 1575 and 1577; the Calvinistic-Polish version, called the Radzivil Bible, and published in 1563; and the Socinian version, made also from the original texts, by the celebrated Simon Budny, which was published at Nieswicz, in Lithuania, in 1570; as

well as the writings of Nicholas Paruta, Martin Chechowiz, and Simon Budny, the heads of Unitarianism in Poland. As all these sects, who differed from each other on almost every other point, agreed in their attack upon the Jews and their faith, the rabbi set to work on a confutation of Christianity. He read the New Test., in Budny's version, with the cool and orderly habit of a hard-working student. Every passage on which he could fix a doubt or hazard a denial was marked as it stands in the sacred book and for the purpose of controversy. The entire stock of all Christian cavils with which educated Jews, at least, are familiar, combined with the objections of the Socinians, were brought to bear on the New Test. by direct attack on all the leading sentences in relation to the person, life, and ministry of Christ. The work, written in Hebrew, under the title of *Confirmation of the qwzh hnwma* and which has a world-wide celebrity, Isaac finished in 1593, when sixty years of age. The work is interesting for its quotations from some little-known Christian and polemical works in the Polish language, and because it has been made use of by critical writers upon the New Test. from Voltaire to Strauss; for the former at least acknowledges in his *Melanges*, 3, 344: "Il a rassemble toutes les difficultes que les incredules ont prodiguees depuis.... Enfin, incredules les plus determines nont presque rien allegui qui ne soit dans ce rempart de la foi du rabbin Issac." The book is divided into two parts — the first, which is devoted to an examination of the objections raised by Christians against Judaism, and which is subdivided into fifty chapters, discusses very minutely the interpretation of the Messianic passages of the Old Test. and their application to Christ as the predicted Messiah; while the second part is taken up with a critical examination of the statements made in the sundry books of the New Test. Troki died in 1594. His work was first published by Wagenseil, with a Latin translation, in his collection of *The, Fiery Darts of Satanm (Tela Jgneaa Satance)* (Altdorf, 1681), from a MS. obtained from *an African Jew*, which was imperfect. A reprint of this vitiated text without the Latin translation appeared in Amsterdam in 1717s and in Jerusalem in 1845. The best edition, however, is that edited by rabbi D. Deutsch, with a German translation (Sohran, 1865). Besides this German translation, there is another by M. Gelling (Hamb. 163L-33). It was translated into Spanish by Isaac Athia, and into Italian by M. Luzzatto. The work has also been redefined by Müller, *Coifutatio Libri Chizuk Enzuwta*, comprised in his *Judcismus ex Rabbiorum Scriptis Detectuts, etc., Refutatus* (ibid. 1644); by GouSset, *Ternio Controvers. adversus Judaeos, Oppositus R. Isaac Chissuk Emuna* (Dordrecht, 1688), which,

however, was not satisfactory to the duke Louis of Orleans (d. 1752), who wrote another refutation; by Gebhard, *Centum Loca N.T. Vindicata adversus Chissuk Emuna* (Greifswalde, 1699); Storr, *Evangelische Glaubenskraft. Gegen das Werk Chissuk Emuna* (Tub. 1703); and by Kidder [Bp.], in his *Demonstration of the Messiah* (2d ed. Lond. 1726). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 4:639 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 26:10; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 2, 138; 3, 448, De' Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 320 sq. id. *Biblioth. Antichristiana*, p. 42 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Steinschneider, *Catal. Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* col. 1074 sq., and his *Jewish Literature*, p. 212; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 444; Rule, *Hist. of the Karaite Jews*, p. 170 sq. Basnage, *Hist. des JuiJs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 772; Geiger, *Isaak Tamroki, ein Apologet des Judenth. am Ende des 16ten Jahrhds.* (Breslau, 1853; reprinted in his *Nachgelassenie Schriften*, 3, 178, Berlin, 1876); id. *Probenjkidischer Vertheidigung geen christliche Angriffe*, in Liebermann's *Kalender*, 1854; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 9:490 sq.; Becker, in *Saat amf Honffung* (Etlang. 1870), 7:154 sq.; Fürst, in the same quarterly (*ibid.* 1871), 8:224 sq. (B. P.)

Trolle, Gustavus

a Swedish prelate, descended from a noble Danish family named *Erik*, was born near the close of the 11th, century, and became archbishop of Upsala Oct. 30, 1514, but was besieged in his palace by an old family enemy; and, although reinforced by the interdict and troops of pope Leo X, he at length fell in battle on the island of Fiona, and died at Gottorp; near *Sleswick*, *Juill* , 1535. For the details of his stormy career see Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Tromm (Van Der Trommen, Lat. Trommius), Abraham

a learned Protestant divine of Holland, was born at Groningen, Aug. 23, 1633, and studied the classics, philosophy, and theology in that university. He traveled through Germany. Switzerland, France, and England, and on his return was appointed curate at Haren. In 1671 he was invited to the pastorate of Groningen, and continued there until his death, May 29, 1719. John Martinius, of Danutzic, having begun a *Concordance of the Old Testament* in Flemish, Tromm completed it (Amsterd. 1685-92, 2 vols. fol.). He also published a *Greek Concordance of the Septuagint* (Utr. 1718, 2 vols. fol.), which has remained a standard work.

Tronchin, Louis

a Swiss divine, was born at Geneva, Dec. 4, 1629, and after studying theology there and at Satumur, he traveled abroad and then became preacher at Lyons in 1654. In 1661 he was made professor of theology in Geneva, where he died, Sept. 8, 1705. He was noted for his mildness during the Calvinistic controversy of his time.

Tronchin, Theodore

a learned Swiss divine, father of the preceding, was born at Geneva, April 17, 1582. He was well educated, visited foreign universities, and on his return to Geneva, in 1606, he gave such proof of his learning that he was chosen professor of the Hebrew language. He was made minister in 1608, and created rector of the university in 1610. In 1616 he was promoted to the professorship of divinity, He was sent from Geneva to the Council of Dort, where he displayed his great knowledge in divinity, and a moderation which was highly applauded. For several of his works see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s.v.

Troop

is, in the A. V., especially employed as the rendering (sometimes "band," etc.) of גִּדּוּד *gedûd*, which means a marauding party, in the forays for which Palestine has always been notorious, especially beyond the Jordan (Q149Genesis 49:19; Q1021 Samuel 3:22; 22:30; 30:8; Q192Job 19:12; Q182Psalms 18:29; Q182Jeremiah 18:22; Q103Hosea 6:9; 7:1; Q103Micah 5:1).

Tropaea

(τρόπαια), the name of churches erected in honor of martyrs, or dedicated to them. The reason of the name is found in the reported appearance of the cross to Constantine, and in the labarum on which, according to Eusebius, were inscribed the words τοῦ σταυροῦ τρόπαιον.

Tropes

or *sequence*, are verses sung before the holy Gospel in the mass. They are a kind of prose, written in a species of verse, though unfettered by any recognized law of meter. They were introduced at the close of the 9th century. Four only are found in the Roman missal. *SEE SEQUENCE*.

Troph'imus

(**Τρόφιμος**, *nutritious*) a Hellenistic Christian, who with others traveled with the apostle Paul in the course of his third missionary journey, and during part of the route which he took in returning from Macedonia towards Syria (**ἄλλοι** Acts 20:4). A.D. 54. From what we know concerning the collection which was going on at this time for the poor Christians in Judaea, we are disposed to connect him with the business of that contribution. Both he and Tychicus accompanied Paul from Macedonia as far as Asia (**ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας** frag, *cl. cit.*), but Tychicus seems to have remained there, while Trophimus proceeded with the apostle to Jerusalem. There he was the innocent cause of the tumult in which Paul was apprehended, and from which the voyage to Rome ultimately resulted. Certain Jews from the district of Asia saw the two Christian missionaries together, and *supposed* that Paul had taken Trophimus into the Temple (21:27-29). From this passage we learn two new facts, viz. that Trophimus was a Gentile and that he was a native not simply of Asia; but of Ephesus. A considerable interval now elapses, during which we have no trace of either Tychicus or Trophimus; but in the last letter written by Paul, shortly before his martyrdom, from Rome, he mentions them both (**Τυχικὸν ἀπέστειλα εἰς Ἔφεσον;**, **ἄλλοι** 2 Timothy 4:12; **Τρόφιμον ἀπέλιπον ἐν ἰλητῶ ἄσθε νοῦντα**, ver. 20). From the last of the phrases we gather simply that the apostle had no long time before been in the Levant, that Trophimus had been with him, and a that he had been left in infirm health at Miletus. Of the further details we are ignorant; but this we may say here, that while there would be considerable difficulty in accommodating this passage to any part of the recorded narrative previous to the voyage to Rome, all difficulty vanishes on the supposition of two imprisonments, and a journey in the Levant between them. Trophimus was no doubt at Miletus on the occasion' recorded in **ἄλλοι** Acts 20:15-38, but it is most certain that he was not left there. The theory also that he was left there on the voyage to Rome is preposterous; for the wind forced Paul's vessel to run direct from the south-west corner of Asia Minor to the east end of Crete (**ἄλλοι** Acts 27:7). We may add that when Trophimus was left in sickness at Miletus, whenever that might be; he was within easy reach of his home friends at Ephesus, as we see from 20:17.

Stanley thinks that Trophimus was one of the two brethren who, with Titus, conveyed the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (**ἄλλοι** 2 Corinthians 8:16-24). "Trophimus was like Titus, one of the few Gentiles who

accompanied the apostle; an Ephesian, and therefore likely to have been sent by the apostle from Ephesus with the first epistle, or to have accompanied him from Ephesus now; he was, as is implied of ‘this brother,’ whose praise was in all the churches, well known; so well known that the Jews of Asia [Minor?] at Jerusalem immediately recognized him; he was also especially connected with the apostle on this very mission of the collection for the poor in Judaea. Thus far would appear from the description of him in ^{<402>}Acts 21:29. From 20:4 it also appears that he was with Paul on his return from this very visit to Corinth” (*Commentary on Corinthians*, 2nd ed. p. 492).

The traditional story that Trophimus was one of the seventy disciples is evidently wrong; but that part of the legend which states that he was beheaded by Nero’s orders is possibly true (*Menol. Gr.* 3, 57).

Tropici

are those who explain away, by figurative interpretations, texts of Scripture which Catholic faith and tradition require to be otherwise interpreted. Athanasius (*Ad Serap.* 1, 2, 10, 21) gives the name Tropici to the *Pneumatomachi* (q.v.) in so marked a manner that it has narrowly escaped becoming a proper name of that sect. For example, they argued that in ^{<412>}1 Timothy 5:21 the name of the Holy Spirit would naturally follow the names of Father and Son, that the term “elect angels,” tropically taken, includes the Holy Spirit, the inference being that the Holy Spirit is a created angel. The word Tropici has been used, again, by Catholic writers to describe those who err regarding the holy sacraments, and explain as mere figures the words of our Lord in ^{<415>}John 3:5; ^{<416>}Matthew 16:26.

Tropitae

(*τροπίται*) were a sect of heretics who held that our Lord acquired a body of flesh by conversion of the substance of the godhead into the substance of flesh; an opinion which arose in the latter time of the Arian controversy among those who, maintaining the true divinity of the Son of God, and rightly desiring to maintain his sinlessness, were perplexed by the erroneous assumption that the human body, as such, is and cannot but be the seat of sin. To avoid the impiety of attributing a sinful body to our Lord, they devised the tenet that the body of Christ is consubstantial with his divinity, which passes into the somewhat more definite proposition that the substance of the Word is converted into the substance of flesh, and that

the flesh being in the form of man is thus called human. This heresy was first dealt with by Athanasius (*Epistle to Epictetus*), A.D. 370. Apollinaris was at the head of those who denied the true incarnation of Christ, asserting the general proposition that the Son of God did not assume that which in man is the seat of sin; and varied applications of this proposition - were made by his followers.. A belief in the possibility of the conversion of the godhead into flesh almost necessarily presupposes the reception of the Cabalistic doctrine that all matter is an emanation from God. Athanasius remarks that Valentinus fancied the flesh to be a part of Deity, and so concluded that the passion was common to the whole Trinity. Fabricius remarks that the heresy is confuted by Tertullian. The Council of Chalcedon determined that the two natures in Christ are united **ἀτρέπτως**.

Tropological Interpretation

is where a *moral* signification is given to a passage. An illustration will explain this sense. In ⁽¹⁵²⁰⁾Deuteronomy 25:4 we read, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn." Paul (⁽¹⁶⁰⁰⁾1 Corinthians 9:9) quotes this precept of the law, adding the comment, "Doth God take care for oxen ? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written." Blunt, *Dict, of Doctrines*, s.v. **SEE HERMENEUTICS**,

Trosle, Council Of (Concilium Trosleianum)

was held in Trosle, a small village near Soissons, France. It assembled June 26, 909, Herive, archbishop of Rheims, presiding. The decrees of this council are signed by twelve prelates, and are contained in fifteen chapters; they are in the form rather of long exhortations than of canons, showing the pitiable condition of the Church,

1. Orders due respect to the Church, to clerks, and to monks.
3. Relates to the reform of abuses in monastic institutions.
4. Anathematizes those who pillage the Church.
5. Anathematizes those who injure and persecute the clergy.
6. Is directed against those who refuse tithe.
7. Against rapine and robbery, and orders restitution.
8. Is directed against the violent abduction of women, and incest.

9. Forbids priests to have women in their houses.
10. Exhorts all Christians to charity, and to avoid luxury and excess.
11. Forbids perjury and on the breaking.
12. Is directed against passionate and litigious persons.
13. Against liars and homicides.
14. Denounces those who plunder the property of bishops after their death.
15. Contains an exhortation to all the faithful to abstain from sin and to do their duty. See Mansi, *Concil.* 9:520.

Trost, Martin

professor of Hebrew at Wittenberg, where he also died, April 8, 1636, was born at Hoxter in the year 1588. He published, *Grammatica Hebraica Universalis* (Hafniae, 1627, and often); excerpts from his grammar were published by Baldovius, Gezelius, Mitternacht, and Mylius: — *Disputatio de Mutatione Punctorum Hebrceorum Generali* (Wittenberg, 1633): — *Novum Test. Syr. cum Versione Latina ex Diversis Editionibus Recensitum. Accesserunt in fine notationes variantis lectionis collectae ac M. Tr.* (Cothen, 1621). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 449; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 55; 2, 808; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Handbuch*, p. 141. (B. P.)

Troth (Truth)

a word occurring in the Prayer-book only in the marriage service, thus, “And thereto I plight thee my troth;” that is, “thereto I most solemnly pledge thee my *truth and sincerity*.” Near the end of the same service the minister says that the persons now married have “pledged their *troth* each to other,” i.e. have promised to be *true* and *faithful to* each other. — Stanton, *Dict. of the Church*, s.v.

Trough

(*tqwpshohketh*, from *hqv*; *to drink*), a vessel of wood or stone for watering animals (^{Q1241}Genesis 24:20; 30:38). *SEE WELL*. But in ^{Q1216}Exodus 2:16 a different term (*fheerahat*, from the idea of *owing*;

“gutter,” ^{<OCT8>}Genesis 30:38, 41) is employed for the same thing. *SEE KNEADING-TROUGH.*

Troy, John Thomas, D.D.

an Irish prelate, was born near Porterstown, in the county of Dublin, and at the age of fifteen went to Rome, where he became a Dominican, and finally rector of St. Clement's in that city. In 1776 he was elected bishop of Ossory. In January, 1779, he promulgated very spirited circulars against the outrages of the Whiteboys, and in October excommunicated them. In 1786 he was promoted to the see of Dublin. In November, 1787, he issued his pastoral directions to his clergy, in which he strictly prohibited the future celebration of midnight masses. In 1793 he published *Pastoral Instructions on the Duties of Christian Citizens*. He died May 11, 1823. See D'Alton, *Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 480.

Troyes, Councils Of (Concilium Tricassinum)

were held in Troyes, France, a city which has a splendid Gothic cathedral, founded in 1208; the Church of St. Urban; the Church of St. John, in which Henry V of England was married; the Church of Sainte-Madeleine, containing a stone rood loft of great beauty; and a public library of 110,000 volumes.

I. Held Oct. 25, 867. 'About twenty bishops, from the kingdoms of Charles and Lothaire, were present, who wrote a long letter to pope Nicholas I, in which they gave the history of the affair of Ebbo, and of the priests whom he had ordained. They, moreover, besought the pope not to interfere with the rule laid down by his predecessor, and not to permit, in future, the deposition of any bishop without the intervention of the Holy See. This was in accordance with the principles of the false decretals of the pope. See Mansi, *Concil.* 8:868.

II. Held in 878, by pope John VIII, who presided over thirty bishops. The former had come into France to escape from the violence of Lambert, duke of Spoleto. In the first session, the pope exhorted the bishops to compassionate the injuries which the Roman Church had suffered from Lambert and his accomplices, and to excommunicate them. The prelates, however, declined to act until the arrival of their brethren. In the second session, John read an account of the ravages committed by Lambert, after which the council declared him to be worthy of death and anathema. The

archbishop of Arles presented a petition against bishops and priests leaving one Church for another, and also against persons deserting their wives in order to marry other women. In the third session the bishops declared their consent to the pope's propositions. Hincmar of Laon, whose eyes had been put out, presented a complaint against his uncle, and demanded to be judged according to the canons. Hincmar of Rheims required that the cause might be delayed, to give him time to reply to the complaint. Further, the sentence of condemnation passed against Formosus, formerly bishop of Porto, and Gregory, a nobleman, was read, anathematizing them without hope of absolution; as also were the canons forbidding the translation of bishops, viz. those of Sardica, Africa, and of pope Leo. Seven canons were published.

1. Orders that temporal lords shall show due respect to bishops, and that they shall not sit down in their presence without their permission.
7. Forbids to receive anonymous accusations against any person.

III. Held in 1104, by the legate Richard, bishop of Albano, whom Paschal II had sent into France to absolve king Philip. The council was very numerous, and among those present we find Ivo of Chartres. Hubert, bishop of Senlis, accused of simony, cleared himself by oath. The election of the abbot Godefroi, by the people of Amiens, to the bishopric of that town was approved, and, in spite of the abbot's resistance, he was compelled to consent to it. See Mansi, *Concil.* 10:738.

IV. Held in 1107, by pope Paschal II, who presided. The main object of this council was to excite the zeal of men for the Crusade, besides which sentence of excommunication was denounced against those who should violate the Truce of God. The freedom of elections of bishops was asserted and established, and the condemnation of investitures repeated. Several German bishops were on various accounts suspended. Mansi (*Concil.* 10:754) adds five canons to those usually attributed to this council.

1. Orders that any one receiving investiture at the hands of a layman shall be deposed, as well as the persons ordaining or consecrating him.

V. Held Jan. 13, 1128, by the legate Matthew, bishop of Albano, assisted by the archbishops of Rheims and Sens, thirteen bishops, and by St. Bernard, St. Stephen, and other abbots. A rule was drawn up for the Order of the Templars, instituted in 1118, prepared by authority of the pope and

of the patriarch of Jerusalem. In this council the white dress was given to the Templars. See Mansi, *Concil.* 10:922.

Truber, Primus

a notable personage in the Reformation in Germany, was consecrated to the priesthood by Peter Bonomus, bishop of Trieste, and took charge of the parish of Lack in 1527. In 1531 he became a canon of Laibach, where the new doctrine was already promulgated, and soon afterwards he took ground in opposition to the Church of Rome. He was assailed by the clergy and the government, but protected by the nobles until 1540. Bishop Bonomus then called him to Trieste. In 1547 the bishop of Laibach, Urban Textor, procured an order for the apprehension of Truber, in consequence of which the latter was compelled to flee. He found a new parish at Rothenburg in the following year, and while there he entered into wedlock with a woman named Barbara. From 1553 to 1560 he was pastor at Kempten. As early as 1550, or, perhaps, earlier still, Truber had endeavored to minister to the needs of his countrymen by preparing translations in the Wendish dialect of an *Abecedarium* and a catechism, which were printed, with Latin letters, at Tübingen. The prosecution of his plans was made possible through Vergerius (q.v.), who induced duke Christopher of Würtemberg to pay for the printing. In 1555 the Wendish *Gospel of St. Matthew* appeared in print, and in 1556 the other historical books of the New Test. Romans, both epistles to the Corinthians, and Galatians were published in 1561. After various vicissitudes, Truber obtained the parish of Urach, where the famous baron Hans Ungnad became his patron and enabled him to establish his own press for the printing of Slavic books. The types used were both Glagolitic and Cyrillic. **SEE GLAGOLITA.** The accounts of the printing-office are still in existence, and show that many princes and towns contributed to its support. Its publications included Luther's catechisms, the *Augsburg Confession*, and the *Apology*, Melancthon's *Loci Communes*, the Würtemberg *Church Discipline*, the *Beneficium Christi*, and spiritual hymns: but the enterprise was not remunerative, and was abandoned soon after the death of baron Ungnad in 1564. Truber passed the last twenty years of his life in charge of the parish of Deredingen, near Tübingen. Two days before he died he dictated to his amanuensis the closing sentences for his translation of Luther's *Hauspostille*. He died June 28, 1586, after a brief illness, and in the seventy-eighth year of his age. See Sillem, *Primus Truber, der Reformator Krains* (Erlang. 1861); Schnurrer, *Slavischer*

Bicherdruck in Württemberg (Tib. 1799); and particularly Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 21 s.v., where a much more complete and somewhat divergent sketch of Truber's career is given.

Trublet, Nicholas C. J.

a French abbé, of temporary fame, was born at St. Malo, in December, 1697. There are no memoirs of his education or early progress, but it appears that he was treasurer of the Church of Nantes, and afterwards archdeacon and canon of St. Malo. His irreproachable conduct and agreeable manners procured him very general esteem as a man, but as a writer he never ranked high in public opinion, and though ambitious of a seat in the French Academy, did not secure that honor until 1761. He died in March, 1770, at his native place. His principal works are, *E'ssais de Literature et de Morale* (4 vols. 12mo): —*Panegyriques des Saints*: —*Megmoires pour servir a l'Histoire de Messieurs de la Motte et de Fontenelle* (Amst. 17.61). He was also a contributor to the *Journal des Savans* and *Journal Chretien*. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Truce of God

a scheme set on foot by the Church in the Middle Ages for the purpose of quelling the violence and preventing the frequency of private wars, occasioned by the fierce spirit of barbarism. It was first proposed at the Council of Charroux in 989, adopted by the Council of Orleans in 1016, and by the Council of Limoges in 1031. In France a general peace and cessation from hostilities took place A.D. 1032, and continued seven years, through the efforts of the bishop of Aquitaine. A resolution was formed that no man should, in time to come, attack or molest his adversaries during the season set apart for celebrating the great festivals of the Church, or from the evening of Thursday in each week to the morning of Monday in the week ensuing, the intervening days being consecrated as particularly holy—Thursday as the day of our Lord's ascension; Friday as that of his Passion; Saturday, when he rested in the grave; and Sunday, the day of his resurrection. In 1034 it was opposed by the bishop of Cambrai. Later it was extended to nearly all the more important fasts, feasts, and holy seasons of the Church. England (1042) and Italy adopted the custom, which was further confirmed by the second and third Lateran councils (A.D. 1139, 1179). A change in the dispositions of men so sudden, and one

which proposed a resolution so unexpected, was considered as miraculous, and the respite from hostilities which followed upon it was called the "Truce of God." This cessation from hostilities during three complete days every week allowed a considerable space for the passions of the antagonists to cool, and for the people to enjoy a respite from the calamities of war, and to take measures for their own security. The triumph of legal over feudal government eventually did away with the institution and the necessity for it. See Trench, *Medieval Church History*, p. 424 sq.

True, Charles K., D.D.

an eminent Methodist Episcopal divine, was born in Portland, Me., Aug. 14, 1809. The family afterwards removed to Boston. He graduated at Harvard University in 1832, having been converted at the Eastham camp-meeting while connected with that college, and immediately commenced preaching in the vicinity, being among the first Methodist preachers at the opening of denominational services in Newton Upper Falls, established through the faithful endeavors of Marshall S. Rice. His early efforts awakened great attention. His personal appearance was attractive, his voice pleasant, his address graceful, and his discourses often very eloquent. He entered the New England Conference in 1833, was an agent of the New England Education Society in 1834, and became the first principal of the Amenia Seminary in 1835. He entered the New York Conference in 1836, and had a memorable experience, both in the conference and in his charge at Middletown, Conn., in the antislavery controversy, having early taken very pronounced grounds on the question. In 1838 he was transferred to the New England Conference, and stationed at Lynn. He remained, filling appointments with much acceptableness, in Boston and vicinity until 1849, when he was elected professor of intellectual and moral science in Wesleyan University. He became again a member of the New York Conference in 1860, but re-entered the New England Conference in 1866. From 1870 to 1873 he was a financial agent of the Wesleyan University, and was a member of the New York East Conference until his death, which occurred suddenly, June 20, 1878. During his last years he was connected with one or two of the charitable societies whose offices are in New York city, and supplied the pulpits of charges in the New York East Conference not far distant from his home. Dr. True wrote a text-book upon logic, and several interesting volumes of a historical character. He was a man of fine abilities, an original thinker, with marked repose of mind and manner, self-reliant, and with just enough eccentricity to give an original flavor to his

opinions. He was a good preacher, at times powerful in discourse, and particularly effective in exhortation. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1879, p. 30 sq.

True Reformed Dutch Church

is an organization which grew out of the secession of the Rev. Solomon Froeligh, D.D., in 1822. . He was a professor of theology, a man of erudition, and pastor of the two congregations of Hackensack and Schralenburg, N. J., which he carried with him. His secession was the culmination of difficulties of long standing, in which he was subjected to censure for aggression upon a neighboring Church. He refused to submit to the authorities of the Church. A number of disaffected ministers united with him, together with portions of their churches. The grounds alleged for their separation were that the Dutch Church had become erroneous in doctrine, lax in discipline, and corrupt in practice. The confusion, strife, and troubles produced by this conflict were long and bitter. The “True Reformed Dutch Church” retains the standards of the Church which it left, and declares that it alone keeps them in their purity. It holds no fellowship with any other denomination, refuses to co-operate with the benevolent religious institutions of the age, and is generally antinomian in sentiment and practice. The churches of this sect are less than twenty in number, small, feeble, and dwindling away with the survivors of the original strife. They are located in New Jersey and New York. For full accounts, reference is made to their pamphlet entitled *Reasons Assigned by a Number of Ministers, Elders, and Deacons for Declaring Themselves the True Reformed Dutch Church in the United States of America*. See also Corwin, *Manual of the Ref. Church in America*; Taylor, *Annals of Classis and Township of Bergen*, very full and accurate. (W. J. R. T.)

Trullo, Council of

the name by which the sixth Council of CONSTANTINOPLE *SEE* *CONSTANTINOPLE* (q.v.) is called, from the circumstance of its having been held in the domed chapel of the palace.

Trumbull, Benjamin, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born in Hebron, Conn., Dec. 19, 1735, graduated at Yale College in 1759, and was ordained December, 1760, pastor at North Haven, where he remained until his death, Feb. 2, 1820. He

published, *A Discourse Delivered at Freemans Meeting* (1773): —*A Plea in Vindication of the Connecticut Title to the Contested Lands lying West of the Province of New York, Addressed to the Public* (1776): —*An Appeal to the Public respecting Divorce* (1785): —*An 'Address on Family Religion* (1807): —*Twelve Discourses on the Divine Origin of the Scriptures* (1810): —*A General History of the United States*, etc. (eod.): —*Two Pamphlets on the Unlawfulness of Marrying a Wife's Sister* (eod.): —*A Complete History of Connecticut* (2 vols. 1797, 1818)—and several occasional *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 584.

Trumbull, Robert, D.D.

a distinguished Baptist minister and scholar, was born in Whiteburn, Linlithgowshire, Scotland, Sept. 10, 1809. He was brought up as a Presbyterian. Having graduated at the Glasgow University, he attended the theological lectures of Drs. Chalmers and Dick in Edinburgh, having among his fellow-students Kobert Pollok, the author of the *Course of Time*. While pursuing his theological studies, he changed his sentiments on the subject of Christian baptism, and connected himself with a Baptist Church. For a year and a half he preached in Westmancotte, Worcestershire, England. In 1833 he came to this country, and for two years was pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Danbury, Conn., when he was called to the pastorate of the First Baptist Church in Detroit, Mich., where he remained two years, and then became pastor of the South Baptist Church in Hartford, Conn. In all these churches his labors were greatly blessed. For two years he continued in Hartford, and then accepted a call in 1839 to what is now the Harvard Street Church in Boston, where his six years (1839-45) ministry added greatly to the strength of the Church. In July, 1845, he returned to Hartford, to take the pastoral charge of the First Baptist Church in that city. His connection with that Church as its minister continued for twenty-four years. "Under his earnest and faithful ministry the Church enjoyed a succession of revivals and constant accessions, till it became in numbers, beneficence, and influence one of the strongest in the denomination." The unusually long pastorate of Dr. Trumbull closed in 1869. It was not his wish again to become a permanent pastor. For, more than two years he preached in New Haven, supplying the pulpit of a mission chapel in Dwight Street one year, and another year preaching in a chapel in the northwestern part of the city. Dr. Trumbull was chosen in 1872 secretary of the Connecticut Baptist Convention. In this capacity he served for the remainder of his life, performing a work for the feeble

Baptist churches in Connecticut the value of which cannot be overestimated. His memory is cherished with warm affection in the community and state which he so long blessed by his Christian ministry. For a little more than five years he devoted himself with great zeal to his work, and saw it abundantly successful. He died at Hartford, Nov. 20, 1877. Dr. Trumbull was a voluminous writer, considering the amount of ministerial work he performed during his life. Among his published writings were the following: *Olympia Morata* (1842): — *Vinet's Vital Christianity-a translation* (1846): — *Genius of Scotland* (1847): — *Pulpit Writers of France and Switzerland* (1848): — *Genius of Italy* (1849): — *Theophany, or the Manifestation of God in Christ* (1851) : — *Vinet's Miscellanies* (1852): — *Life Pictures* (1857). He edited also sir William Hamilton's *Discussions on Philosophy, Literature, and University Reform*. He was the editor of the *Christian Review* for two years. See *Christian Secretary*, Nov. 28, 1877. (J. C. S.)

Trump

(σάλπιγξ, ^{<612>}1 Corinthians 15:22; ^{<346>}1 Thessalonians 4:16). *SEE TRUMPET.*

Trumpet

is in the A.V. usually the rendering of one or the other of the two Hebrew words detailed below; but besides these it occasionally stands as the representative of the following: **לְבוֹשׁ** ^{<1913>}Exodus 19:13, the *jubilee* (q.v.) trumpet; **[יָקַט]**; *takea*, ^{<374>}Ezekiel 7:14, prop. the *blowing* of the trumpet. *SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.*

Picture for Trumpet 1

1. **חֲרָשִׁים** } *chatsotserah* (Sept. σάλπιγξ, Vtmlg. *tuba*), prob. an onomatopoeic word, like the Lat. *taratantara*, from the quivering reverberation of its sound, was the *straight* trumpet (Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 12, 6; Jerome, *ad Hos.* 5, 8; Buxtorf, *Lex.* s.v.), and is the term used in ^{<402>}Numbers 10:2, 8, 9, 10; 31:6; ^{<114>}2 Kings 11:14 (“trumpeter,” in first occurrence); 12:13; ^{<318>}1 Chronicles 13:8; 15:24, 28; 16:6, 42; ^{<452>}2 Chronicles 5:12, 13; 13:12, 14; 15:14; 20:28; 23:13; 29:26, 27, 28; Ezra 3, 10; ^{<625>}Nehemiah 12:35, 41; ^{<986>}Psalms 98:6; ^{<388>}Hosea 5:8. There were originally two such, which the priests used on festive occasions

(^{<0400>}Numbers 10:2 sq.; comp. 31:6; ^{<1213>}2 Kings 12:13). Later (in David's time) the instruments were of a richer character (^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 15:24; 16:42; 2 Chronicles 5, 12 sq.; 29:20; for a conjecture as to their form, see Sommner, *Bibl Abhandl.* 1, 39 sq.). Similar ones were employed in the year of jubilee (^{<1214>}2 Kings 11:14), and for popular proclamations (^{<0308>}Hosea 5:8); comp. Rosellini, *Monum.* II, 3, 32; Wilkinson, 2, 262. The form of this trumpet is indicated in the sculpture on the Arch of Titus at Rome (see *Reland, Spolia Templi Hieros.* p. 184 sq.) and on coins (Frohlich, *Anal. Syr. proleg.* p. 80, pl. 18, fig. 17 and 18), and it appears to have emitted a clear, shrill tone (comp. Foskel, 1, 86), adapted to an *alarum* ([qīṭ]). *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.*

2. שׁוֹפָר, *shophar* (Sept. usually **σάλπιγξ**, Vulg. *buccina*), was the *curved* trumpet or horn (Lat. *lituus*) for signals; and is the word elsewhere rendered "trumpet" in the A. V. ("cornet," ^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 15:28; ^{<1414>}2 Chronicles 15:14; ^{<0306>}Psalms 98:6; ^{<0308>}Hosea 5:8). It was sounded in the year of jubilee (^{<0309>}Leviticus 25:9; the Talmudic New-year's day, Mishna, *Rosh hash-Shanah*, 3, 3), in battle (^{<0325>}Job 29:25 [28]; ^{<0405>}Jeremiah 4:5; 6:1), and by sentinels (^{<0306>}Ezekiel 33:6); and had a loud (^{<0301>}Isaiah 58:1) tone like a thunder-peal (^{<0206>}Exodus 19:16,19). Some writers fail to distinguish this from the preceding kind of trumpet (Credner, *Joel*, p.164 sq.; Hoffmann, in Warnekros, *Hebr. Alterth.* p. 598 sq.); both instruments are named in the same connection in ^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 15:28; ^{<1414>}2 Chronicles 15:14; ^{<0306>}Psalms 98:6; Hosea 5, 8 (see Zoega, *De Buccina* [Lips. 1712]). Jerome (on the passage last cited) clearly distinguishes the *shophar*: "Buccina pastoralis est et cornu recurvo efficitur, unde et proprie Hebraice *shophar*, Graece **κερατίνη** appellatur." According to the Mishna (*ut sup.*), however, the *shophar* was sometimes straight and at others crooked (see Doughtei *Analect.* 1, 99 sq.). Curved horns (as of oxen or sheep) are still common in the synagogue under the same name (**שׁוֹפָר**); according to the Gemara (*Shabb.* 36:1), **שׁוֹפָר** originally denoted only the curved horn and not until the downfall of the Jewish polity was it confounded with the **שׁוֹפָר** } The second Temple contained thirteen boxes (in the court of the women), shaped like (straight) trumpets (*shopharoth*), for the deposition of alms (Mishna, *Shekal.* 6:5). The horn with which the year of jubilee was ushered in is technically called (as above observed) **שׁוֹפָר**, **שׁוֹפָר** or **שׁוֹפָר** (^{<0304>}Joshua 6:4 sq.); and the force of breath required to sound it is denoted by the term **עֵינִים**; *to*

draw out (see Winer's *Simonis Lex.* p. 394,584; comp. Graser, *Kathol. Messe, 1*, 107 sq.). **SEE CORNET.**

Picture for Trumpet 2

As above intimated, the Lord commanded Moses to make two trumpets of beaten silver, for the purpose of calling the people together when they were to decamp (Numbers 10). They chiefly used these trumpets, however, to proclaim the beginning of the civil year, the beginning of the sabbatical year (^{<R23>}Leviticus 23:24; ^{<R20>}Numbers 29:1), and the beginning of the jubilee (^{<R20>}Leviticus 25:9, 10). Josephus says (*Ant.* 3, 12, 6) that they were near a cubit long, and that their tube or pipe was of the thickness of a common flute. Their mouths were no wider than just admitted to blow into them, and their ends were like those of a modern trumpet. There were originally but two in the camp, though afterwards a great number were made. In the time of Joshua there were seven (^{<R10>}Joshua 3:4), and at the dedication of the Temple of Solomon there were one hundred and twenty priests that sounded trumpets (^{<R12>}2 Chronicles 5:12). The following particulars concerning the use of trumpets in the Temple will be useful, and are collected chiefly from Lightfoot's *Temple Service*. The trumpets were sounded exclusively by the priests, who stood not in the Levitical choir, but apart, and opposite to the Levites, on the other side of the altar, both parties looking towards it the priests on the west side and the Levites on the east. The trumpets did not join in the concert but were sounded during certain regulated pauses in the vocal and instrumental music. "The manner of their blowing with their trumpets was first a long plain blast, then a blast with breakings and quaverings, and then a long plain blast again. The priests did never blow but these three blasts went together. ... The Jews do express these three several soundings that they made at one blowing by the words (translated) An alarm in the midst, and a plain note before and after it; which our Christian writers do most commonly express by *tarantara*, though that word seems to put the quavering sound before and after, and the plain in the midst, contrary to the Jewish description of it." **SEE NEW YEAR FESTIVAL OF.**

In addition to the sacred trumpets of the Temple, whose use was restricted to the priests, even in war and in battle, there were others used by the Hebrew generals (^{<R27>}Judges 3:27). Ehud sounded the trumpet to assemble Israel against the Moabites, whose king, Eglon, he had lately slain. Gideon took a trumpet in his hand, and gave each of his people one, when he

assaulted the Midianites (^{<000D>}Judges 7:2, 16). Joab sounded the trumpet as a signal of retreat to his soldiers, in the battle against Abner (^{<0028>}2 Samuel 2:28), in that against Absalom (18:16), and in the pursuit of Sheba, son of Bichri (10, 22). *SEE WAR.*

In ^{<000D>}Matthew 6:2 we read, "When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues," and most expositors have regarded this as an expression derived by an easy metaphor from the practice of using the trumpet to proclaim whatever was about to be done, in order to call attention to it and make it extensively known. Others, however, refer it to the trumpet-shaped boxes in which the alms were deposited (see above), and which gave a ringing sound as the coin was dropped into them. *SEE TEMPLE.*

Trumpets, Feast Of

(h[W^rT]μωφ ^{<000E>}Numbers 29:1; Sept. ἡμέρα σημασίας; *Vulg. dies clangoris et tubatrum*; h[W^rT]ˆwokʒ ^{<0024>}Leviticus 23:24; μνημόσυνον σαλπύγγων; *sabbatum memoriale clangentibus tubis*: in the Mishna, הַיְחִיבֹּס, "the beginning of the year"), the feast of the new moon, which fell on the first of Tisri. It differed from the ordinary festivals of the new moon in several important particulars. It was one of the seven days of Holy Convocation. *SEE FEAST.* Instead of the mere blowing of the trumpets of the Temple at the time of the offering of the sacrifices, it was "a day of blowing of trumpets." In addition to the daily sacrifices and the eleven victims offered on the first of every month [see NEW MOON], there were offered a young bullock, a ram, and seven lambs of the first year, with the accustomed meat offerings, and a kid for a sin-offering (^{<000E>}Numbers 29:1-6). The regular monthly offering was thus repeated, with the exception of one young bullock.

It is said that both kinds of trumpet were blown in the Temple on this day, the straight trumpet (hrxʒp) and the cornet rpwor ˆrq), and that elsewhere any one, even a child, might blow a cornet (Reland, 4:7, 2; Carpzov, p. 425; *Rosh hash-Shan.* 1, 2). When the festival fell upon a Sabbath, the trumpets were blown in the Temple, but not out of it (*Rosh hash-Shan.* 4:1). *SEE JUBILEE.*

It has been conjectured that Psalm 81, one of the songs of Asaph, was composed expressly for the Feast of Trumpets. The psalm is used in the

service for that day by the modern Jews. As the third verse is rendered in the Sept., the Vulgate, and the A.V., this would seem highly probable—"Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, the time appointed, on our solemn feast day." But the best authorities understand the word translated *new moon* (*חֹדֶשׁ*) to mean *full moon*. Hence the psalm would more properly belong to the service for one of the festivals which take place at the full moon, the Passover, or the Feast of Tabernacles (Gesenius, *Thesaur. s.v.*; Rosenmüller and Hengstenberg on *Psalms 81*).

Various meanings have been assigned to the Feast of Trumpets. Maimonides considered that its purpose was to awaken the people from their spiritual slumber to prepare for the solemn humiliation of the Day of Atonement, which followed it within ten days. This may receive some countenance from ^{<2125>}Joel 2:15, "Blow the trumpet (*רַבְעָה*) in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly." Some have supposed that it was intended to introduce the seventh or sabbatical month of the year, which was especially holy because it was the seventh, and because it contained the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles (Fagius, in ^{<1224>}*Leviticus 23:24*; Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* c. 24). Philo and some early Christian writers regarded it as a memorial of the giving of the law on Sinai (Philo, *Opp.* v, 46, ed. Tauch.; Basil, in *Psalms 81*; Theodoret, *Quaest.* 32 viz. *Leviticus*). But there seems to be no sufficient reason to call in question the common opinion of Jews and Christians, that it was the festival of the New-year's-day of the civil year, the first of Tisri, the month which commenced the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee. If the New-moon Festival was taken as the consecration of a natural division of time, the month in which the earth yielded the last ripe produce of the season, and began again to foster seed for the supply of the future, might well be regarded as the first month of the year. The fact that Tisri was the great month for sowing might thus have easily suggested the thought of commemorating on this day the finished work of creation, when the sons of God shouted for joy (^{<1330>}Job 38:7). The Feast of Trumpets thus came to be regarded as the anniversary of the birthday of the world (Mishna, *Rosh hash-Shun.* 1, 1; Hupfeld, *De Fest. Heb.* 2, 13; Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* c. 24).

It was an odd-fancy of the rabbins that on this day, every year, God judges all men, and that they pass before him as a flock of sheep pass before a shepherd (*Rosh hash-Shan.* 1, 2). **SEE NEW YEAR.**

Trust in God

signifies confidence in or dependence upon him. This trust ought to be:

1. Sincere and unreserved not in idols, in men, in talents, riches, power, in ourselves part and in him part (^{<3185>}Proverbs 3:5-6);
2. Universal-body, soul, circumstances (^{<4187>}1 Peter 5:7);
3. Perpetual (^{<2304>}Isaiah 26:4)
4. With a lively expectation of his blessing (^{<3300>}Micah 7:7).

The encouragement we have to trust in him arises:

1. From his liberality (^{<6182>}Romans 8:32; ^{<4841>}Psalms 84:11);
2. His ability (^{<3017>}James 2:17);
3. His relationship (^{<4933>}Psalms 103:13);
4. His promise (^{<2336>}Isaiah 33:16);
5. His conduct in all ages to those who have trusted him (^{<0485>}Genesis 48:15, 16; ^{<4375>}Psalms 37:25).

The happiness of those who trust in him is great, if we consider,

1. Their safety (^{<4950>}Psalms 125:1);
2. Their courage (xxvii, 1);
3. Their peace (^{<2318>}Isaiah 26:3);
4. Their character and fruitfulness (^{<4000>}Psalms 1:3);
5. Their end (37:37; ^{<4853>}Job 5:26). *SEE FAITH.*

Trust-deeds

are forms of conveyances of real estate specifying some trust for which the property is held. At an early period of his history Wesley published a model deed for the settlement of chapels, to the effect that the trustees, for the time being, should permit Wesley himself, and such other persons as he might from time to time appoint, to have the free use of such premises, to preach therein God's word. After his death, and that of Charles Wesley and William Grimshaw, the Chapels were to be held in trust for the sole use of such persons as might be appointed at the yearly conference of the people called Methodists, provided that the said persons preached no other doctrines than those contained in Wesley's *Notes on the New Test.*, and in his four volumes of *Sermons*. This was followed, on Feb. 28, 1784, by the *Deed of Declaration*, explaining the words "yearly conference of the people called Methodists." This *Deed of Declaration* is recognized in the

trust deeds of all the chapels built by the Wesleyans. In the Methodist Episcopal Church it is directed that the following trust-clause shall be inserted in each deed: "In trust, that said premises shall be used, kept, maintained, and disposed of as a place of divine worship for the use of the ministry and membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America; subject to the discipline, usage, and ministerial appointments of said Church, as from time to time authorized and declared by the General Conference of said Church, and the Annual Conference within whose bounds the said premises are situate. In trust, that said premises shall be held, kept, and maintained as a place of residence for the use and occupancy of the preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America who may, from time to time, be stationed in said place; subject to the usage and discipline of said Church, as from time to time authorized and declared by the General Conference of said Church, and by the Annual Conference within whose bounds said premises are situate."

Trustees are Church officers appointed for the purposes of holding the legal title to Church property, and of taking care thereof. In the different branches of Methodism there are some differences of provision, but in general principles they are the same. In the Methodist Episcopal Church the *Discipline* says, "Each board of trustees of our Church property shall consist of not less than three nor more than nine persons, each of whom shall be not less than twenty-one years of age, two thirds of whom shall be members of the Methodist Episcopal Church." "Where the Church has not received a legal act of incorporation or charter; and where the law of the state does not specify any particular mode of election, the trustees are elected annually by the Fourth Quarterly Conference . . . upon the nomination of the preacher in charge, or the presiding elder of the district. Where the state or territory directs the mode of election, that mode must be strictly observed; and where charters of incorporation are obtained, they specify the particular qualifications and time of election of these officers."

The trustees have the charge of all repairs to be made on Church property, and of all financial matters pertaining to its preservation; are directed by *the Discipline* to make an annual report to the Fourth Quarterly Conference of the amount and value of the property, expenditures and liabilities, etc.; and are held amenable to the Quarterly Conference for the manner in which they perform their duty. By the action of the General

Conference of 1876 trustees are forbidden to “mortgage or encumber the real estate for the current expenses of the Church.”

Trustees, General Board Of

The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1864, appointed a committee of seven to report a plan of trusteeship. The report of the committee was adopted, and is substantially the same as the section of the *Discipline* on that subject. The General Conference appointed a board whose headquarters should be at Cincinnati, and which was incorporated with the title of “the Board of Trustees of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States,” and its charter was recorded July 11, 1865. According to the *Discipline*, “The duty of the board shall be to hold in trust, for the benefit of the Methodist Episcopal Church, any and all donations, bequests, grants, and funds in trust, etc., that may be given or conveyed to said board, or to the Methodist Episcopal Church, as such, for any benevolent object, and to administer the said funds, and the proceeds of the same, in accordance with the direction of the donors,” etc.

Truth

conformity to fact.

1. It has been distinguished by most *philosophical* writers, according as it respects being, knowledge, and speech, into

(1.) *Veritas entis*, or truth of the thing. The foundation of all truth is in truth of being--that truth by which a thing is what it is, by which it has its own nature and properties; and has not merely the appearance, but reality, of being. Philosophy is the knowledge of being; and if there were no real being — that is, if truth could not be predicated of things — there could be no knowledge.

(2.) *Veritas cognitionis*, or truth of knowledge. Truth, as predicated of knowledge, is the conformity of our knowledge with the reality of the object known; for, as knowledge is the knowledge of something, when a thing is known as it is that knowledge is formally true. To know that fire is hot is true knowledge. Objective truth is the conformity of the thing or object known with true knowledge.

(3.) *Veritas signi*, or truth of the sign. This consists in its adequateness or conformity to the thing signified. The truth and adequacy of signs belong to enunciation in logic.

2. *Scientific* truth consists in the conformity of thoughts to things; and *moral* truth lies in the correspondence of words with thoughts; while *logical* truth depends on the self-consistency of thoughts themselves.

3. Truth, in the strict *logical sense*, applies to propositions, and nothing else; and consists in the conformity of the declaration made to the actual state of the case. In its *etymological* sense, truth signifies that which the speaker *believes* to be the fact. In this sense it is opposed to a *lie*, and may be called *moral*. Truth is not infrequently applied to arguments, when the proper expressions would be “correct,” “conclusive,” “valid.” The use of truth in the sense of *reality* should be avoided. People speak of the *truth or falsity* of facts; whereas, properly speaking, they are either *real or fictitious*. It is the *statement* that is true or false.

4. *Necessary* truths are such as are known independently of inductive proof; are those in which we not only learn that the proposition is true, but that it *must* be true; are those the opposite of which is inconceivable, contradictory, impossible. *Contingent* truths are those which, without doing violence to reason, we may conceive to be otherwise.

5. *Absolute* truth is the knowledge of God, the ground of all relative truth and being. All relative truth is partial because each relation presupposes something which is not relative. As to us relative truth is partial in another sense, because the relations known to us are affected by relations which we do not know, and therefore our knowledge even as relative knowledge is incomplete as a whole and in each of its parts. At the same time, relative knowledge is real knowledge; and if it were possible habitually to realize in consciousness that it is partial, it would be strictly true so far as it goes. See Blunt, *Dict. of Hist. Theol.* s.v.; Fleming, *Vocab. of Philos. Sciences*, s.v.

6. In Scripture language, eminently, God is truth; that is, in him is no fallacy, deception, perverseness, etc. Jesus Christ, being God, is also the truth, and is the true way to God, the true representative, image, character, of the Father. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, who communicates truth, who maintains the truth in believers, guides them in the truth, and

who hates and punishes falsehood or lies, even to the death of the transgressor (~~ⲥⲟⲩⲟⲩ~~ Psalm 31:5; ~~ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲓⲛ~~ John 14:6, 17; ~~ⲁⲕⲏⲧ~~ Acts 5:3, etc.).

Especially is truth a name given to the religion of Jesus, in opposition to that of the Jew and that of the heathen. As contrasted with the Jewish system, it was *the* “truth” in the sense of “reality,” as distinguished from the “emblems,” symbols, representations, of that reality; from the “shadow of good things to come,” contained in the Levitical law in this sense it is that the apostle tells us “the law was given by Moses, but grace and *truth* came by Jesus Christ.” As contrasted with paganism, Christianity was *truth* opposed to *falsehood*. The heathen mythology not only was not *true*, but was not even supposed as true: it not only deserved no faith, but it demanded none. Jesus inaugurated a new way of propagating a religion, by inviting converts not to conform to its institutions, but to “believe” and to let their actions be agreeable to truth: nothing, then, was more natural than that Christianity should receive names expressive of this grand peculiarity, *the truth* and *the faith*. See *Whately, Essays on Difficulties of St. Paul*, essay 1.

Tryphae'na

(**Τρύφαινα**, *luxurious*), a person mentioned in connection with Tryphosa (q.v.), the two being Christian women at Rome, who, among those that are enumerated in the conclusion of Paul's letter to that city, receive a special salutation, and on the special ground that they are engaged there in “laboring in the Lord” (~~ⲥⲟⲩⲟⲩ~~ Romans 16:12). A.D. 55. They may have been sisters, but it is more likely that they were fellow-deaconesses, and among the predecessors of that large number of official women who ministered in the Church of Rome at a later period (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:43); for it is to be observed that they are spoken of as at that time occupied in Christian service (**τὰς κοπιώσας**), while the salutation to Persis, in the same verse, is connected with past service (**ἥτις ἐκοπίασεν**).

We know nothing more of these two sister-workers of the apostolic time; but the name of one of them occurs curiously, with other names familiar to us in Paul's epistles, in the Apocryphal *Acts of Paul and Thecla*. See **THECLA LEGEND**.

There Tryphsena appears as a rich Christian widow of Antioch, who gives Thecla a refuge in her house, and sends money to Paul for the relief of the

poor (see Jones, *On the Canon*, 2, 371, 380). It is impossible to discern any trace of probability in this part of the legend.

It is an interesting fact that the columbaria of “Caesar’s household” in the *Vigna Qodini*, near the Porta S. Sebastiano, at Rome, contain the name Tryphaena, as well as other names mentioned in this chapter, Philologus and Julia (ver. 15), and also Amplias (ver. 8). See Wordsworth, *Tour in Italy* (1862), 2, 173.

Trypho

an eminent man, who was seized as a Christian and imprisoned at Nice, about A.D. 50, in company with another, named Respicius. They were soon after put to the rack, which they bore with admirable patience for three hours, and uttered the praises of the Almighty the whole time. They were then exposed naked to the severity of the open air, which benumbed all their limbs, as it was in the very depth of winter.

Try’phon

Picture for Tryphon

(**Τρύφων**, a not infrequent Greek name of the later age), a usurper of the Syrian throne. His proper name was *Diodotus* (Strabo, 16:2, 10; Appian, *Syr.* 68), and the surname Tryphon was given to him, or, according to Appian, adopted by him, after his accession to power (Livy, *Epit.* 53, 45). He was a native of Cariana, a fortified place in the district of Apamea, where, he was brought up (Strabo, *loc. cit.*). In the time of Alexander Balas he was attached to the court (Appian, *loc. cit.*, **δοῦλος τῶν βασιλέων**; Diodor. *Fr.* 21:ap. Müller, *Hist. Gr. Frogm.* 2, 17, **στρατηγός**; 1 Macc. 11:39, **τῶν παρὰ Ἀλεξῆ**); but towards the close of his reign he seems to have joined in the conspiracy which was set on foot to transfer the crown of Syria to Ptolemy Philometor (ver. 13; Diodor. *loc. cit.*). After the death of Alexander Balas he took advantage of the unpopularity of Demetrius II to put forward the claims of Antiochus VI, the young son of Alexander (1: Macc. 11:39), B.C. 145. After a time he obtained the support of Jonathan, who had been alienated from Demetrius by his ingratitude, and the young king was crowned (B.C. 144). Tryphon, however, soon revealed his real designs on the kingdom, and, fearing the opposition of Jonathan, he gained possession of his person by treachery (12, 39-50), and after a short time put him to death (13, 23). As the way

now seemed clear, he murdered Antiochus, and seized the supreme power (ver. 31, 32), which he exercised, as far as he was able, with violence and rapacity (ver. 34). His tyranny again encouraged the hopes of Demetrius, who was engaged in preparing an expedition against him (B.C. 141), when he was taken prisoner (14, 1-3), and Tryphon retained the throne (Justin, 36:1; Diodor: *Leg.* 31), till Antiochus VII, the brother of Demetrius, drove him to Dora, from which he escaped to Orthosia, in Phoenicia (1 Macc. 15:10-14; 37-39), B.C. 139. Not long afterwards, being hard pressed by Antiochus, he committed suicide, or, according to other accounts, was put to death by Antiochus (Strabo, 14:5, 2; Appian, *Syr.* 68, Ἀντίοχος κτείνει...σὸν πόνον πολλῶ). Josephus (*Ant.* 13:7, 2) adds that he was killed at Apamea, the place which he made his headquarters (Strabo, 16:2, 10). The authority of Tryphon was evidently very partial, as appears from the growth of Jewish independence under Simon Maccabaeus, and Strabo describes him as one of the chief authors of Cilician piracy (14, 3, 2). His name occurs on the coins of Antiochus VI, and he also struck coins in his own name. *SEE ANTIOCHUS; SEE DEMETRIUS.*

Trypho'sa

(Τρυφῶσα, *luxurious*), a Christian female at Rome, addressed by Paul (Rom. 16:12). A.D. 55. *SEE TRYPHENA.*

Tsab

SEE TORTOISE.

Tsabians

(from *abx*; a *host*) were those who worshipped the heavenly hosts, that being one of the earliest forms in which idolatry appeared. This species of idolatry first prevailed in Chaldaea, whence it spread over all the East, passed into Egypt, and thence found its way into Greece. The sun, moon, and each of the stars was believed to be a divine intelligence, who exercised a constant influence for good or evil upon the destinies of men. *SEE SABIANS.*

Tsabua

SEE HYENA.

Tsaphtsaphah

SEE WILLOW.

Tschirner

SEE TZSCHIRNER.

Tschornaboltzi

(or rather *Tchernolftz*), Russian sect, the members of which refuse to take an oath, hold it unlawful to shave the beard, and do not pray for the emperor and imperial family according to the prescribed form. They have many things in common with the other sects, and believe that the end of the world is at hand. *SEE RUSSIAN SECTS.*

Tseba

SEE SABAOOTH.

Tsebi

SEE ROE.

Tselatsal

SEE LOCUST.

Tsepha

SEE COCKATRICE.

Tsephardea

SEE FROG.

Tseri

SEE BALM.

Tsing-Chamun-Keaou

or *Tea-sect* of China (q.v.).

Tsinnin

SEE THORN.

Tsiphoni

SEE ADDER.

Tsippor

SEE SPARROW.

Tsirah

SEE HORNET.

Tsiriuph

(*āyryx*), or *anagram*, is a Cabalistic rule according to which various words are formed through the change of any word into others by the transposition of the component letters. Thus *tyçarb*, “in the beginning,” has been anagramatized *ça tyrb*, “a covenant of fire,” to accord with ^{<631D>}Deuteronomy 33:2, “from his right hand went a fiery law for them.” ‘In a Cabalistic book entitled *μυνωqyt* upwards of seventy combinations of this single word are formed by R. Simeon benJochai. The Cabalists say that because the Hebrew letters are spiritual, and simple figures, they can therefore be construed in different ways; but this can be done in any language. Thus Herbert anagramatized the Virgin *Mary* into *Army*, as seen in the following two lines:

*“How well her name an Army doth present,
In whom the Lord of hosts did pitch his tent!” (B.P.)*

Tsiyim

SEE WILDERNESS, BEASTS OF.

Tsonkhapa

a Thibetan reformer and monk, was born A.D. 1355, in the district of Amdo. He strictly prohibited ordinary tricks and pretended miracles of charlatanism, and united and reconciled the dialectical and mystical schools of modern Buddhism. He also published most comprehensive works. His

innovations were never universally acknowledged. His followers, however, called *Geluckpa*, or *Galdaupa*, are the most numerous, and wear a yellow garb, the others having chosen red. *SEE THIBET.*

Tsor

SEE FLINT.

Tsori

SEE BALM.

Tu'bal

(Heb. *Tubal'*, I bWT [I bī] in ^{Q102}Genesis 10:2; ^{Q325}Ezekiel 32:26; 39:1], of uncertain signification; Sept. **θουβέλ**, except in ^{Q301}Ezekiel 39:1, where Alex. **θουβέρ**; Vulg. *Thubal*, but in ^{Q369}Isaiah 66:19, *Italia*). In the ancient ethnological tables of Genesis and 1 Chronicles Tubal is reckoned with Javan and Meshech among the sons of Japheth (^{Q102}Genesis 10:2; 1 Chronicles 1, 5). B.C. post 2514. The three are again associated in the enumeration of the sources of the wealth of Tyre Javan, Tubal, and Meshech brought slaves and copper vessels to the Phoenician markets (^{Q273}Ezekiel 27:13). Tubal and Javan (^{Q369}Isaiah 66:19), Meshech and Tubal (^{Q325}Ezekiel 32:26; 38:2, 3; 39:1), are nations of the north (^{Q385}Ezekiel 38:15; 39:2). Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 6, 1) identifies the descendants of Tubal with the Iberians, that is-not, as Jerome would understand it, Spaniards, but-the inhabitants of a tract of country between the Caspian and Euxine seas, which nearly corresponded to the modern Georgia. Knobel connects these Iberians of the East and West, and considers the *Tibareni* to have been a branch of this widely spread Turanian family, known to the Hebrews as Tubal (*Volkertafel.* Genesis § 13). Bochart (*Phaleg*, 3, 12) makes the Moschi and Tibareni represent Meshech and Tubal. These two Colchian tribes are mentioned together in Herodotus on two occasions, first, as forming part of the nineteenth satrapy of the Persian empire (3, 94), and again as being in the army of Xerxes under the command of Ariomardus the son of Darius: (7, 78). The Moschi and Tibareni, moreover, are “constantly associated, under the names of *Muskai* and *Tuplai*, in the Assyrian inscriptions” (Sir H. Rawlinson, in Rawlinson’s *Herod* 1, 535). The Tibareni are said by the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (2, 1010) to have been a Scythian tribe, and they as well as the Moschi are probably to be referred to that Turanian people who in very

early times spread themselves over the entire region between the Mediterranean and India, the Persian Gulf and the Caucasus (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 535). In the time of Sargon, according to the inscriptions, Ambris, the son of Khuliya, was hereditary chief of Tubal (the southern slopes of Taurus). He had cultivated relations with the kings of Musak and Vararat (Meshech and Ararat, or the Moschi and Armenia), who were in revolt against Assyria, and thus drew upon himself the hostility of the great king (*ibid.* 1, 169, note 3). In former times the Tibareni were probably more important; and the Moschi and Tibareni, Meshech and Tubal, may have been names by which powerful hordes of Scythians were known to the Hebrews. But in history we only hear of them as pushed to the farthest limits of their ancient settlements, and occupying merely a strip of coast along the Euxine. Their neighbors the Chaldaeans were in the same condition. In the time of Herodotus the Moschi and Tibareni were even more closely connected than at a later period, for in Xenophon we find them separated by the Macrones and Mossynoeci (*Anab.* 5, 5,1; Pliny, 6:4, etc.). The limits of the territory of the Tibareni are extremely difficult to determine with any degree of accuracy. After a part of the ten thousand Greeks, on their retreat with Xenophon, had embarked at Cerasus (perhaps near the modern KerasAn Dere Su), the rest marched along the coast, and soon came to the boundaries of the Mossynceci (*Anab.* 5, 4, 2). They traversed the country occupied by this people in eight days, and then came to the Chalybes, and after them to the Tibareni. The eastern limit of the Tibareni was therefore about eighty or ninety miles along the coast west of Cerasus. Two days march through Tibarene brought the Greeks to Cotyora (*ibid.* 5, 5, 3), and they were altogether three days in passing through the country (Diod. Sic. 14, 30). Now from Cape Jasonium to Boon, according to Arrian (*Peripl.* 16), the distance was 90 stadia, 90 more to Cotyora, and 60 from Cotyora to the river Melanthius, making in all a coast line of 240 stadia, or three days march. Prof. Rawlinson (*Herod.* 4:181) conjectures that the Tibareni occupied the coast between Cape Yasfin (Jasonium) and the river Melanthius (Melet Irmak); but if we follow Xenophon, we must place Boon as their western boundary, one day's march from Cotyora, and their eastern limit must be sought some ten miles east of the Melet Irmak, perhaps not far from the modern Aptar, which is three and a half hours from that river. The anonymous author of the Periplus of the Euxine says (33) that the Tibareni formerly dwelt west of Cotyora as far as Polemonium, at the mouth of the Puleman chai, one and a half miles east of Fatsah.

In the time of Xenophon the Tibareni were an independent tribe (*Anab.* 7:8, 25). Long before this they were subject to a number of petty chiefs, which was a principal element of their weakness, and rendered their subjugation by Assyria more easy. Dr. Hincks (quoted by Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 380, note 1) has found as many as twenty-four kings of the *Tuplai* mentioned in the inscriptions. They are said by Apollonius Rhodius to have been rich in flocks (*Aug.* 2, 377). The traffic in slaves and vessels of copper with which the people of Tubal supplied the markets of Tyre (~~3273~~ Ezekiel 27:13) still further connects them with the Tibareni. It is well known that the regions bordering on the Pontus Euxinus furnished the most beautiful slaves, and that the slave-traffic was an extensive branch of trade among the Cappadocians (Polyb. 4:38, 4; Horace, *Ep.* 1, 6, 39; Persius, *Sat.* 6:77; Martial, *Ep.* 6:77; 10:76, etc.). The copper of the Mossynoeci, the neighbors of the Tibareni, was celebrated as being extremely bright and without any admixture of tin (Aristot. *De Mir. Auscult.* 62); and the Chalybes, who lived between these tribes, were long famous for their craft as metal-smiths. We must not forget, too, the copper-mines of Chalvar in Armenia (Hamilton, *Asia Min.* 1. 173).

The Arabic version of ~~0102~~ Genesis 10:2 gives Chorasán and *China for* Meshech and Tubal; in Eusebius (see Bochart) they are Illyria and Thessaly. The Talmudists (*Yoma*, fol. 10, 2), according to Bochart, define Tubal as “the home of the *Uniaci* (yqyywna),” whom he is inclined to identify with the Huns (*Phaleg*, 3, 12). ‘They may, perhaps, take their name from AEnoe, the modern Unieh, a town on the south coast of the Black Sea, not far from Cape Yasfn, and so in the immediate neighborhood of the Tibareni. In the Targum of R. Joseph on 1 Chronicles (ed. Wilkins) *aynytyw* is given as, the equivalent of Tubal, and Wilkins renders it by Bithynia. But the reading in this passage, as well as in the Targums of Jerusalem and of Jonathan on Genesis 10, is too doubtful to be followed as even a traditional authority. *SEE ETHNOLOGY.*

Tu’bal-cain

(Heb. *Tu’bal Ka’yin*, *ˁyǝp̄l bWT*, apparently of foreign etymology; Sept. *ὁ θοβέλ*; Vulg. *Tubal cain*), the son of Lamech the Cainite by his wife Zillah (~~0102~~ Genesis 4:22). B.C. cir. 3700. He is called “a furbisher of every cutting instrument of copper and iron.” The Jewish legend of later times associates him with his father’s song. “Lamech was blind,” says the story as told by Rashi, “and Tubal-cain was leading him; and he saw Cain, and he appeared

to him like a wild beast, so he told his father to draw his bow, and he slew him. And when he knew that it was Cain his ancestor, he smote his hands together and struck his son between them. So he slew him, and his wives withdraw from him and he conciliates them.” In this story Tubal-cain is the “young man” of the song. Rashi apparently considers the name of Tubal-cain as an appellation, for he makes him director of the works of Cain for making weapons of war, and connects “Tubal” with **ל בַּעַי** *tabbel, to season*, and so *to prepare skillfully*. He appears, moreover, to have pointed it **ל בַּעַי** *tobel*, which seems to have been the reading of the Sept. and Josephus. According to the writer last mentioned (*Ant.* 1, 2, 2), Tubal-cain was distinguished for his prodigious strength and his success in war.

The derivation of the name is extremely obscure. Hasse (*Entdeckungen*, 2, 37, quoted by Knobel on ¹⁰⁰²Genesis 4:22) identifies Tubal-cain with *Vulcan*; and Buttmann (*Mythol.* 1, 164) not only compares these names, but adds to the comparison the **Τελχῖνες** of Rhodes, the first workers in copper and iron (Strabo, 14:654), and Dwalinn, the daemon smith of the Scandinavian mythology. Gesenius proposed to consider it a hybrid word, compounded of the Pers. *tupal*, iron slag, or *scoria*, and the Arab. *kain*, a *smith*; but this etymology is more than doubtful. The Scythian race *Tubal*, who were coppersmiths (³²⁷³Ezekiel 27:13), naturally suggest themselves in connection with Tubal-cain.

Tubie'ni

(**Τουβιῆνοι**; Alex. **Τουβεῖνοι**; Vulg. *Tubiancei*). The “Jews called Tubieni” lived about Charax, 750 stadia from a strongly fortified city called Caspis (2 Macc. 12:17). They were doubtless the same who are elsewhere mentioned as living in the towns of *Toubion* (A.V. “Tobie”), which again is probably the same with the TOB **SEE TOB** (q.v.) of the Old Test.

Tübingen School, the Old

The origin of this school, which became so noteworthy a factor in the development of Protestant theology during the latter half of the 18th century, is associated chiefly with the personality and influence of G. C. Storr (q.v.), professor of theology in the University of Tübingen, and, at a later day, court-preacher at Stuttgart. This scholar gathered about him a number of pupils, whom he impressed with the broad culture and thorough and comprehensive learning as well as logical arrangement and

extraordinary clearness of his lectures, and whom he captivated by his evident piety, dignified demeanor, and unvarying kindness. Storr's dominant elements of character, whether as a man or a scholar, were, however, wholly of the objective class. His piety was not the expression of profound religious feeling, but of rigidly earnest and conscientious principle; and as his heart lacked fervor, so his intellect was deficient in imagination and the true speculative quality. The age in which he lived was a' period of unrest. The orthodoxy of Brentius and Jakob Andrea was beginning to loosen its hold upon the times. J. W. Jager, the learned chancellor (1702-20), had ventured upon the innovation of introducing a more attractive method in theology than that in vogue. Pfaff and Weismann also broke away from the polemical methods of orthodoxy, and sought to impart greater simplicity: and life to theological instruction. In another direction, the so-called enlightenment or neology of the 18th century was gaining prominence and power, and was rejecting not merely the form, but the substance, of the orthodox teachings. Storr was not able to deny that the crisis which had come upon theology had its origin in very adequate causes; but he could not fully accept all its results, and therefore assumed a position midway between the contending parties, so as to be able to retain much of the substance of the old orthodox theology while adopting much of the methods of the new. He endeavored to base his teaching wholly on the Scriptures, and for that purpose brought together a mass of isolated passages to serve as the basis of his theology; but he had no conception of the organic unity of Scripture, of its living combination into separate principles, and of a consequent genetic unfolding of scriptural truths. Baur strikingly remarks that Storr recognised no canon, but only passages, of the Scriptures. His system was furthermore impaired by the Pelagianizing tendency 'of his mind, which led him to tone down the contrast between the fundamental doctrines of sin and grace, and to make grave concessions to neology with regard to the doctrines of the atonement and of the person of Christ. His great object was to render Christianity plausible to the destructive criticism of his time; and the endeavor to realize that object occasioned in his bearing a certain indecision and ambiguity of manner, so that his theology is made to seem forced and constrained. Great attention is given to the discussion of unimportant and particular ideas, while the thought of a connected and organic system of Christianity has no proper recognition in his works. This disposition to expend effort upon subordinate details is apparent in all his works, and especially in his criticism of Kant's *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Vernunft*,

and in the works he aimed against the “accommodation hypothesis” of Semler, Teller, and others. It was his misfortune to want the historical sense, and that attitude of impartiality towards doctrine which would have enabled him to discover the gradual development of scriptural truth. His system of Christian dogmatics and ethics aims to be simply a bringing-together and connecting of the results of exegesis; and this aim is realized by the mosaic-like collocation of isolated passages in such a manner as to justify the above criticism of Baur that Storr had no authoritative rule, but only a fragmentary view of Scripture. In this way he gave expression to the principle of the authority of Scripture upon which he professed to erect his entire system.

The school of Storr was, more particularly, composed of Johann Friedrich Flatt, Friedrich Gottlieb Susskind, and Karl Christian Flatt, all of them pupils successors, and in part colleagues of Storr in the theological faculty (for a more particular notice of these scholars, see the articles under their names). The older Flatt was an acute and learned man, exceedingly conscientious and careful, naturally cheerful, but infirm in body and greatly afflicted by repeated sorrows, in consequence of which he developed a measure of irritability and melancholy in his disposition. He left lectures on Christian ethics and on the Pauline epistles, which were published from notes by his pupils. Susskind devoted his scientific activity chiefly to the elucidation of fundamental questions in doctrines and apologetics considered with reference to the philosophy current in his day. Against Kant and Fichte he discussed the office and the limitations of reason, and against Schelling he endeavored to secure the theistic basis of Christianity. His investigations in the line of doctrine were chiefly concerned with the idea of the possibility of the forgiveness of sins, or, in other words, of the remission of penalty. He also discussed, in a fragmentary way, the theology of Schleiermacher (see Susskind, *Vermischte Schriften*, 1831). His leading personal traits were great intellectual penetration and energy of the will, united with sternness of manner and the utmost conscientiousness of spirit. He was a master in logic, bold and confident in debate, the dialectician of, his school. His ability was nevertheless impaired by the lack of speculative power and depth. The younger Flatt was rather a receptive than an independently creative character. His earliest work attempted to prove that the Kantian theory of atonement, according to which the forgiveness of sins is determined by, and consequent on, the measure of moral reformation, is not the only reasonable, but also the only allowable, view

under the New Test. He was induced to retract the teachings of that book, and in time became wholly identified with the tendency of Storr and the elder Flatt.

The peculiarity of these theologians lay in the abstract theism beyond which they were not able to advance by reason of the want of true philosophical sense. They employed a pitiless logic to expose the gaps and weaknesses of transcendental speculation, but failed to attain to a living apprehension of their own theism; and, while they defended their theory of revelation with the utmost tenacity, they rendered that theory thoroughly intolerable to reason by numerous provisos, explanations, and modifications. This criticism applies to everything which is peculiar to their teaching, and indicates what is, more than any other feature, the characteristic of their school.

Affiliated to this school, though less closely than the men already named, was Ernst Gottlieb Bengel, professor of historical theology at Tübingen. This scholar passed beyond the ordinary favorable attitude of the school of Storr in his fondness for Socinian views, and was also a Kantianizing, rationalizing supranaturalist. So firmly was he entrenched in such views that he steadily refused to be influenced by any new tendency which the changing philosophy of a new era might bring to bear upon theological inquiry. He scarcely indicated that he knew of the existence of Schleiermacher, and prevented the appointment of Bockshammer who had written an unusually able work on the freedom of the will—to the faculty as the successor of the elder Flatt, because of Bockshammer's departure from the old plan to which Bengel was committed. Other adherents of this school, as Steudel, Christian Friedrich Schmid; etc., remained more faithful to the Storriai ideas in some respects, but were, on the other hand, gradually led away from the traditional position of the Tübingen school through the influence of the theology of Schleiermacher. New men, new tendencies, new methods, have taken the place of the old, not only with respect to the external fact, but even as regards the results of what was at one time a noteworthy factor in the development of theological science. The Tübingen school has produced, upon the whole, effects much less important to such development than its prominence would seem to warrant.

See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v., and the various names mentioned in this article in Herzog and this *Cyclopedia*. **SEE RATIONALISM.**

Tubingen School, The New.

A very different sera was inaugurated in the University of Tübingen on the appointment of F. C. Baur (q.v.) as professor of theology in 1826. He began to attack the objective positions of Christianity through the Pauline epistles, selecting some of these only as authentic, and pointing out alleged discrepancies between them and other parts of the New-Test. history. His theory, which is summed up in his work on the apostle Paul, is, in brief, that, taking the epistles to the Galatians, the Romans, and the Corinthians especially as guides, we find therein “exposed the fact that there were two parties in the early Church, the Pauline and the Petrine. These struggled for supremacy, and the conflict was a long one. Peter was a thorough Jew, and his side predominated even after, the death of the principal combatants. Judaism was the cradle of Christianity; and the latter was only an earnest, restless, reformatory branch of the former. But it was not an offshoot as yet, for Christianity was essentially Jewish all through its first historic period. The canonical writings of the New Test., which constitute the chief literature of the first two centuries, are the literary monument of Christianity while it was yet undeveloped and undetached from Judaism. These writings are the *mediating theology* of those distant days. The Petrine party was very strong until the middle of the 2nd century, when it was obliged to yield to, or rather harmonize with, the Pauline. Many causes contributed to bring the two factions together. There was an absence of growth quite incompatible with their respective strength. Alone, they were almost unable to brave the storm of persecution. Finally, for the sake of security and propagation, they laid down their weapons and united under one banner. From this union came the subsequent growth of Christianity. The canonical works so much revered by the Church had been written in the interest of one or the other of these parties. Since the enmity has been destroyed, their literary productions must be considered in the light of history. The Church is therefore much mistaken in attaching importance to the Scriptures, for they were written for a timeserving end, and are quite unworthy of the interest which we attach to them.”

It is obvious how destructive to the essential faith of Christians were these positions, and yet it is wonderful that they were broached with so much assurance, although based upon so trivial a comparison of circumstances. Nevertheless, a numerous circle of disciples clustered around Baur, and they enjoyed his leadership until his death, in 1860. But the writings of both the master and his school were quickly answered by the best

theologians of Germany, such as Thiersch, Dorner, Leckler, Lange, Schaff, Bleek, Hase, Bunsen, and Tischendorf. Yet the effects of the insinuations, suspicions, and criticisms of Baur were for a long time a serious hindrance to the truth. The authors of the movement were disciples of the Hegelian philosophy. Their aim was to explain the origin of Christianity by natural causes alone. In this endeavor they but reproduced in a new and ingenious form the exploded infidelity of a former age. And the primitive doctrine of supranaturalism was again defended by an appeal, as of old and ever, to facts of the inspired records and the instinctive convictions of humanity. Yet some of its champions in this contest were themselves unconsciously infected more or less by the insinuating influences of the new skepticism, and were led to make concessions which later and so under theologians have seen to be unnecessary and untenable.

Meanwhile, the attack upon the fundamental documents of Christianity was resumed in a still more virulent form by D. F. Strauss (q.v.), on his appointment to the theological faculty of Tübingen in 1832, and culminated in his famous *Leben Jesu*, which boldly impugns the historical truth of the Gospel itself. For the discussion of the controversy resulting, *SEE MYTHICAL THEORY*. A strong reaction has long since set in against these negative views, even in Tübingen itself so that what has recently been known as “the Tübingen theology” is likely soon to be a thing of the past. See Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 280 sq.; Cook, *Monday Lectures*, ser. 1; Fisher, *Supernat. Origin of Christianity*, p. 35. — *SEE NEOLOGY*.

Tuch, Johann Christian Friedrich

a Protestant divine of Germany, was born Dec. 17, 1806, at Quedlinburg. Having prepared himself for the university at the gymnasium in Nordhausen, he went in 1828 to Halle, where he attended the lectures of Gesenius. Here he also commenced his lectures on Oriental languages and Old-Test. exegesis. In 1839 the Zurich University made him licentiate of theology, while the philosophical faculty of Halle appointed him extraordinary professor. In 1841 he was called to Leipsic, and was made ordinary professor in 1843, having shortly before been honored with the doctorate by the Tübingen faculty. In 1853 he was made third professor and canon of Zeitz, and died as first professor, April 12, 1867. His main work is his learned *Commentary on Genesis* (Halle, 1838; 2d ed. 1871). He also published *Commentationis de Lipsiensi Codice Pentateuchi Syri Manuscripto Particula I* (Lips. 1849): —*Commentationes Geographicae*.

Pars 1, De Nino Urbe Animadversiones tres (ibid. 1845): —*Reise des Sheikh Ibrahim el-Khijari elMedeni durch einen Theil Palastinas* (ibid. 1850): —*Commentatio de αἰσαλώθ ἐν Ἀρβήλοις*, 1 Macc. 9:2 (ibid. 1853): —*Die Himmelfahrt Jesu* (ibid. 1857): —*Quaestiones de Flavii Josephi Libris Historicis* (ibid. 1859): —*Quaestiones de Flavii Josephi loco B. .1 4:8, 2* (ibid. 1860). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 450; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1352; *Theol. Universal-Lex.* s.v.; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift*, 1871, pt. 3; Diestel, *Gesch. d. alten Testaments in der christl. Kirche*, p. 613, 648, 730; *Literarischer Handweiser für das kathol. Deutschland*, 1867, p. 266. (B. P.)

Tucher, Christoph Karl Goittlieb

a famous jurist of Germany, was born May 14, 1798, at Nuremberg. He studied jurisprudence at Erlangen, Heidelberg, and Berlin, and after 'having occupied prominent positions in his profession, he died at Berlin, Feb. 17, 1877. He is known as the author of the following hymnological works: *Schatz des evangelischen Kirchenqesanges, der Melodie und Harmonie nach, aus den Quellen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts geschopft*, etc. (Stutt. 1840): —*Schatz des evangielischen Kirchengesangs im 1. Jahrhundert der Reformation* (Leips. 1848, 2 vols). (B. P.)

Tucker, Abraham

a metaphysical writer, was born in London in 1705, and was educated at Bishop's Stortford School and Merton College, Oxford. He studied for a while at the Inner Temple, but was not admitted to the bar. He died in 1774. He published, *Free-will, Fore-knowledge, and Fate; a Fragment by Edward Search* (Lond. 1763, 8vo): — *Man in Quest of Himself or a Defence of the Individuality of the Human Mind or Self*, etc., by Cuthbert Comment, *Gent.* (763, 8vo). His great work, however, is *The Light of Nature Pursued*, by Edward Search (1768-78; Cambridge, Mass., 1831, 4 vols. 8vo; with later editions, and an abridgment by William Hazlitt, 1807, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tucker, Elijah W.

a Congregational minister, was born at Dorchester, Mass., March 31, 1810. He was converted at the age of twenty, graduated at Brown University in 1838, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1841, and labored at South New Market, N. H., in 1841 sq.; Chatham, Mass., in 1846

sq.; Essex, Conn., in 1852; Goshen, Conn., 1853-58; Preston, Conn., 1858-65; and Northfield, Conn., in 1865, until his death, July 6, 1866. Mr. Tucker was a direct, earnest preacher, aid a sympathetic, watchful pastor. Revivals resulted from his labors in almost every field. See *Cong. Quarterly*, 1867, p. 46.

Tucker, Elisha, D.D.

a Baptist minister, was born at Rensselaerville, Albany County, N.Y., Dec. 24, 1794. His early education was limited. He began to preach in 1816, and was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church of Coventry, Chenango County, N.Y., Aug. 19, 1818. Here he continued with great success until Aug. 12, 1822, when he became pastor of the Church at Fredonia, N. Y. He was afterwards pastor of the First Baptist Church in Buffalo from September, 1831, until October, 1836; then of the Second. Baptist Church of Rochester, N.Y., until May, 1841; and of the Oliver Street Baptist Church, New York city until 1848. In 1851 his health became very much impaired, and he began traveling in the hope of improving it, but died Dec. 29, 1853. He was the eldest of six brothers, five of whom entered the ministry. Dr. Tucker published a *Sermon Delivered at Fredonia at the Ordination of Mr. Jarius Handy* (1826). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:667.

Tucker, Josiah, D.D.

a learned English divine, was born at Laugherne, Carmarthenshire, in 1711. He was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1737 became curate of St. Stephen's Church, Bristol, and was subsequently appointed minor canon in the cathedral of that city. On the death of Mr. Catcott, he became rector of St. Stephen's, and in 1758 was created dean of Gloucester. Mr. Tucker was an able advocate of the great political questions of the day, and was bold and determined in the principles, which he advocated. He died Nov. 4, 1799. He wrote, *The Elements of Commerce and Theory of Taxes* (Bristol, 1753, 4to): —*Six Sermons* (1772, 12mo): —four tracts, etc., on political and commercial subjects (Glouces. 1774, 8vo): —besides *Treatises*, etc. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tucker, Levi, D.D.

a Baptist minister, was horn in Schoharie County, N. Y., July 6, 1804. He studied theology at the Hamilton Institution, graduated June 3, 1829, and

on the 10th of the same month was ordained pastor of the church at Deposit, N.Y. In the summer of 1831 he accepted a call to settle at Blockley (now West Philadelphia), Pa., where he labored with great success, acting also for a while as agent of the Baptist Educational Society of that state, until the spring of 1836, when he removed to Cleveland, O. After remaining there seven years, he was for a while pastor of the Washington Street Baptist Church in Buffalo, and on Dec. 29, 1848, became pastor of the Bowdon Place Church, Boston. His health having become greatly impaired, he resigned his charge in September, 1852, and took a journey to England, France, Italy, and Egypt, whence he returned in the early part of August, 1853, and died on the 23d of the same month. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:786.

Tucker (or Tooker), William, D.D.

a learned English divine of the 16th century, was born at Exeter. He was educated at New College, Oxford and was admitted perpetual fellow in 1577. In 1585 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Barnstable, in Devonshire. He was eventually made chaplain to queen Elizabeth. Dr. Tucker afterwards became prebendary of Salisbury, and took his degree of D.D. in 1594. He was made canon of the church at Exeter, and was installed dean of Lichfield, Feb. 21, 1604. He died at Salisbury, March 19, 1620. Dr. Tucker was esteemed an excellent Greek and Latin scholar. He was an able divine, a person of great gravity and piety, and well read in curious and critical authors. His publications are, *Charisma, sive Ribilium Sanitatum Gratia*, etc. (Lond. 1597, 4to), a historical defense of the power of royalty to cure the king's evil: —*Q f the Fabric of the Church and Churchmen's Living* (ibid. 1604, 8vo): —*Singulare (Certamen cum Martino Becano Jesuita* (ibid. 1611, 8vo), written in defence of James I against Becan and Bellarmine. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Author s*, s.v.

Tuckerman, Joseph, D.D.

a Unitarian minister, was born in Boston, Mass., Jan. 18, 1778, and graduated from Harvard College in 1798. After devoting himself to the study of theology, under Rev. Thomas Thacher of Bedham, he was ordained and installed as pastor in Chelsea, Nov. 4, 1801. While at Chelsea, his attention was drawn to the temptations and necessities of seafaring men, and in the winter of 1811-12 he founded the first society for

the religious and moral improvement of seamen. In 1116 Mr. Tuckerman visited England in search of health, but soon returned without having experienced much apparent advantage from his tour. He resigned his charge at Chelsea in 1826, preaching his farewell sermon on Nov. 4. He immediately entered upon his work as minister at large in Boston, devoting himself to the visitation of the poor and destitute for the remainder of his life. In 1833 he again went to Europe, returning in the following year. He died in Havana, whither he had gone for his health, April 20, 1840. He published a large number of *Sermons, Letters, Essays*, etc. (1800-38). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8:345.

Tauckney, Anthony

a learned Nonconformist divine of England, was born at Kirton, Lincolnshire, in September, 1599. He was matriculated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, at fourteen, received his degree of A.M. in 1620, and was chosen fellow of his college three years after. In 1627 he took his degree of B.D., and became assistant to the famous vicar John Cotton upon whose departure he was chosen to the vicarage. When the assembly of divines met at Westminster, Mr. Tuckney was one of the two nominated for the county of Lincoln, and was appointed minister of St. Michael Querne's, Cheapside. In 1645 he was appointed master of Emanuel College, but did not entirely reside on this employment until 1648, when, being chosen vice-chancellor, he removed with his family to Cambridge, and took his degree of D.D. the year after. In 1653 he was chosen master of St. John's, and two years after regius professor of divinity. At the Restoration complaints were made by royalists against Mr. Tuckney, who resigned both positions June 22, 1661, receiving a pension of £100 per year. The rest of his life he spent in retirement, mostly in London. Although appointed commissioner at the Savoy Conference, he never attended it. In the time of the plague he lived at Colwich Hall, near Nottingham, where he was troubled and confined, but was discharged in a few months. Upon the passage of the Five-mile Act he removed to Oundle, and thence to Warmington, Northamptonshire. After the fire of London he removed to Stockerston, Leicestershire, and then to Tottenham, and in 1669-70 to Spitalyard, where he died in February, 1670. He wrote, *Sermon on ²⁴⁸²Jeremiah 8:22* (Lond. 1643, 4to): — *Five Sermons* (1656 12mo): — *Forty Sermons* (1676, 4to), published by his son *Letters*, etc. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tudehope, Archibald

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Paisley, Scotland, Aug. 19, 1801; graduated at the University of Glasgow in April, 1822; studied theology at the Divinity Hall of the Relief Synod in Paisley; was licensed by the Relief Presbytery of Glasgow in 1828, and ordained pastor of the Church in Annan, in Dumfriesshire, Scotland, Oct. 14, 1834. In 1838 he emigrated to the United States, and became pastor of the Ninth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he remained till 1849. He died Dec. 6, 1861. He was an instructive preacher, and his sermons to children were specially successful efforts. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 214.

Tuidela, Benjamin (Ben-Jonah) Of

the famous Jewish traveler of the 12th century, is known for his researches on the state of the various colonies of the Hebrew people, both in the East and in the West. From 1165 to 1173 he traveled in several countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and published his results in his *Afassaoth*, or *Itinerarium, of Benjamin*. Among Christians the book has not been favorably received. In the first place, the whole of its complexion is Jewish—recording in every place of his arrival the census, condition, and leading names of his nation; scarcely ever noticing the objects which usually invite the attention of Gentile travelers, such as customs, climate, language, politics, history, etc. In the second place, he commits numerous errors in dates: and names when he does refer to Gentile history; and, thirdly, the farther he advances from home, the more wonderful are his reports concerning the numbers and wealth of the Jews. These considerations have induced every one of his translators to believe that he never quitted Spain, but made a compilation of all the travelers tales he could gather respecting foreign lands. On the other hand, Gibbon (*Decline*, 5, 348, Milman's ed.) remarks, "The errors and fictions of the Jewish rabbi are not sufficient grounds to deny the reality of his travels." In our days, however, deeper investigation has certified the reality of the voyage, and the actual truth of many of its details, which are, however, mixed up with much that is fabulous, and accompanied by many incredible tales. This curious book of travels was edited, with a Latin translation, by Arias Montanus at Antwerp in 1622, and by L'Empereur at Leyden in 1633; with an English translation it was published in Purchase's *Pilgrims* (Loud. 1625, 2, 1437); by Harris, in *Collection of Voyages and Travels* (ibid. 1744-48), 1, 546-555; by Gerrons (ibid. 1784); by Pinkerton, in his *Collection of Voyages and*

Travels of the World (ibid. 1804-14), vol. 7; and in Bohn's *Early Travels in Palestine* (ibid. 1848, p. 63-126). The best edition is that of Asher, *The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela* (translated, etc.; vol. 1, bibliography and translation, Lond. and Berl. 1840; vol. 2, notes and essays, ibid. 1841). A French translation is given in Bergeron, *Collection de Voyages, faits principalement en Asie, dans les XIIIe, XIe, XI Ve, et XTVe Siecles* (the Hague, 1735, 2 vols.); by Barratier (Amst. 1784, 2 vols.); another transl. appeared at Paris in 1830; a Dutch transl. by Bara (Amst. 1666); and a German transl. in Jewish characters by Arbich (Frankf.—on-the-M. 1711). "See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1, 117 sq.; De' Rossi, *Dizionario Storico*, p. 321 sq. (Germ. transl.); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 6:214; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. d. Juden in d. roman. Staaten*, p. 154; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 289, 371-420; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 2, 54; 3, 363; Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, p. 617 (Taylor's transl.); Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 283 sq.; Lindo, *History of the Jews in Spain*, p. 67; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 210 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 259; Adams, *History of the Jews* (Boston, 1812), 1, 238 sq. (B. P.)

Tudor, Salathiel

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bedford County, Pa., in 1789. Converted when a youth, he labored as a local preacher for eleven years; and was received on trial in the Pittsburgh Conference in 1827. In 1829 his health declined; in 1830 he was a superannuate, and he died Nov. 26 of the same year. As a preacher he was acceptable and useful. "His end was peaceful and glorious." See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1832, p. 159.

Tudor Flower

SEE TUDOR STYLE.

Tudor Rose

A conventional representation of the rose, found in Third-pointed architectural work, both in wood and stone carvings, adopted in honor of the Tudors.

Tudor Style

Picture for Tudor

This name is used by some writers on Gothic architecture, but they do not agree in the application of it. It is variously employed to designate the Perpendicular style throughout its continuance — the latter period of this style-and the mixed style which sprang up on the decline of Gothic architecture, usually called Elizabethan. The term is not very extensively used, and is most commonly understood to mean late Perpendicular work, and Henry VI's Chapel at Westminster is looked upon as the most perfect specimen in this style. The *Tudor Flower* is a flat flower, or leaf, placed upright on its stalk, much used in Perpendicular work, especially late in the style, in long suites as a crest or ornamental finishing on cornices, etc. The examples differ considerably in detail, but the general effect does not vary much.

Tueshimel Erdeni

in Lamaism, is the name for one of the seven sanctuaries which are placed upon the altars in front of the idol. It is a drawing, upon a gold background representing an ambassador of the heavenly kingdom and also the god of the temple.

Tuet, Esprit Claude

a French ascetic author, was born about 1745 and died about 1787, and was the writer of a number of religious tracts and sermons, for which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Tufa

a porous stone (called *travertine* when compact) found in calcareous streams, and used, from its lightness, in vaultings, as at Bredon and Canterbury.

Tuff-taffeta

a kind of inferior silk used in church-hangings.

Tuiscon

in German mythology, was an earth-born god, from whom all Germans are said to have sprung. He was highly esteemed by his son, man. The Druids sacrificed human beings to him. According to the accounts given by Caesar, these sacrifices were made not only in Germany, but throughout the whole of Gaul. Some hold him to be a historic person, others a personified idea.

Tukkiyim

SEE PEACOCK.

Tukudh Version

This version is of a very recent date; and the translation of the four gospels and the epistles of John into that dialect was undertaken by the British and Foreign Bible Society, at the request of the Church Missionary Society, and was made in the year 1872 by the Rev. R. McDonald, who had been laboring among the people with much success. As to the dialect itself, it is spoken by a tribe of Indians on the river Yucon, on the confines of the Arctic region. Mr. McDonald, who has been laboring there for the last sixteen years, has reduced the language to writing, and in his translating efforts has had the assistance of a native Christian. The syllabic characters, which were adopted in the Cree version, were first tried, but the unusually large number of syllables in the language obliged the translator to fall back upon the Roman characters. The following, taken from the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1873, will be of interest to the student: "The Tukudh tribe, which is often known by the name of *Loucheux*, from a peculiarity in the eyes of some of the natives, is small, not including more than about eight hundred, nearly the whole of whom are under Christian instruction. Their numbers, however, are on the increase, and it is not improbable that some neighboring tribes will become incorporated with them, and thus add considerably to the community. Like most of the North American Indian tribes, the Tukudh Indians have among themselves certain religious beliefs on which it is not impossible to build up the pure theology of the Bible. Their name *Tukudh* signifies 'haughty people.' When the geographical position of Mr. McDonald's station at Fort Macpherson is considered, it will not be wondered at that these people are living in primitive simplicity. The edition requested is to consist of five hundred copies, and some of the gospels it is proposed to bind separately.

The expense of the work will be large and the readers few; but when a language has been reduced to written form, and Christian men capable of translating the Scriptures are available, the committee deem it a matter of clear duty to go forward in printing the Word of God, even though but a comparatively small population may be benefited by their labors.” According to the report for 1879, about 810 copies altogether have been circulated among these people. (B. P.)

Tulchans, or Tulchan Bishops

A *tulchan* was the effigy of a calf, or rather it was a stuffed calfskin, set up before a cow when she was milked under the belief that the animal thereby yielded her milk more freely. The custom has long been discontinued. Under the regent Morton, and after 1572, attempts were made to introduce bishops into the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The men who consented to take the title had bound themselves, as the price of their elevation, to receive only a small part of the revenues, the rest going to Morton and his lordly colleagues. “The bishop had the title, but my lord had the milk.” Such bishops were called tulchans by the people. The first tulchan was John Douglas, appointed to the see of St. Andrew’s. Patrick Adamson, who afterwards himself became a tulchan, said in a sermon, “There be three kinds of bishops my lord bishop, my lord’s bishop, and the Lord’s bishop. My lord bishop was in the papistry; my lord’s bishop is now, when my lord gets the benefice, and the bishop serves for nothing but to make his title sure; and the Lord’s bishop is the true minister of the gospel.”

Tulisso

in Prussian mythology, were priests of a lower order, belonging to none of the three higher classes of Grivaites, Siggonos, and Wurrkaites. The care of the sick rested with them, whom they either prepared for death, or sought, with their scanty knowledge, to cure or to alleviate their sufferings. They resided among the populace in villages, and were therefore not esteemed very much.

Tulla Intoon and Halthiorhin

According to the Finnish creed, each man bore within him from his birth a divine spirit who was his inseparable companion for life. This spirit became more closely united to its subject in proportion as the latter tore himself away from earthly things to retire into the sanctuary of his soul. The

magician, therefore, aspired to a transcendental ecstasy (*tulla intoon*), to a great state of excitement of the soul (*tulla haltiorhin*), in which he became like the spirit, dwelling in him and entirely identified with it. He used artificial means, e.g. intoxicating drugs, in order to attain to this state of excitement. Lenormant, *Chaldaean Magic*, p. 254.

Tulloch, James

a Scotch Congregational minister, was the first Dissenter who settled in Scotland. He was tutored by Rev. Mr. Ewing of Glasgow, and sent out under the auspices of the Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home. Mr. Tulloch was settled over the Congregational Church at Bixter in 1808, and did much in establishing new churches and propagating the Gospel. He died Feb. 26, 1862. See (Lond.) *Cong. Yearbook*, 1864, p. 247.

Tully, George

an English divine, was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, and died rector of Gateside in 1697. He was a zealous writer against popery, and was suspended for a sermon he preached and published in 1686. "He was the first clergyman who suffered in the reign of James II in defense of our religion against popish superstition and idolatry." He is best known as the author of *Discourse on the Government of the Thoughts* (1693-94, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.

Tully, Thomas

a learned English divine, was born in the city of Carlisle July 22, 1620; he entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1634, and obtained a fellowship. In 1642 he was created A.M., and became master of the grammar-school at Tetbury, in Gloucestershire. He afterwards returned to his college, and became a noted tutor and preacher there. He died Jan. 14, 1676.

Tulu, or Tuluvu

is the ancient and proper dialect of the long narrow tract of land now called Canara, situated westward of Mysore, between the range of the Western Ghauts and the ocean. Owing to the long subjection of Canara to Karriata princes, the Karnata or Canarese language is now chiefly spoken by the higher classes in the province, while the Tulu still continues the vernacular of the common people, especially in South Canlara. In idiom and structure

it closely resembles the Malayalam language, and it is written in the same characters. In 1834 a missionary station was established by the German Missionary Society at Mangalore, the capital of Canara. In 1844 a translation of the New Test. was made, which was published in 1852. See *Bible of Every Land*, p. 144. (B. P.)

Turn

Among the Egyptians the sun was considered in each phase a different god, having its peculiar name, attribute, and worship. Thus the sun during its nocturnal existence was *Turn*; when it shone in the meridian, it was *Ra*; when it produced and nourished life, it was venerated as *Kheper*. Since, according to the Egyptians, the night precedes the day, Tum was considered to have been born before Ra, and to have issued alone from the abyss of chaos. —Lenormant, *Chaldaean Magic*, p. 81 sq.

Tumanurong

in the mythology of the Marquesas, was a goddess who descended from heaven and was immediately made queen by the people, who were charmed by her beauty. She married the then ruling sovereign, and gave birth to a son, who was able to speak immediately after his birth.

Tumblers

a name given to the TUNKER *SEE TUNKER* (q.v.) in ridicule of their peculiar motions while undergoing the rite of baptism by immersion.

Tundley, Ralph

an English Congregational minister, was born at Alton, Staffordshire, in 1795. He was converted under the influence of the Dissenters, became interested in Sunday-school work, and at the earnest solicitation of the Church at Alton he became their pastor and ministered to them until his death, Feb. 22, 1863. See (Lond.) *Cong. Year-book*, 1864, p. 247.

Tunic, or Tunicle

a term applied to several articles of clerical dress.

(1.) A dress worn by the subdeacon, made originally of linen, reaching to the feet, and then of inferior silk, and narrower than the dalmatic of the deacon, with shorter and tighter sleeves, and devoid of the stripes or

embroidery of that vestment. For some centuries, however, the assimilation has grown so complete as to render the slight difference between them almost imperceptible. Bishops wore both the tunic and dalmatic at pontifical mass.

(2.) The *parva tunica*, or cotta, a linen habit reaching to the knees, used at all kinds of services by simple clerks and others; it differed from the rochet, in being fuller. Amalarius speaks of a blue tunic of jacinth color, or *subucula*, worn by the bishop (Rupert says under the chasuble) as emblematical of the seamless robe of Christ.

(3.) A dress worn by monks. *SEE COAT*.

Tunicle-ball

a ball of crystal to which tassels were attached, hanging from the shoulders of medieval dalmatics.

Tunicle-chest

a chest for holding the tunic and dalmatic, and differing in shape from those chests which contained the copes and chasubles of a sacristy.

Tunis, Jewish Mission At

As early as the year 1833, the London Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews commenced missionary operations in Tunis. The first missionary to that place was the late Rev. Dr. F. C. Ewald, who arrived there June 30. He found a Jewish population from 30,000 to 40,000, all living in their own quarter. There was also a large number of Roman Catholics, who had their own church and convent, a Greek community with church and priest, and about fifty Protestants without the means of grace. Mr. Ewald at once commenced divine service, which was attended by almost every Protestant. The Jews being accessible in that place, opportunities were afforded to the missionary to preach unto them the word of God. The Bible in Hebrew' was eagerly sought after and bought by them, and thus the work could be carried on. In 1855 Mr. Page, who succeeded Dr. Ewald, established a school there, which proved a great success. Owing, however, to the removal by cholera of Mr. Page from the scene of his labors, missionary operations had to be suspended for a time, to be resumed again in 1860 by the Rev. Mr. Fenner. In July, 1861, a school was opened for Jewish boys with six scholars, whose number had

increased by the close of the year to ninety-nine, all Jewish youths from seven to eighteen years of age. In 1862 a girls school was established through the benevolence of a Christian lady in the north of England. Since that time missionary operations have been carried on there regularly, and in spite of the efforts made by the Israelitish Alliance to counterbalance the work of the mission, there were 160 boys and 305 girls in attendance at the mission schools during the year 1878-79. Since 1862, 1600 girls and 960 boys have passed through the schools. The popularity of these schools may be best seen from the fact that a notice of the opening of the mission schools after the summer vacation was put up in the principal synagogues of Tunis. In connection with the two-day schools, Sunday schools have also been opened there of late, besides a night school which seems very promising. Some years ago the society built a chapel, where the Protestant community of Tunis is now gathered regularly for divine service, and where the sacraments are administered. According to the last report for the year 1879, there were fourteen persons engaged at this station, viz. two ordained ministers, a colporteur and depository, a schoolmaster, four assistants, a schoolmistress and four assistants. (B. P.)

Tunkers

(Germ. *tunken*, "to dip"), a sect of German-American Baptists, called by themselves *Brethren*. Their name is sometimes erroneously spelled *Dunkers*. The sect is said to have been founded by Alexander Mack at Schwarzenau, Westphalia, in 1708. Driven from Germany, some of them emigrated to America in 1719, and settled in Pennsylvania. They formed a settlement at Ephrata, Lancaster Co., under the directorship of Conrad Peysel. Here they built a town in the form of a triangle, the houses being three stories in height; and each of them a kind of monastery. They dressed much in the style of monks and nuns, men and women lived in different houses, and they used a vegetable diet, practicing considerable mortification. Although marriage was not forbidden, when couples married they were required to remove from Ephrata. They subsequently settled in Ohio, Indiana, Maryland, Virginia, and several other states. Their doctrines are similar to those of the Mennonites (q.v.), and in dress and manners they resemble the Friends. They use the kiss of charity, feet-washing, laying-on of hands, anointing the sick with oil; are opposed to war, and will not engage in lawsuits. They hold love-feasts, and an annual meeting about Whitsuntide, which is attended by their bishops, teachers, and representatives chosen by the congregations. Universal redemption, though

not an article of faith, is commonly held by them. Some of the more strict sabbatarians, observing Saturday as their day of rest. They oppose statistics, which they believe to savor of pride, and, therefore, trustworthy statements as to their numbers cannot be given; they are supposed to number about 100,000. By reason of their quiet and peaceable lives they have retained a name which was given to them at first, that of “The Harmless People.”

For the denomination there are now published four weekly papers — the *Primitive Christian*, the *Gospel Preacher*, the *Brethren at Work*, and the *Progressive Christian*. This last is published at Berlin, Pa., by the liberals among the Brethren or Tunkers; and its position is defined (in the *Independent* of May 8, 1879) as follows:

“We are in full accord with the Church on all Gospel doctrines and practices; but do not believe in any tradition as being worthy of comparison with a divine injunction. In fact, we do not regard a custom one hundred or five hundred years old, whether it originated in the Church or in the world, as possessing any claims upon the attention of Bible Christians. We believe in “nonconformity to the world” from all its sinful practices; but we hold that the earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof, and that the inventions and discoveries of man are simply the products of the wisdom of God, and should be applied by the Christian to the glorifying of his name. We believe that the time now is when we shall neither in the garb of a hundred years ago nor ill the style of the present age worship the Father; but when the true worshippers shall worship him in spirit and in truth. We believe in self-denial, but not in stoicism; we advocate close communion, but not exclusiveness. In short, we hold that the Word of God is our perfect law, which if we obey we do well.” *SEE BAPTISTS, GERMAN.*

Tunnell, John

an early Methodist minister, was about thirteen years in the work of the ministry; was elected to the office of an elder at the Christmas Conference in 1784; traveled extensively throughout the United States; was for years the leader of a pioneer band of preachers among the Holston mountains; and died in great peace near Sweet Springs, Va., July 9, 1790. He was buried by Asbury among the Alleghany heights, a martyr to his work. He

was a man of solid piety, great simplicity, and godly sincerity; well known and much esteemed both by ministers and people for his indefatigable labors, and his commanding talents as a preacher. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 37; Bangs, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, 1, 319; Stevens, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, 2, 34, 38, 39, 43, 53, 99, 272, 297, 496.

Tunstall (or Tonstall), Cuthbert

a learned Romish prelate, was born at Hatchford, near Richmond, Yorkshire, about 1474. He entered Balliol College, Oxford, about 1491, but subsequently went to Cambridge and became a fellow of King's Hall. He afterwards went to Padua and took the degree of LL.D. On his return to England, archbishop Warham constituted him vicar general, August, 1511, recommended him to Henry VIII, and in December of the same year collated him to the rectory of Harrow-on-the-hill, Middlesex which he held till 1522. In 1514 he was installed prebendary of Stowlonga, Church of Lincoln, and in the following year admitted archdeacon of Chester. He was made master of the rolls in 1516. Serving as an ambassador to emperor Charles V, he was rewarded on his return (prob. 1519) by a series of preferments. In 1519 he was made prebendary of Bontevant, Church of York; in May, 1521, prebendary of Combe and Hornham, Church of Saram, and dean of Salisbury. He was promoted to the bishopric of London in 1522; was made keeper of the privy seal in 1523; and in 1525 he and Sir Richard Wingfield went as ambassadors to Spain. In July, 1527, Tunstall attended cardinal Wolsey on his embassy to France, and in 1529 was one of the English ambassadors employed to negotiate the treaty of Cambray. On his return he exerted himself to suppress Tyndale's edition of the New Test. In 1530 he was translated to the bishopric of Durham, where he laid out large sums in improving his episcopal houses. At first Tunstall favored the divorce of Henry VIII, but afterwards espoused the cause of the queen. When Henry took the title of supreme head of the Church, Tunstall recommended this course in his injunctions and in a sermon preached at Durham. He also vindicated the king's supremacy in 1533, in a sermon preached before the king on Palm-Sunday. In 1535 he was one of the commissioners for taking the althuation of ecclesiastical benefices and in 1538 was appointed to confer about the Reformation with the German ambassadors. A new edition of the English Bible was revised by him and Nicholas Heath, bishop of Rochester, in 1541. In December, 1551, he was committed to the Tower on a charge of misprision of treason, and although the bill was thrown out by the House of Commons, he was

brought before a commission (consisting of the chief-justice of the king's bench and six others) and deprived of his bishopric. He continued a prisoner in the Tower during the remainder of Edward's reign. 'On the accession of Mary, in 1553, Tunstall was restored to his bishopric, but, on account of his mild treatment of the Protestants, was again deprived, July, 1559. He was committed to the custody of Parker, then in possession of Lambeth Palace, who treated him in a very friendly and respectful manner, until he died Nov. 18, 1559. Tunstall was opposed to making transubstantiation an article of faith, and also held the doctrine of justification by faith only. His principal writings are, *In Laudem Slatrimonii* (Lond. 1518, 4to): —*De Arte Supputandi* (Lond. 1522, 4to): —*Sermon on Royal Supremacy* (Lond. 1539, 4to): —*Confudtio*, etc. (Paris, 1522, 4to): —*De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Domini Jesu' Christi in Eucharistia* (Lutet. 1554, 4to): — (*Compendium in Decem Libros Ethicorum Aristotelis* (Paris, 1554, 8vo): —*Contra Impios Blasphematores Dei Prædestinationis* (Antwerp. 1555, 4to): —*Godly and Devout Prayers in English and Latin*, etc. (1558, 8vo). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tunstall, James, D.D.

an English divine, was born about 1710, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became fellow and tutor. In 1739 he obtained the rectory of Sturmer, Essex, and two years later was elected public orator of the university, and was appointed chaplain to Potter, archbishop of Canterbury. In 1744 he was created D.D. at Cambridge; was afterwards collated to the rectory of Great Chart, Kent, and to the vicarage of Minster, Isle of Thanet; both of which he resigned in 1757 for the valuable vicarage of Rochdale, Lancashire, where he remained until his death, March 28, 1772. His writings are, *Epistola ad Virum Eruditum Conyers Middleton*, etc. (Camb. 1741, 8vo): —*Observations on the Present Collection of Epistles between Cicero and Brutus*: —*Sermon before the House of Commons* (May 29, 1746): —*Vindication of the Power of the State to Prohibit Clandestine Marriages*, etc. (1755): —*Marriage in Society Stated*, etc. (1755): —*Lectures on Natural and Revealed Religion* (published after his death, in 4to). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Tuonela

was, according to the Finnish belief, the river of the country of the dead. — Lenormait, *Chald. Magic*, p. 258.

Tuoni

was the father of Kivutar, or Kipu-typo, the Finnish goddess of diseases. — Lenormant, *Chald. Magic*, p. 259.

Tuquo

in the mythology of the Hottentots, is the evil spirit causing harm and misery, for whom numerous sacrifices are offered for the purpose of relieving the Hottentots, whom he is said to persecute.

Tura (Or Turra), Cosimo (Cosime Da Ferrara)

an Italian painter, was born at Ferrara in 1406. He was a disciple of Galasso Galassi, and was court-painter in the time of the duke Borso d' Este. He died in 1469. Tura worked both in oil and fresco, and painted in the dry, Gothic style then prevailing. Among his paintings are, *Annunciation* and *Nativity*, in the cathedral: — *Acts of St. Eustace*, Monastery of San Guglielmo: — *Virgin and Saints*, Church of San Giovanni: — *Christ Praying in the Garden*, at the Cappuccini: — *Madonna with Saints*, Berlin Museum. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts*; s.v.

Turban

Though it is presumable that in a climate like that of Palestine the inhabitants did not expose themselves to the cold of winter or the heats of summer without some covering for the head, there is no certain evidence that any such was in common use. The Hebrews have several words by which articles of head-dress are designated, but they all apparently belong to coverings which were either official or merely ornamental, with the exception of those used by the military.

In the Pentateuch two kinds of head-coverings are mentioned as forming part of the priest's dress, the *ṭipṭiṣ* of the high-priest, and the *h[B]nā* of the common priests; the former of which was probably a sort of tiara, while the latter may have been a turban, but was more probably a high cap of a flower-like Nape, such as are found among Orientals in the present day

(Bahr, *Symbolik des mos. Cult.* 2, 66). As these head coverings (A. V. “bonnets”) were expressly designed for “glory and for beauty” (^{<0230>}Exodus 28:40), they evidently give us no idea of what was commonly worn on the head by the people. In the ceremony prescribed for the drinking of the waters of jealousy, the priest is directed to *loosen* ([**rp**) the woman’s head i.e. to let her hair fall down loosely (Numbers 5, 18); and in the law concerning the leper it is prescribed that his head shall be *loosened* ([**wrp**); phraseology which seems to indicate that it was customary in the Mosaic times to bind the hair with a band or fillet, such as we see represented on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. On the other hand, from the stress that is laid in the law concerning the Nazarite on his suffering his locks to grow, and on his hair thus abundantly grown being the crown of God on him (^{<0135>}Leviticus 13:45), it seems fair to infer that the cropping of the hair, and perhaps also the shaving of the head and the wearing of some covering (it may be of artificial hair, as among the Egyptians), was common among the people.

In the other books the terms which occur designating head-dress, besides those which are *regal*, such as **rzn** and **hrf** [*SEE CROWN*, and those which are *military*, *SEE ARMOR*, are the following:

1. **āynæ** *tsaniph*. This term occurs three times in the Old Test. (^{<0204>}Job 29:14; ^{<0113>}Isaiah 62:3; ^{<0115>}Zechariah 3:5). In all these cases the usage of the word shows that it refers, not to an ordinary article of dress, but to one which was ornamental and for display. It was probably a turban, the word being derived from **ānx** *to roll round* or *wind*. Schrider (*De Vest. Mulier. Heb.* p. 364) endeavors to prove from the Arabic that this word means a narrow strip wound round the head; but his instances only prove that the Arabic *tsinf* and *tsinfa* denote a small band, or the hem of a garment. In ^{<0112>}Isaiah 3:22 the fern. *tseniphah* is used of a female head-dress worn for ornament.

2. **raē**] *peer*. This word is used of the head-dress of distinguished persons, both male and female (^{<0111>}Isaiah 3:20; 61:3, 10; ^{<0117>}Ezekiel 24:17, 23; 44:18). In ^{<0228>}Exodus 39:28 it is used of the priest’s head-dress, as also in ^{<0118>}Ezekiel 44:18. In all the other instances it indicates an article of holiday costume. Saalschütz suggests that the *peer* was probably the hat or bonnet, properly so called, and the *tsaniph* the ornamental headband wrapped round it.

3. **trjpxæ]** *tsephirdth*, from **rpix**; *to circle*, a *circlet* or *diadem* (²³⁸⁵Isaiah 28:5); or it may have been a piece of fine muslin wound round the turban for ornament, such as the Orientals still use.

4. **hyw]** *ælivyah* (²⁰⁰⁹Proverbs 1:9; 4:9). Some regard this as a species of fillet by which the head was bound; but it probably means rather a garland or wreath of flowers.

The examination of these terms has failed to convey to us any information respecting the ordinary every-day costume for the head of the Hebrew people. Probably they were wont simply to throw some part of their dress over their heads when they had occasion to expose themselves to the weather, or to fold a piece of cloth over their heads, as do the Arabs of the present day, reserving such articles as those above named for holiday or festive occasions (Jahn, *Biblische Archiologie*, I, 2, 2, p. 116; Saalschütz, *Arch. der Hebr.* 2, 22). *SEE HEAD-DRESS.*

Turchi, Alessandro

called *Veronese*, also *L' Orbetto*, an Italian painter, was born at Verona (according to Pozzo) about 1578. When a lad his talent was recognised by Felice Riccio, who took him into his study, and carefully instructed him. Leaving Riccio, he went to Venice, where he studied with Carlo Cagliari, and then proceeded to Rome. Here he made his home until his death, in 1648. Turchi excelled in the choice and distribution of his colors, among which he introduced a reddish tint which much enlivens his pictures. At Rome he painted some altar-pieces and other pictures for the churches, the most esteemed of which are in the Church of La Concezione. Among his other principal works at Rome are, *The Flight into Egypt*, in San Romualdo; *The Holy Family*, in San Lorenio; and *St. Carlo Borromeo*, in San Salvatore. There are also to be noticed his *Passion of the Forty Martyrs*, in San Stefano; and his *Pieta at La Misericordia*. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts*, s.v.

Turck, Anthony

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was a native of New York State, and of Dutch descent. He was received into the traveling connection in 1793; “a holy and devout man, indefatigable and successful in his labors, subject to great afflictions, temptations, and trials,” but with “increasing sweetness in

communion with God” towards his end, and victory in death. He died March 13, 1803. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 109.

Turibio (Turibius), St.

is said to have been born Nov. 16, 1538, of good family. Every Christian perfection distinguished him in early youth. He was educated at Valladolid and Salamanca, was made president of Granada by Philip II, and subsequently became archbishop of Lima, in South America, though still a layman. He was consecrated in 1581, and proceeded to initiate an excellent administration, during which he founded hospitals, seminaries, and churches, ordered diocesan and provincial synods, traveled in the execution of his duties over the entire country, and displayed great devotion during a contagious pestilence. He is credited with the miraculous cure of several persons who were sick, and with at least one successful raising of the dead to life. He died at Santa, Nov. 23, 1606. It is said that his body was brought, undecayed, to Lima after a whole year had passed since his decease, and that it continued to work miracles. He was accordingly beatified in 1679 by Innocent XI, and canonized by Benedict XIII in 1726. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 11:330; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Turin, Council Of (Concilium Turinense)

was held at Turin, Italy, in 398, or, according to others, in 401, to settle certain differences which had arisen among the Gallican prelates. The bishops of the province of Aix, Proculus of Marseilles, Simplicius of Vienne, and the bishop of Arles were present. As Turin was at that time under the metropolitan of Milan, it is conjectured that Simplicianus of Milan convoked it.

1. The first question settled in the council was that of Proculus of Marseilles, who (although that see was not in the province) desired to be recognised as metropolitan of the province of Narbonne. The council, for the sake of peace, granted to Proculus personally, but, not to his see, the right of primacy which he claimed, declaring, however, that after his death the metropolitan should be a bishop of the province itself.

2. The council took into consideration the differences, between the archbishops of Aries and Vienne, who both, pretended to the primacy of Viennese Gaul. The decision was that he of the two who could prove his

city to be the metropolis of the province as to civil matters, should be considered as the lawful metropolitan, and in the meantime they were exhorted to live in peace.

3. The excuses of the bishops Octavius, Ursion, Remigius, and Triferius were considered. These prelates were accused of having conferred orders irregularly and uncanonically. The council decided that, in this case, indulgence should be granted to the four bishops; but that, in future, any bishops so violating the ancient decrees of the Church should be deprived of the right of ordaining, and of all voice in synodical assemblies; and that those who should be so ordained should be deposed. This canon was confirmed in the Council of Riez, A.D. 439.

Several other regulations relating to the affairs of the Church were also made, and eight canons in all published. See Mansi, *Concil.* 2, 1155. — Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v.

Turkey

is the largest Mohammedan empire of the world, containing extensive possessions in Eastern Europe, Western Asia, and Northern Africa. Including the provinces in Europe and Africa, which are virtually independent, and only pay an annual tribute to the Turkish government, the Turkish Empire, in 1880, had an area of 2,302,000 square miles, and 47,000,000 inhabitants. In consequence of the treaty of Berlin in 1878, Turkey had to recognize the entire independence of Roumania and Servia, and to consent to the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the government of Austria. Moreover, Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia have become virtually independent of Turkish rule, leaving to the Turkish government only a small territory in Europe which is fully under its control. In Africa, Egypt and Tunis are likewise independent in point of administration. Deducting the dependencies, the Turkish government at present rules over a territory of 1,043,000 square miles, with a population of 23,500,000. In June, 1880, the Supplementary Conference at Berlin declared that in order to carry out the provisions of the treaty of Berlin concerning the rectification of the frontier between Turkey and Greece, Turkey ought to cede to Greece a territory containing about 8292 square miles and 400,000 inhabitants.

Picture for Turkey 1

Note by the Editor. — For the purpose of enabling our readers to understand more fully the present complicated boundaries of Turkey, we insert a map based upon the one recently issued by Stanford, of Charing Cross, London. It will be perceived that, in consequence of the late Russo-Turkish war, Turkey has lost far more than half her European possessions, which are to be bounded henceforth by the Balkan Mountains instead of the River Save and the eastern Carpathian chain. Romania, Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia, and Montenegro are wholly severed from her. Bulgaria has lost a slice of her territory on the west, given to Servia, and another on the north-east, given to Romania. Montenegro has gained a piece on the north-west from Bosnia, and another on the south-east from Turkey. Bosnia, including the part of Croatia formerly in Turkey, together with Herzegovina, has been occupied by Austria, and is not likely to be restored to Turkey. Greece gains a part of Albania and Thessaly and Russia that part of Romania (bounded by the Pruth and the Danube) adjoining Bessarabia (which she already held). In Asia Russia also acquires a district of Armenia adjoining Batum. Besides, there is created a quasi-independent district of Eastern Romania, within the above narrowed limits of Turkey. Turkey in Europe virtually now consists merely of a part of Romania and a part of Albania. The interior changes in territory and population made by the Berlin treaty are stated as follows in the London *Athenaeum*. Estimates of other statisticians vary considerably from these figures, to Russia. If we exclude the provinces “indefinitely” to be occupied by Austria, and Eastern Romania, there remain to Turkey in Europe only 74,790 square miles, with 4,779,000 inhabitants, of whom 1,521,500 are Mohammedans. In Armenia Russia takes 10,000 square miles, with about 350,000 inhabitants. Cyprus, entrusted to the keeping of England, has an area of 2288 square miles, and about 150,000 inhabitants. Many of these accessions, however, are already the fruitful source of contention, and some of them will probably have to be taken possession of by force of arms. Greece is at the present moment (Aug. 1880) preparing to do so for her share. It is impossible now to predict what the issue will be.]

Picture for Turkey 2

The former volumes of this *Cyclopaedia* have special articles on *SEE BULGARIA, SEE EGYPT, SEE ROUMANIA, SEE SERVIA*; and on some of the Eastern Churches which are wholly or chiefly found in Turkey, as

the JACOBITES, NESTORIANS, and MARONITES. In the present article, after giving such preliminary information of a general character as the intense interest at present prevailing on the Oriental question seems to demand, we treat, more particularly, of the religions of Turkey proper, so far as they have not yet been discussed in the special articles which have just been referred to.

I. *Geographical and Ethnological Features.* — The geographical position of the Turkish empire is peculiar, and would, under a strong government, be most advantageous. It connects Europe with Asia, Asia with Africa, the East with the West the Mohammedan with the Christian world. It has an extensive seacoast, which is indented by numerous gulfs and bays, and embraces many excellent harbors; Some parts of this coast were in former times the seat of a very flourishing commerce, which would undoubtedly be revived under favorable circumstances. Almost the entire territory which is subject to direct Turkish rule is noted for its fertility; but Turkish misrule has not only arrested, but diminished, its productiveness. By far the greater portion of the Turkish possessions is situated in Asia. The European possessions have always been much smaller, but as they contained the capital and seat of government, they have hitherto been of much greater political importance. This importance has, however, of late been greatly reduced by the territorial losses which Turkey has sustained by the last Eastern war and the treaty of Berlin. The African part of the Turkish empire consists almost wholly of tributary states; and the farther the territory of one of these states, Egypt, is extended, the smaller becomes the hold the Turkish government has on it. Although ruling over portions of Europe, Asia, and Africa, Turkey is really an Asiatic power.

While the Turks are the ruling race of the empire, they constitute a majority of the total population only in the Asiatic possessions. Even Asiatic Turkey can hardly be said to be an Ottoman land, for the bulk of the people are descendants of the old Seljukian Turks who have been subjected by the Ottoman Turks. In the African dependencies the Turks are hardly represented at all, and in Europe they are almost everywhere in a minority. According to an elaborate article on the ethnographical relations of Turkey in Petermann's *Geographische Mittheilungen*, 1876, No. 7, the Turks are to be found as a compact population only in three sanjaks, those of Rustchuk, Tulcha, and Varna. These three sanjaks formed part of the vilayet of the Danube. They are less numerous in the Rhodope Mountains. On the shores of the AEgean Sea and the Sea of Marmora, and on the

south-east shore of the Black Sea, they are greatly outnumbered by the Greeks, especially in the direction of Constantinople. It is a remarkable fact that all the sanjaks which contain the most compact Turkish population are now subject to the semi-independent prince of Christian Bulgaria and to the Christian governor of the autonomous province of Eastern Romania. The aggregate number of the Osmanli Turks in Europe, including Bulgaria, Eastern Romania, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, is estimated at about 2,000,000. Exclusive of these provinces, over which the authority of the sultan is not likely to be ever restored, the number of Osmanlis will barely reach 1,000,000 in a total population of about 5,000,000. In Asia the Turkish race is supposed to number more than 8,500,000 of a total population of 17,000,000; but this number embraces many old tribes who have been totally absorbed and merged in the Turks. The Turcomans, who live chiefly in Northern Mesopotamia, and number about 100,000, belong to the same race as the Turks.

Up to the time of the late Eastern war, the bulk of the population in the European dominions of Turkey was made up of five non-Turkish tribes — Roumanians, Servians, Bulgarians, Greeks, and Albanians. The Roumanians, who chiefly inhabit the principality of Roumania, where they number about 5,000,000, have long been semi-independent of Turkey, and became entirely independent by the treaty of Berlin. Only about 200,000 remain subject to Turkish rule. Outside of Roumania and Turkey, Austria has a Roumanian population exceeding three millions. West and south of the Roumanians we find two branches of the Slavic race, the Servians and the Bulgarians. The Servians embrace the inhabitants of the principalities of Servia and Montenegro, and of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Both Montenegro (q.v.) and Servia (q.v.) are now independent states; Bosnia and Herzegovina have been placed under Austrian administration, and are likely to become soon a part of the Austrian empire. In Bosnia, the landed aristocracy, after the conquest of the country by the Turks, became Mohammedans, in order to save their property and their privileges, but they continue to speak the Servian language. Outside of the present and former dominions of the sultan, Austria has a Servian population of about 4,500,000, called Croatians, Slavonians; Dalmatians, and Slovenians. The large majority of the Servians belong to the Greek Oriental Church; but in Austria and in Bosnia there is also a large Roman Catholic element. According to a recent work by Klaić on Bosnia (Agram, 1878), written in the Croatian language, the population of Bosnia is divided, as regards the

religious denominations, into Orthodox Greek Church, 646,678, or 48.4 percent; Mohammedans. 480,596, or 35.9 percent; Roman Catholics, 207,119, or 15.5 percent; and Jews, 3000, or 2 percent; but in regard to race, 1,291,393 of this population are Slaves, only 2000 Osmanli Turks, 30,000 Albanians, and 11,000 gypsies. The Servians of all the different denominations in Austria and the former Turkish dominions are only now awakening to the full significance of the fact that their common language makes them joint members of one nationality, and a strong movement towards uniting at some future time all these members into one state has set in. Although the Mohammedan Bosnians are strongly opposed to this union movement, as well as to the annexation of their province to Austria, the rule of the Osmanli Turks over the Servian nationality may be said to be at an end.

The second Slavic race of European Turkey is the Bulgarians. They occupy the country south of the Danube, their southern ethnic boundary being a line passing through the towns of Nissa, Prisrend, Ochrida, Kastoria, Niagostos, Salonica, Adrianople, and Burgas, on the Black Sea. The number of Bulgarians is estimated at from three to four millions. After four centuries and a half of oppression, they were considered at the beginning of the 19th century the most wretched people of Europe. Then a marvelous awakening began. *SEE BULGARIA*. In spite of all oppression, they laid the foundation of a national system of education, and re-established the independence of their national Church. The treaty of San Stefano, March 3, 1878, between Russia and Turkey, provided for the establishment of Bulgaria as a tributary Ottoman principality and a national militia. The principality thus constituted would have extended from the boundaries of Servia and Albania to the Black Sea, and from the Danube nearly to the AEgean Sea, taking in about fifty miles of the AEgean coast. It would have included all the predominantly Bulgarian districts, both north and south of the Balkans, containing an aggregate of 79,400 square miles and an estimated population of between five and five and a half millions. But although the Bulgarians would have been the dominant race, a considerable number of Turks, Servians, and Greeks would have been merged in the Bulgarian majority. The treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, greatly modified this plan. The tributary principality of Bulgaria, as constituted by it, contains only 33,000 square miles and about 1,860,000 inhabitants. The Bulgarian districts south of the Balkans were constituted as the autonomous province of Eastern Roumelia, the governor of which must be

a Christian, but is appointed by the Turkish government with the consent of the treaty powers. Eastern Roumelia, has about 13,664 square miles and 850,000 inhabitants, of whom about 600,000 are Bulgarians, 150,000 Greeks, and 70,000 Turks. The aggregate population of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia reaches about 3,000,000, of whom fully 2,500,000 are Bulgarians, and the remainder mostly Turks and Greeks. The Mohammedan population is estimated at from 800,000 to 950,000, but fully two thirds of them are of Bulgarian descent. The Bulgarians, generally, were greatly dissatisfied with the provisions of the treaty of Berlin, and a strong movement began at once for a reunion of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, which can hardly fail to be ere long successful, and result in the emancipation of the entire Bulgarian population from Turkish rule.

The Greeks, or Hellenes, have a numerical preponderance in the southern part of European Turkey, especially in Thessaly, Epirus, Southern Macedonia, and the islands, the most important of which is Crete. They are the most civilized among the Christian races of Turkey. Their number is estimated at about 1,000,000 in European and 1,000,000 in Asiatic Turkey. The people of the predominantly Greek districts expressed during the late civil war a desire to be annexed to the kingdom of Greece, and the government of that kingdom made in January, 1879, an attempt to occupy these districts. The attempt had, however, to be abandoned at the request of the great powers. The Congress of Berlin expressed a desire that the frontier between Greece and Turkey should be rectified to the advantage of the former power, and offered the mediation of the great powers in case Turkey and Greece should be unable to agree. As this agreement was not reached, the supplementary congress held in Berlin in June, 1880, designated the new frontier between the two states. In Asia, the Greeks are fast occupying the seaports and coast of Asia Minor, from which the Turks are steadily retiring before them, and it is believed by many that a vigorous Greek kingdom in Europe would soon find a legitimate field of expansion along the coast of Asia no less than that of Europe.

The Albanians occupy the country south of the Servians and Bulgarians, and north of the Greeks. Their number is estimated at from 1,200,000 to 2,000,000. More than one half of them have embraced Islam, though it is said that many of the Mohammedan Albanians remain secretly Christian. They are divided into a number of tribes. Some of the most warlike mountain tribes are Roman Catholics. In the frontier districts the Albanians

are greatly mixed with Servians in the north and with Greeks in the south. They opposed with great vigor the cession to Montenegro by the Turkish government of some districts largely inhabited by Albanians, and declared an intention to oppose no less vigorously the cession of some of their southern districts to Greece. The Albanians are the only one of the five non-Turkish nationalities of European Turkey which shows some kind of attachment to the Ottoman government. This must partly be explained by the predominance among them of Mohammedanism, and partly by their determination not to be absorbed by Servians and Greeks. The increasing consolidation of Servians, Bulgarians, and Greeks will, however, cut them off from Constantinople, and make it impossible for them to remain a Turkish province.

A curious fact in the relation of the different races that people European Turkey is the irregular manner in which they are distinguished and mingled. "No locality," says Baker, in his *Turkey*, "can be found where the population is exclusively of the same nationality; but a rival race crops up here and there, and jostles its neighbors. We find, for instance, a quarter where the majority of the population are Bulgarians; but among them in considerable numbers are Turks, Greeks, Circassians, and gypsies. In another quarter the majority are Albanians, but they again have to bear the friction of Bulgarians, Wallachians, Greeks, and Turks; and so on all over the country. Each of these nations has its own language, religion, and customs; and it therefore follows that the difficulty of governing the mass lies in a direct ratio to the number of races represented in it." This irregular distribution of races has, however, been considerably affected by the close of the Eastern war, when, especially, large numbers of Turks and Bulgarians left their endangered homes, and emigrated to districts predominantly inhabited by coreligionists. The Austrian consul Sax (in *Oesterreichische Monatsschruffür den Orient*, 1878) estimates the number of those who from the spring of 1877 to the close of, 1878 changed their residence at more than one million.

II. Origin and Political History. — The Turks are first heard of in history when they emerged from the regions of Central Asia, and emigrated, early in the Christian sera, to the neighborhood of the Aral and Caspian seas. In the 6th century they formed an alliance with the Roman emperor Justin II; in the 7th they began to learn the Mohammedan religion at the hands of the Saracens. After their conversion to Mohammedanism they rapidly rose in power and influence. One branch, which, after its leader, Seljuk, received

the name of Seljukian Turks, subjugated a large portion of Persia, and thence spread into Syria, Armenia, Georgia, and Lower Egypt. Under Malek Shah, the grandson of Seljuk, the dynasty of the Seljukian Turks was in the 11th century the greatest power in Asia. They gradually pressed their conquests to the West, and from this time a more special and crying persecution of the Christians began. After Malek's death, the empire was divided into smaller states, which became rivals, and were finally extinguished in the 13th century by the irruption of the Moguls under Genghis Khan. . Then the history (of the Ottoman Turks begins. The first mention of them is made at the beginning of the 13th century, when they emigrated, under the name of Oghuze Turks, from the main body in Khorassan, Persia, to the mountains in Armenia, whence a part removed and settled near Angora, still acknowledging the suzerainty of the Seljukian sultan of Iconium. Partly at the expense of the Greeks, partly at that of other Turkish emirs or princes, the leaders of this band, Ertoghrul and his son Othman, or Osman, gradually grew in power. Othman became the most powerful prince in Western Asia and from him his followers took the name by which this branch of the Turks has ever since been designated, that of Ottoman, or Osmanli. Shortly before the death of Othman, in 1326, his armies took Brousa, which became the Asiatic capital of the Ottomans. With Othman's son, Orkhan the Ottoman empire begins. He made himself entirely independent of the Seljukian sultan, though he continued to bear the inferior title of emir. During his reign Gallipoli, in the Thracian Chersonesus, the first acquisition of the Turks in Europe, was conquered, in 1357, and all of Western Asia occupied. He imposed upon the conquered Christian nations the tribute of children, who were brought up in the Mohammedan faith, and out of whom was formed the famous force of the Janizaries, who for three centuries constituted the strength of the Ottoman armies in the reign of Murad I, the successor of Orkhan, Adrianople was taken, which became the European capital of the Ottomans till they captured Constantinople. When the Turks entered Europe, the territory of the Greek empire was almost limited to a quadrangle extending from Constantinople to Adrianople, and from the Black Sea to the Archipelago, to a small part of the coast near Thessalonica, and the larger portion of the Peloponnesus. The bulk of what subsequently became European Turkey consisted of the empire of Servia, extending from the Danube to the Peloponnesus, and bounded on the west by Bosnia and the Adriatic Sea; and of the kingdom of Bulgaria, extending from the Danube to Adrianople bounded on the east by the Black Sea. The frontier between

Bulgaria and Servia was constantly changing. When the Turks began to get a foothold, Widdin and Sophia were the nearest Bulgarian towns to the frontier. At this time the power of Servia began to go down after the death of Stephen Dushan, its greatest ruler, and Bulgaria began to split up into three separate kingdoms. Thus both were unable to resist the advancing Turks. In 1363 the Bulgarian city of Philippopolis was taken. About 1371 the chief of the three Bulgarian kingdoms, that of Tirnova, became tributary. For a while a Slavic confederation, under the Bosnian king Stephen, won some successes; but in the great battle of Kossova, in 1389, the confederate Bosnians, Servians, Bulgarians, and Wallachians were utterly defeated. Two or three years later, Servia and Wallachia became tributary, and the greater part of Bulgaria was conquered. Murad's son, Bajazet I, was the first to exchange the humbler title of emir for that of sultan, and also the first who attacked Constantinople. The progress of the Turks was arrested by the stunning defeat which they suffered in 1402 at Angora, at the hand of Timur, the famous Tamerlane; but they recovered their power under Bajazet's grandson, Murad II (1421-51), who conquered Thessalonica, Corinth, Patras, and a part of Albania, which was heroically defended by the great Scanderbeg. His son, Mohammed II (1451-81), conquered Constantinople, and thereby destroyed the Greek empire. He reduced, in 1459, Servia from a tributary principality to an Ottoman province; in 1463 Bosnia was annexed; in 1461, the Christian empire of Trebizond, in Asia; in 1466, Caramania; in 1479, the Peloponnesus, which at that time belonged to the Venetians. In 1480 Otranto, in Italy, was captured; and the design was openly avowed to conquer all of Western Europe and to exterminate Christianity. But Mohammed's death, in 1481, put an end to these schemes; Otranto was soon abandoned, and no further progress was ever made west of the Adriatic. The conquests of Mohammed gave to the Turkish empire about the same extent it had before the late Eastern war. In the whole of the Balkan peninsula only the small mountain district of Montenegro has kept its independence to our own times. Selim the Inflexible (1512-19) warred against Mohammedan enemies, and annexed Syria and Egypt to his dominions. From the last of a line of nominal caliphs Selim obtained a cession of his rights, and ever since the Ottoman sultans have been acknowledged as chiefs of their religion by all Mussulmans of the Sunnite sect. During the reign of Suleiman II (1519-66) the empire attained the greatest extent it has ever had. The larger portion of Hungary was annexed; a Turkish pasha ruled at Buda; and the princes of Transylvania,

Moldavia, and Wallachia became vassals of the sultan. Rhodes was taken from the Knights of St. John, and a large tract of land in Asia from the Persians. With the death of Suleiman the decline of Turkish power began. The reign of Selim II, the Drunkard (1566-74), was marked by the first great reverse of the Ottoman arms—the overthrow of the Turkish fleet by the fleets of Spain and Venice at the battle of Lepanto, in 1571. No lasting conquests of importance were made from this time, except the islands of Cyprus and Crete. The frontier on the north towards Hungary, and in later times towards Russia, went steadily back. The succession of great rulers was stopped. The powers of the sultan became less, the power of the pashas greater. In 1622 a sultan was, for the first time, murdered. In the latter half of the 17th century the Turks began to lose their hold on Hungary. The battle of St. Gotthard, in 1664, was the first great overthrow of the Turks by land. At the end of the 17th century the Turks had been at war with all their Christian neighbors, and they had lost territory at all points except one. In a war against Poland they had gained Podolia; they had lost, besides Hungary, the Peloponnesus, and Azof. All of these territories, inclusive of Podolia, were given up by the treaties in 1699 and 1700. The peace of Carlowitz, in 1699, marks a point in the decline of the Ottoman power, and the Turks were for the first time compelled to treat with the Christian powers of Europe on equal terms. The wars against Austria, which, with breaks from time to time, had gone on since the battle of Mohacz, 1526, by which the Turks established their rule over Hungary, were ended by the peace of Sistova in 1791. The result was that Hungary was freed from the Turk, but that Servia and Bosnia were left in his clutches. The frontier established by that peace has remained almost unchanged. The most dangerous of all the foreign enemies of Turkey proved to be Russia. The wars between Russia and the Turks began in the middle of the 17th century, and the two countries have ever since appeared as irreconcilable hereditary foes whose interminable conflict could only be ended by the destruction of the one or the other. The wars between Russia and Turkey put oil a very distinctive character when Peter the Great, in 1696, took Azof, the key of the Black Sea. From the time that Mohammed the Conqueror took the Genoese possessions in the Crimea, the Black Sea had been wholly under the power of the Turks. When Azof fell into the hands of the Russians, it remained for a great time the point of contention between the two countries. A new stage in the history of these wars is marked by the famous treaty of Kainarji of 1774, which ended the first war of Catherine II against the Turks. This treaty for the first time brought the

Ottoman power into some measure of dependence. It gave Russia a firm foothold on the Black Sea, and the important right to remonstrate in behalf of Wallachia and Moldavia, in case of any breach of their privileges by the Turks.

The most prominent feature in the Turkish history of the 19th century is the successful revolt of the subject Christian nations against the Ottoman power. This war of independence began in Servia in the first years of the new century. It was at first a rising against local tyrants who defied the authority of the sultan, but it soon became a war of independence. In 1826 the independence of the country was recognised by Turkey, which was only to receive an annual tribute, and for some time retained the right of keeping garrisons in certain fortresses. The Greek war of independence began in 1821. Finding himself unable to subdue both Greece and Servia, the sultan had to apply for help to his rebellious vassal, pasha Mehemet Ali of Egypt; but the outrages of the Egyptians led to an interference by England, France, and Russia, who, in 1827, in the treaty of London, agreed to make Greece free; destroyed, in November, 1827, at the battle of Navarino, the Turkish and Egyptian fleet, and compelled the sultan to agree to the treaty of London. In the treaty of Adrianople (1829), Turkey had not only to acknowledge the independence of Greece, but the almost complete independence of Moldavia and Wallachia, whose hospodars thereafter held office for lifetime, and to cede several fortresses on the coast of the Black Sea to Russia. Mahmud II (1808-40) was desirous of introducing important reforms, and in 1826 exterminated the Janizaries; but while his reforms did little good to the Christians, they set his Mohammedan subjects against him. There were Mohammedan revolts in Albania and Bosnia, which were put down in 1831 and 1832; but more important was the rebellion of Mehemet Ali of Egypt, who conquered Syria and other Asiatic possessions of the sultan, and seemed to threaten the very existence of the empire, when (1840) four of the great Christian powers of Europe concluded the treaty of Buda-Pest, and compelled Mehemet Ali to give up his Asiatic conquests. In the Crimean war (1853-55), Turkey would probably have been crushed by Russia but for the interference of England, France, and Sardinia in its behalf. By the treaty of peace in 1856, the powers which signed it—France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Sardinia—declared that the Sublime Porte was admitted to partake in the advantages of public law and the European concert. This concession was made to the Porte in recognition of the *hatti-hamayum*

(Feb. 18, 1856), a proclamation which promised to the Christians equal civil rights, but which the Porte found itself no more able to carry out than a preceding reformatory edict, the *hatti-sherif* of Gulhane of 1853. The approaching collapse of Turkey became more and more apparent. Terrible massacres of Christians in Damascus and Mount Lebanon led, in 1860, to a French intervention. In 1861 Moldavia and Wallachia united themselves, in spite of the treaty of Paris and of the protest of the Porte, into one state, called Roumania. A powerful impulse was given to the aspiration of the Christians for freedom by the complete victory of the nationality principle in Italy and Germany. As the Italians and Germans had re-established an Italian kingdom and a German empire, thus the Greeks of Turkey expressed a wish for a union with Greece, the Servians began to dream of the re-establishment of a large Servian empire, the Bulgarians of a Bulgarian kingdom, the Roumanians of severing the last tie of connection with Turkey. The first movement in this direction was the insurrection in Crete in 1866, which was suppressed in 1869. The powers which had signed the treaty of Paris held a special conference and recognised the demands of the Porte as just. In 1867 the demand of Servia that the Turkish garrisons be withdrawn from all the Servian fortresses was granted. In 1872 the sultan conceded to the khedive of Egypt two important attributes of sovereignty, the direct hereditary succession and the authorization to make loans. On July 6, 1875, an insurrection broke out in Herzegovina, which gradually kindled the great Eastern war. A series of joint steps were taken by the great powers of Europe to induce the Porte to concede the reform demanded by the Christian insurgents. The most important were, the note of count Andrassy of Dec. 30, 1875; the Berlin Memorandum of May 14, 1876; the Constantinople Conference from December, 1876, to January, 1877; and the London Protocol of March 21, 1877. On April 24 Russia declared war, and at the beginning of 1878 Turkey was utterly crushed. In the peace of San Stefano of March 3, 1878, Turkey had to recognize the entire independence of Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro, to cede some additional territory to Servia and Montenegro, and to consent to the establishment of an independent principality of Bulgaria. In the case of Bulgaria, these stipulations were considerably modified by the treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, as has already been stated. Bosnia and Herzegovina were placed under Austrian administration, and to Greece the annexation of some Greek districts in Southern Turkey was promised. The introduction of the reforms formally demanded by the great powers of Europe was again promised, and their execution placed

under the guarantee of the great powers. A few weeks before (June 4, 1878), Turkey had concluded a secret treaty with England, which assumed a protectorate over the Asiatic dominions of the sultan as long as Russia would not return its conquests in Armenia. In return, Cyprus was placed under English administration, and the Porte pledged itself to carry through administrative reforms in the Asiatic possessions. Thus Turkey appeared in an entirely helpless condition, and, so far as its European possessions were concerned, in a state of total decay. Among the European powers, only one—the Tory government of England—occasionally used its influence in behalf of the Turkish government. The fall of the Tory ministry in 1880, and the access to power of the Liberal party, which, during the war, had openly expressed its sympathy with the Christian nationalities of the Balkan peninsula, especially with the Greeks, deprived the Mohammedan government of its last hope. As the Turks had been unable to agree with the Greek government about the promised rectification of frontier, the powers which had signed the treaty of Berlin held another special conference at Berlin in June, 1880, and designated the districts which, in their opinion, should be ceded to Greece. The vital power of Turkey appears to be exhausted. A constitution drawn up by Midhat Pasha, and proclaimed Dec. 23, 1876, which promised to the population very extensive rights, failed to make any impression either at home or abroad. The Parliament which met in March, 1877, attracted more attention by its novelty than by its work.

III. *National Characteristics and Governmental Policy.* — Comparing Turkey with the other states of Europe, we are struck with one very remarkable distinction. In all the other countries of Europe the bulk of the people have learned that they have a common country, and that, however widely their opinions may differ, and however much they may dislike the existing government, they have important interests in common. The Turks have never become a nation. After subjecting many tribes of different race and religion, the exclusive aim of the sultans has been to keep them in subjection, and to extort from them as high a tribute as possible. The effect of Turkey's rule has therefore been most blighting upon every interest of her subjects. Morally, socially, economically, and politically, her dependencies have sunk, under the combined influence of a false, fanatical, and sensual religion, a bigoted, selfish, and imbecile regime, and an ignorant, fatalistic, and effete philosophy, to the lowest possible point of civilized communities. Corruption reigns in every department of state, and

superstition in every form of society. The ruling class, being Turks and Moslems, feel no sympathy with the natives, who are largely Christian and of different races from themselves. Extortion, bribery, chicanery, and treachery have for ages characterized the government, until it has become a festering ulcer and a burning shame upon the face of Europe. But for the intrigues and jealousies among the other European powers, each of which has been anxious to outwit the rest in seizing upon the spoils of "the Sick Man's estate," Turkey would have been dismembered long ago by foreign interference, or have collapsed in utter ruin by its internal rottenness. England has been largely chargeable for maintaining, by her diplomatic policy, this eyesore and blot upon the map of the world.

Several large territories are but very loosely connected with the empire. Tunis, in Africa, considers itself as a vassal state of the sultan, but without any definite obligation, not even that of paying an annual tribute. Formerly there were two other states of this class, Algeria and Tripoli; but the former has been conquered by France, and the latter has recently come under the direct authority of the sultan. The vassal states which had only to pay an annual tribute, and were otherwise autonomous, were, in 1878, Roumania and Servia, in Europe; Samos, in Asia; and Egypt, in Africa. In 1878 Roumania and Servia became entirely independent, and Bulgaria was erected into a tributary vassal state. In the autonomous province of Eastern Roumelia, the power of the sultan has been almost reduced to the right of appointing a governor.

By the old law of succession, which has been left unchanged by the constitution of 1876, the crown is inherited, according to seniority, by the male descendants of Othman, sprung from the imperial harem. The harem is considered a permanent State institution. All children born in the harem, whether offspring of free women or of slaves, are legitimate and of equal lineage; but the sultan is succeeded by his eldest son only when there are no uncles or cousins of greater age. It has not been the custom of the sultans for some centuries to contract regular marriages. A special feature attending the accession of new sultans to the throne has been the slaughter of brothers and other near kinsfolk who were feared as rivals. Until very recently the will of the sultan was not limited by any law. The precepts of the Koran were regarded as the fundamental law of the empire. The legislative and the executive authority were exercised in the name of the sultan by the grand vizier as head of the temporal government, and the Sheik el-Islam as the head of the Church. The constitution of 1876

pretended to make the sultan a constitutional monarch and to provide for the exercise of the legislative and judicial powers after the model of the West European states; but the constitution thus far (1880) is almost a dead letter. Several Christians, however, have of late held the position of Minister of State. The financial affairs of the government are in a condition of thorough and hopeless disorganization, and the time of the empire's complete dissolution cannot be distant.

IV. Mohammedanism. — The Turks have been a Mohammedan people from the 10th century, and have ever since been the banner-bearer among the Mohammedan states. The sultan is regarded as the head of the Sunnite Mohammedans, *SEE SUNNITES* not only in Turkey, but as far' as the Sunnite form of Mohammedanism extends. Church and State are so intimately united in Turkey that the judicial and the priestly power are vested in the same officer, the *Ulema*, who regards the Koran as the sole authority for the decision of ecclesiastical as well as civil causes. "The administration of justice in Turkey is now divided into two parts — that of the *Sheri*, wherein all judges are Mussulmans, and that of the *Nizamiyeh*, composed of both Christians and Mussulmans. The head of all the courts of the *Sheri* is the Sheik el-Islam, who sanctions all their judgments. The judicatory of the *Sheri* is composed of a high court of appeal (*Arzodacy*), divided into two chambers (*Sudur*), one for Turkey in Europe, and one for Asia. At the head of each is a *cazi-asker*, literally military judge. The *cazi-asker* is assisted by fourteen honorary chief justices. In the hierarchy of the *Ulema* the mollahs rank next to the *cazi-asker*, and after them the cadis. The first in rank are the mollahs of Constantinople, nine in number, and who sit in the court *Sheri*, at the capital, for a year, being taken in turn from the body of the mollahs. At its head is the mollah of Stamboul. The second in rank is the *Mevlevizet*, which numbers fifty-seven titularies. The mollah, when on duty, serves for only a year, and then returns to the roll" (Baker, *Turkey*). Turkish education, until recently, was also in close connection with the State religion. It was organized by sultan, Mohammed I (1451-81), the greatest soldier statesman that the Ottoman empire has produced. He established elementary schools called *mektebs*, scattered over his empire in every town and in almost every Mohammedan village, and numerous public-schools or colleges of the higher order, which were called *medresses*, in distinction from the *mektebs*, or elementary schools. The *mediesses* went through ten regular courses of grammar, syntax, logic, metaphysics, philology, the science of tropes, the science of style, rhetoric,

geometry, and astronomy. The taker of a degree in these subjects received the title of *danishmend*, which, has now been replaced by the term *sofia*. The degree entitles him to the mastership of one of the minor public schools; but in that case he renounces the prospect of becoming a member of the 'Ulema, or of any of the higher educational appointments. For this it is necessary to go through a still further course of study, and to pass several examinations. Incentives to work are given in the honors and endowments, which are conferred. The Ulema supplies all the professors of the high-schools, who are called *muderris*, and from the; same order are chosen all the ministers of justice, including the *cazi-askers*, the *mollahs*, and the *cadis*. The actual priesthood of Turkey takes a very inferior position in the State. The ministers of public worship are called *imaums*, who officiate at public prayers, and *sheiks*, or preachers. But the fact that the appointments to the priesthood are allotted to the holders of minor degrees does not mark, on the part of the Turks, any want of respect for their faith. It only arises in consequence of the legal profession being so intimately connected with the Church as expounders of the law of the Koran that they, in fact, form the senior branch of the hierarchy. Dervishes, or Mohammedan monks, are very numerous and are divided into a number of sects. *SEE DERVISH*. The *Vacouf*, or Church property, which belongs to the mosques and other religious institutions and to benevolent foundations, is administered by a special department of the State called the *Evkaf*, and consists of two classes: 1st Property or its produce actually belonging to such ecclesiastical establishments, and held and received on their account by the *Evkaf*; and 2nd. Property owned by private persons, but lapsing, in default of direct heirs of the owner, to the *Evkaf*, and subject, in the meantime, to a small yearly contribution payable to that department; but an owner of *Vacouf* property having no direct heirs is not debarred from selling it to a person having such heirs, and so preventing it, for the time, from falling into the *Evkaf*. By a recent law a private person holding *Vacouf* property can, on payment of certain fees to the government, have it converted into what is called *mulkieh*, a title which gives the holder the fee simple of the land, to do with it as he pleases, to leave it by will, and, in default of his doing so, it passes to his next heir. Trustworthy statistics on the religious denominations of Turkey cannot yet be obtained. E.G. Ravenstein, in an article on the population of Russia and Turkey in the *Journal of the Statistical Society* (Lond. 1877), estimates the total population of European Turkey, exclusive of Roumania and Servia,

but inclusive of Bosnia and Bulgaria, at 9,661,000, which he distributes-as follows among the religious denominations:

EUROPE.

Turkish Mohammedans	1,767,500	
Mohammedans of other nationalities	2, 479,500	
	Total Mohammedans	4, 247,000
Greek Church	4,705,450	
Armenians	89,000	
Roman Catholics	426,000	
Protestants	10,000	
	Total Christians	5,230,450
Jews		78,000
Gypsies		104,750
	Total	9,660,200

ASIA.

Turks	6,973,500	
Other Mohammedans	6,299,850	
	Total Mohammedans	13,273,350
Greek Church	1,484,868	
Armenians	735,100	
Roman Catholics	100,100	
Protestants	10,450	
Maronites, etc.	487,000	
	Total Christians	2, 817,518
Jezides and Kizilbashi		62,000
Jews		106,000
Gypsies		67,000
	Total	16,325,868

A Servian statistician, Jakshitsh, gives the following estimates of the population of European Turkey: *Christians* in Turkey proper, 2,484,501; in Eastern Roumelia, 559,776; in Bosnia, 780,276; in Bulgaria, 1,196,248;

total; 5,020,801. *Mohammedans* in Turkey proper, 1,883,127; in Eastern Roumelia, 359,434; in Bosnia, 400,635; in Bulgaria, 760,267; total, 3,403,463. *Jews* in Turkey proper, 55,018; in Eastern Roumelia, 3969; in Bosnia, 6968; in Bulgaria, 8959; total, 74,914. Total population of European Turkey, 8,499,178. According to these authorities, the aggregate number of Mohammedans in European and Asiatic Turkey may be estimated at from 15,700,000 to 16,500,000, that of Christians of all denominations at about 8,000,000, that of the Jews at about 200,000. The aggregate population of the African dependencies, owing to the rapid expansion of the Egyptian dominions of late years, was estimated, in 1880, at 20,500,000, nearly all of whom, with the exception of the Copts of Egypt, are Mohammedans. *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.*

V. *The Christian Churches of Turkey.* — Although the Turks, after the conquest of the Balkan peninsula, displayed all the horrors of Oriental despotism, they did not aim at the extermination of the Christian religion. There is probably no country of Christian Europe which has not imposed, at some time in the course of its history, more severe penalties upon the profession of a dissenting Christian creed than the Turks have done upon the profession of Christianity. The Christians, in their civil relations, found themselves greatly oppressed, but the Turks did not meddle with the internal affairs of the churches. The influence which they usurped by the appointment of the high dignitaries in the Eastern churches was inspired by considerations not of power or proselytism, but of greed. The social advantages which an apostasy to Islam involved gradually induced nearly the whole population of Albania, the entire nobility of the Bosnians, and large numbers of the Bulgarians and other Christian tribes to adopt the religion of the conquerors; but the immense majority of the population of the European dominions of Turkey and large numbers in Asia continued to adhere to the several Christian churches. As the military power of Turkey began to wane, Russia, France, and other powers claimed, and received by treaty, the right of protectorate over the Turkish subjects professing the national religions of the several European countries. In 1839 the sultan, by the *hatti-sherif* of Gulhane, proclaimed the equality of Christians and Moslems before the law. The provisions of this charter of religious liberty were renewed and extended by sultan Abdul-Mejid in the charter called the *hatti-humayum*, promulgated in February, 1856. The renewal of the charter was mentioned in the treaty of Paris as the consideration on which the powers admitted Turkey to the company of European states, and

guaranteed to it its rights as an independent and inviolable power. The new Turkish constitution of December, 1876, promised to the professors of all religious denominations full equality of civil rights. In the first Turkish Parliament, which met in 1877, all the religions of the empire were fairly represented. Thus among the deputies returned from Constantinople were five Turks, four Christians, and one Jew; and of the Christians, one was a Greek, one a Roman Catholic Armenian, and two Gregorian Armenians. In 1878 the treaty of Berlin (art. 62) placed the establishment of the principle of religious liberty to its fullest extent under the guarantee of all the great powers of Europe. When the Turks completed the conquest of the Balkan peninsula, they designated the aggregate of the Christian subjects as *rajah* (herds), while the different tribes were distinguished as *millet* (nation). The Mohammedan Turks were, however, so strongly inclined to confound Church and State that they viewed the several millets as so many religious communions. Mohammed II, after the capture of Constantinople, made the patriarch of that city the secular head of all the rajah belonging to the Orthodox Eastern or Greek Church. The civil functions of the patriarch were shared in different degrees by the subordinate bishops, and thus the entire hierarchy of the Greek Church appeared as the actual administrator of the civil interests of the people, and as such were held by the Porte responsible for the loyalty of the population. Besides the millet of the Greeks, there are others for the Armenians, United Armenians, Latins, Protestants, and Jews. Their organization is similar to that of the Greeks. The secular jurisdiction of the Armenian patriarch includes the Jacobites. For various statistical statements of the present Christian population of Turkey, see above.

1. *The Greek Church.* — When the Turks took, in 1453, possession of Constantinople, the foremost episcopal see of the Eastern Church became subject to their rule. The patriarch of Constantinople had gradually become for the Eastern Church what the patriarch of Rome became for the West. **SEE GREEK CHURCH.** When the termination of ecclesiastical communion between the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople became a fixed fact, all of the Orthodox Eastern churches looked upon the patriarch of Constantinople as the most eminent bishop of the Orthodox churches, although many of them, like the churches of Russia, were entirely independent of his jurisdiction. As long as there was a shadow of hope that the Eastern Roman empire would be aided by the Catholic Church of Western Europe in its resistance to the advance of the Turks, several

patriarchs of Constantinople had shown a readiness to reunite with Rome. To the bulk of the clergy and the laity the idea of such a reunion was extremely distasteful, and after the conquest of Constantinople it was entirely abandoned. The sultans claimed the same rights with regard to the appointment of the patriarchs that had been possessed by the Eastern or Byzantine emperors, and the Eastern Church submitted to the demand. Georgius Scholarins, who was elected patriarch soon after the conquest of Constantinople, and assumed the name of Gennadius, accepted from sultan Mohammed II the investiture as patriarch of New Rome. The sultan showed, however, but little respect for the authority of the patriarch, and finally compelled him to resign, notwithstanding the petitions of the faithful in his behalf. The next patriarch, Joasaph, was banished by the sultan because he had refused to acknowledge the unlawful marriage of a Mohammedan minister with the daughter of an Athenian prince. Patriarch Simon, also living in the second half of the 15th century, was the first who offered to the sultan one thousand ducats for the patriarchate. This money for the confirmation of the new patriarch is called *kharatzion* or *peskesion*; it has not only been always paid since, but the amount was constantly increased, and the Turkish government generally showed a disposition to sell the patriarchate to the highest bidder, and to vacate it as often as possible. Only a few of the patriarchs were allowed to remain in office for a long term; generally, after holding it for a short term, they were either compelled to resign, or they were banished, throttled, or degraded. The habit of the patriarch to purchase the confirmation by the sultans had a most disastrous influence upon the Church. The Simonistic corruption descended from the patriarchs to the archbishops and bishops, who had to pay heavy sums for their confirmation, and, in return, tried to indemnify themselves by extorting as much money as possible from their people. For political reasons, the external form of the Church was changed as little as possible; but in consequence of the corruption prevailing in the high places, the Church fell into great decay. The lower clergy, who were generally destitute of a higher education, showed but little sympathy with the people; and when the government conferred upon them some privileges, they looked with indifference upon the heavy taxes which oppressed the laity. Little resistance was even made by the clergy to the cruel institution of the Janizaries, a military corps formed by the children of Christians, who were taken away from their parents, educated as fanatical Moslems, and used for the compulsory extension of Mohammedanism. In some of the provinces the power of the Christian people to resist the proselytism of the Turks

gradually relaxed. Especially was this the case in Albania, where the Christian population decreased from 350,000 to 50,000, during the period from 1620 to 1650. Among the apostates were even many priests and monks. The subsequent history of the Greek Church of Turkey does not offer many points of great interest. The growing power of Russia extorted from the Ottoman Porte in a number of treaties the official promise to protect the Christian religion and the Christian churches, and made itself chiefly felt in behalf of the coreligionists of Russia, the Orthodox Eastern Church. Between Constantinople and Rome an entire estrangement continued to exist. At the beginning of the 17th century the patriarch Neophytus II of Constantinople was believed to be favorable to a union with Rome; but no formal negotiations were opened, and none of the following patriarchs of Constantinople has shown any leaning in that direction. All the invitations and overtures that were made by the popes met, in Constantinople, with a firm and decided refusal: thus, in 1848, an invitation from Pius IX, addressed to the entire Eastern Church, for a corporate union with Rome, and another in 1869, addressed by the same pope to the Greek bishops to attend the Vatican Council, were promptly and firmly declined in Constantinople and throughout the Greek Church. In the Asiatic part of Turkey the patriarch Athanasius IV of Antioch, who was elected in 1686, joined the communion of Rome, and was followed by a part of the clergy and laity. Thus arose the United Greek Church of Turkey, *SEE GREEK CHURCH, UNITED*, which, from Syria, spread over all parts of the Turkish Empire. In the 16th century both the Lutheran and the Calvinistic theologians endeavored to establish friendly relations with the Greek Church, and entered into correspondence with several patriarchs of Constantinople. The Lutheran attempts were never attended with any success. The Calvinists completely gained over to their side one of the most gifted patriarchs that have ever occupied the see of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar (q.v.), who went so far as to transmit to Geneva the form of a Calvinistic confession of faith; but, with the violent death of the patriarch, who was strangled, and whose memory was execrated by the Oriental patriarchs, this attempt, too, came to an end, and the Greek Church in Turkey, as well as in other countries, has kept aloof from all corporate negotiations with Protestant churches. In the 19th century the attempts made by the more congenial Anglican churches of the British isles and the United States to establish intercommunion with the various Episcopal churches of the East led to friendly correspondence between the patriarchs of the Greek Church, on the one hand, and the archbishop of Canterbury

and other Anglican bishops, on the other. At the union conferences held at Bonn, Germany, in 1874 and 1875, between Oriental, Anglican, and Old-Catholic theologians, the Greek Church of Turkey was also represented by several theologians. *SEE RUSSIA.*

Until the establishment of the independence of Greece, the Turkish empire comprised nearly all the Greek churches of the world, except those of Russia and Austro-Hungary. Among the bishops of the Greek Church the patriarch of Constantinople holds the highest rank. He alone is invested by the Turkish government with the attributes of civil head of the entire Church. In regard to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he is, however, only the head of the patriarchate of Constantinople; the other three patriarchs (of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria), as well as the metropolitan of Cyprus and the abbot of Mount Sinai, being independent of him. The three patriarchs named receive in their *beraat*, or official decree of confirmation, the same rights and privileges as the patriarch of Constantinople; each of them has his own patriarchal synod, which fills the see in case of vacancy. An attempt made by the patriarch of Constantinople to appoint the patriarchs of the three other sees led, from 1843 to 1845, to a violent controversy between the patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarchal Synod of Jerusalem, in which the latter remained victorious. The three patriarchs communicate, nevertheless, with the Turkish government through the patriarch of Constantinople, and are not even' allowed to come to the capital without his permission. The aggregate territory of these three patriarchates is, however, small, and all the remainder of the Greek churches of Turkey was until recently under the immediate jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. The' establishment of the kingdom of Greece, in 1821, virtually severed the connection of the churches of the kingdom with the patriarch of Constantinople, on whom they had formerly been dependent. The entire independence of the Church of Greece was, however, not proclaimed until 1833, when a synod of the bishops of Greece met for this purpose at Nauplia, and the formal recognition of the independence by the patriarch of Constantinople did not take place until 1850. Servia and Roumania were virtually as independent of the patriarch of Constantinople in ecclesiastical affairs as they were of the sultan in politics. The establishment of their entire political independence, in 1878, entails the complete severance of their ecclesiastical connection with Constantinople. The Bulgarians, although agreeing in doctrine with the Eastern Orthodox Church, were, until 1767, independent of the jurisdiction

of the patriarch of Constantinople, having a primate and patriarch of the national Bulgarian Church at Ochrida; but in 1767 the last patriarch abdicated, and, by the joint efforts of the Turkish government and the patriarch of Constantinople, the Bulgarian Church was not only placed under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Greek patriarch, but entirely denationalized. Their bishops and priests were dismissed, their sees and parishes were occupied by Greeks, their monasteries and schools were seized, and the revenues appropriated by the Greek communities; but the greatest blow of all was struck in the elimination of the Bulgarian language and literature from all the educational establishments. A strong educational movement for re-establishing the rule of the Bulgarian language in school and Church set in about 1840. It made at once rapid and steady progress in the province of education, and at length, in 1870, led to the reorganization of a national Bulgarian Church. Notwithstanding the most desperate opposition to the Bulgarian movement by the patriarch of Constantinople and the Greek Fanar, the Porte found it necessary to yield to the Bulgarians so far as to issue a firman which constituted, under the title of *The Bulgarian Exarchate*, a separate spiritual administration, comprising in its jurisdiction the towns and districts of Rustchuk, Silistria, Shumla, Tirnova, Sophia, Vratcha, Lovtcha; Widdin, Nish, Kustenji, Samarkov, Veles (with the exception of about twenty villages and three towns), the sanjak of Slivmia (except a few villages), the district of Sisopolis, the town of Philippopolis, the district of Stanimaka (with the exception of a few villages), and the metropolitan diocese of Philippopolis (except a few monasteries). The firman further provided that the powers of the exarchate be defined by an organic code, which was to be in conformity on all points with the established laws and religious principles of the Orthodox Church; but to exclude entirely, on the other hand, all interference, direct or indirect, on the part of the patriarch, with monastic affairs, and more especially with the election of the exarch and the bishops. The exarch was to be named by imperial *berat*. He was to be bound, in conformity with ecclesiastical rules, to commemorate the name of the patriarch of Constantinople, and the synod of the exarchate was to be bound to obtain the holy oils in use in the Church from the patriarchate of Constantinople. Although the patriarch of Constantinople at first excommunicated all who availed themselves of the firman and connected themselves with the Bulgarian exarchate, the latter rallied more and more all members of the Orthodox Church who were of the Bulgarian nationality. The treaty of Berlin of 1878, which provided for the establishment of a tributary

principality of Bulgaria, and an autonomous province of Eastern Roumelia, in both of which countries the Bulgarians are the predominant race, made the bulk of the Bulgarian nation virtually independent of both the sultan and the patriarch of Constantinople, and cannot fail to complete, ere long, the organization of a national Bulgarian Church, comprising all the Orthodox Christians who speak the Bulgarian language, and enjoying an independence equal to the national churches of Russia, Greece, Roumania, and Servia. The jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople is thereby restricted to those Christians of the Eastern Orthodox Church who are of the Greek nationality. *SEE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.*

The office of the patriarch is intended to be held by the occupant for life; but the Porte may remove him on account of high-treason, and the synod may ask the Porte for his removal on account of bad administration and of heresy. Charges of the first class are very frequent; and as it is the pecuniary interest of Turkish officials to have the patriarchs removed as often as possible, they are always found willing to co-operate in such removal. Depositions of patriarchs are therefore very frequent. The patriarch is assisted by a "Holy Synod" (*Jemaat*), which consists of from ten to twelve metropolitans, besides the patriarch, its president. The patriarch has the right to select them, with the exception, however, of the metropolitans of Heraclea, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, and Chalcedon, who are members *ex officio*, and among whom, as they are so near the capital, the patriarchal seal, which consists of four parts, is divided. As the keepers of the patriarchal seal must always be present in Constantinople, the four metropolitans occupy a peculiar position, which the Porte recognises by specially enumerating them in the *berat* of the patriarch. The patriarch has no right to send them to their dioceses. He may increase the number of the members of the synod, but is not allowed to reduce it below ten. It is customary for eight of the metropolitans who are members of the synod to be present at Constantinople. They are called "the prominent" (ἔγκριτοι), and are addressed as the "holy old ones" (ἅγιοι γέροντες). In 1847, the Porte desired to add to the synod, for all questions not relating to the doctrine or discipline of the Church, three lay members—the grand logothete Aristarchi; the experience of Samos, Vogoridesi and a rich merchant of Chios, Psychari, generally called Messeyani; but the synod opposed the plan so strongly that it was abandoned by the Porte. According to a habit which is expressly recognised by the sultan, all the patriarchs and metropolitans of the Eastern Orthodox Church who happen to be present

at Constantinople have a right to take part in the debates and resolutions of the Holy Synod. For questions of minor importance, especially such as relate to the administration of the Church, the decision of the patriarch and the four metropolitans who keep the patriarchal seal is deemed sufficient. The Holy Synod is the supreme tribunal for the clergy of the Greek Church, and serves as a court of appeal from the decisions of the bishops. Without its consent, the patriarch can give no decision in ecclesiastical or temporal affairs, and appoint no bishop. The synod alone has judicial and punitive power over the patriarch; and the deposition of the patriarch by the Porte, except in cases of high-treason, takes place only at the request of the Holy Synod. The most important right of the synod is the election of a new patriarch. The synod regulates and distributes the ecclesiastical taxes, and keeps the seals of all the monasteries. It has its own seal, consisting of four pieces, one of which is kept by the patriarch of Constantinople, and the other three by metropolitans elected by the synod. The sessions of the synod are generally held on Sundays and holidays, after divine service. Most of its decrees need for their execution a firman of the sultan. When a new patriarch is to be elected, the members of the synod, and the archbishops and bishops present at the time in Constantinople, assemble at the synodicon, or patriarch's palace, which is situated in the Fanar, or Greek quarter, in order to nominate by ballot, in the presence of a commissary of the Turkish government, three candidates for the vacant see. All the candidates must be metropolitans. As soon as the nomination is made, it is communicated to the representatives of the Greek community, who are assembled in the vestibule of the synodicon. This assembly designates by acclamation, and the shout of ἄξιος (worthy), the candidate of its preference. The election, being thus completed, the minutes are signed by all present, and an official report is made to the Porte, which then orders the *berat* to be drawn up. This official *berat*, for which a large amount of money has to be paid, enumerates all the rights belonging to the patriarch and the synod. On the day after the election, the new patriarch officially visits the grand-vizier, who presents him with a magnificent suit of clothes, consisting of a *caftan* (a long silken robe), a cloak, a black capuchon, and a patriarchal hat; moreover, with a finely wrought patriarchal staff and a white horse. The patriarch pays also to the other ministers of the Porte an official visit. Soon after these visits follows the inthronization, an act of great simplicity, which is performed by the metropolitan of Heraclea. The ecclesiastical rights of the patriarch are very extensive. He appoints, with the concurrence of the synod, all

metropolitans and bishops. He has supreme jurisdiction in all affairs relating to marriage and wills. Complaints against bishops can be decided by the government only with the concurrence of the patriarch. The arrest of a Greek prelate requires the consent of the patriarch and the co-operation of his officers. He has the right, without restraint, to excommunicate any member of the church; to deny ecclesiastical burial, etc. He enjoys the privilege of consecrating the holy oil, and has in all dioceses the right of *the stauropogion*, i.e. the right, at the foundation of a church or a monastery, to erect a cross on the spot where the altar is to stand, and thereby to subject to his control such church or convent. The civil jurisdiction which the patriarch enjoys as the head of the "Greek nation" (which means, in the official language, all the members of the Eastern Church), is in some respects even more comprehensive because it extends also over the other patriarchal dioceses. This power, however, is on the wane. As has already been indicated, the non-Greek nationalities have either achieved their entire independence of Turkish rule, or, like the Bulgarians, have severed their ecclesiastical connection with the patriarch of Constantinople, whose jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as civil, will be restricted to the Church members of the Greek nationality. The patriarch has his own court, before which especially cases of minor importance are brought, not only between Greeks and Greeks, but also between Greeks and people of other churches, even between Greeks and Turks. An appeal can, however, be had from the patriarch's court to the Turkish courts. The revenue of the patriarch is considerable. He inherits the property of metropolitans, bishops, priests, monks, and nuns who die without legal heirs. If there are legal heirs, the persons named may bequeath to the patriarch up to one third of their property. Other sources of revenue are the fees for ordination, the tax on the installation of metropolitans and bishops, the annual contributions from the bishops and from the convents which are immediately subject to the patriarch, smaller contributions from each priest and each layman of his diocese, the fees of his chancery, fees for every marriage and burial, etc. The patriarch has the right to have all these dues collected by special commissaries, who, if necessary, can invoke the aid of the government officials. The patriarch is exempt from ordinary taxes, but has to pay a large sum annually to the government as a special tax, and to make frequent presents to the ministers. The patriarch is assisted in the administration of the patriarchate by a number of officers. They are divided into two choirs — one at the right, and the other at the left. The former consists of three sections, each of which embraces five persons, and is

therefore called a **πένταξ** . All these offices were formerly of great importance, and, with the exception of those which required an ordination or had the superintendence of convents, were in the hands of the noble Greek families, the so-called Phanariotes. The occupants had a vote at the election and deposition of the patriarch. At present, most of these offices are mere titles. The only officer who has still an important political position and considerable influence is the grand logothete (**μέγας λογοθέτης**), or the grand keeper of the seal. He is elected by the patriarch and Holy Synod from among the Greek notables for lifetime he is confirmed by the Porte, and can only be removed by the concurrent action of both powers. ‘The patriarchate conducts through him all negotiations with the Porte relating to its secular privileges; and all the official communications from the patriarch to the Porte pass through his hands. He has the right to countersign all synodal resolutions relating to the appointment of metropolitans and bishops, and to receive certain fees for drawing up the official documents. *SEE PATRIARCHS.*

The three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are not subject to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, but are co-ordinate to him. The *berat* by which they are appointed confers upon them the same rights, and each of them has a synod which has the same rights as the Synod of Constantinople. They are inferior to the patriarch of Constantinople only in so far as they have no civil jurisdiction. The patriarch of Alexandria has jurisdiction over the Greek churches of Egypt, Libya, Arabia, and Nubia; the patriarch of Antioch, who resides at Damascus, over those of Syria, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Isauria, and other Asiatic provinces; the patriarch of Jerusalem, who resides at Galata, a suburb of Constantinople, over those of Palestine. The aggregate territory of the three patriarchates is, however, but small compared with that of Constantinople. Metropolitans with suffragan bishops are rare in the Turkish empire. The name metropolitan or archbishop is generally only a title which confers a higher dignity than the title bishop, but not a greater jurisdiction. The title of metropolitan is especially given to the bishops of the provincial capitals. As bishops must be unmarried, they are generally taken from the monasteries. If a layman is to be ordained a bishop, he has first to take all orders up to priesthood, and then can receive the episcopal ordination only after the expiration of thirty days. The candidate must be thirty years of age, and at his ordination three bishops must be present. Bishops are bound to reside in their dioceses; and if a bishop is absent from

his diocese for more than six months, except it be by order of the patriarch, he is deposed. The bishop has entire control of the Church property of the diocese, and can impose taxes upon his diocesans. Without his permission, no convent can be built within the diocese. The revenue of metropolitans and bishops is derived from the same sources as that of the patriarch. They receive annual contributions from the priests and the laity of the diocese, besides fees and inheritances. The income of many bishops is considerable. The metropolitans and bishops have also an influential position in the political administration of the empire, as they are, in virtue of their office, members-of the administrative councils, by which the *valis* of the vilayets are assisted. In 1836, patriarch Gregory VI and the Holy Synod issued a circular in which all bishops were requested to establish in their dioceses an ecclesiastical committee, after the model of the one existing in Constantinople, for consulting on the spiritual interests of the dioceses. All the diocesan committees send reports to Constantinople, and thence receive advice. The committees consist of not less than three members, who are selected from among the educated, virtuous, and zealous clergy. One member of the committee has to examine the candidates for ordination and to instruct and guide the confessors. A second member has to superintend the printing and the sale of books, the ecclesiastical discipline, and the lives of the clergy. No book can be printed without his permission. The third member superintends education and preaching. The secular clergy are mostly uneducated and poor, and, to support themselves and their families, they often carry on some trade, cultivate a farm, and perform other manual labor. The parochial churches are maintained by the congregations, and on every Sunday and holiday collections are taken up for the purpose. The *koja bachi*, or chief of the congregation, administers the financial affairs, and has, in particular, to take care of the support of the priests, the churches, and the schools. No one can be admitted to a male or female convent without an examination, or before being ten years of age. Besides the monks and nuns who live in convents, there are eremites on Mount Athos, and anchorets in Macedonia. *SEE MONKS, EASTERN.*

The number of metropolitans and bishops who were subject to the patriarch of Constantinople before the churches of Roumania, Servia, and Bulgaria had severed their connection with him amounted, according to Silbernagl (*Veifassung sammflicher Kirchen des Orients* [1865]), to 131, of whom 92 belonged to Europe, 21 to Asia, and 18 to the provinces. In consequence of the decay of the Turkish empire, a very large number of

the dioceses are now no longer subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch, which, ere long, may be restricted to the dioceses in which the people are of the Greek nationality. Under the patriarch of Antioch were 12 dioceses, and to this patriarchate also belongs the archbishop of Cyprus, who is exempt, and has under his jurisdiction 5 suffragan bishops. Under the jurisdiction; of the patriarch of Jerusalem are 14 archbishops and bishops, under that of Alexandria, 4. The population, of the patriarchate of Alexandria is reported as only 5000 souls; that of Jerusalem as 15,000; while the patriarchate of Antioch comprises 29,000 families. The total population connected with the Greek or Orthodox Eastern Church of Turkey, after the great territorial changes made in 1878, was estimated at 3,800,000 (see *Appletons Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1878, art. "Greek Church"); but of this number a considerable part belongs to the Bulgarian dioceses of Eastern Roumelia, which have no longer any ecclesiastical communion with the patriarch of Constantinople. Of the convents of the Church, which are still numerous, the most celebrated are those on Mount Athos (q.v.). Of late, education has begun to make great progress among the population connected with the Greek Church. Two theological seminaries have been established, the one on the island of Chalki, near Constantinople, and the other at Jerusalem; and no one is henceforth to be appointed as bishop who has not been educated at one of these institutions, or is not fully up to the standard of the education there imparted. A flourishing teachers seminary, according to the German model, has been established at Salonica, in Macedonia. *SEE EASTERN CHURCH.*

2. The Armenian Church. — For more than three hundred years nearly two thirds of ancient Armenia has been under the rule of Turkey, *SEE ARMENIA*; and, therefore, although the head of the Church (the catholicos of Echmiadzin) is now a subject of Russia (q.v.), the large majority of the adherents of the Armenian Church are still to be found in Turkey. Among the Armenian bishops of Turkey, the patriarch of Constantinople occupies the highest rank; he is inferior only to the catholicos of Echmiadzin. An Armenian diocese was established at Constantinople as early as 1307. Archbishop Joachim, of Bursa, was raised to the rank of patriarch of Constantinople in 1461 by the sultan Mohammed II, and he was at the same time appointed the civil head of the Armenian nation. The patriarch is elected by the notables and the prominent clergymen of the Armenian community of Constantinople, and is confirmed by the Porte. Formerly the Armenian bankers had the ascendancy in this assembly; but in 1839 several

Armenian employees of the Turkish government obtained the leading influence. The patriarch is entirely dependent upon these laymen, who appoint a coadjutor, or have him removed by the Turkish government, whenever the please. The new patriarch has to make a profession of faith, which consists of nine articles, the eighth of which designates the patriarch, as the vicar of Christ. The *berat* which the patriarch receives from the Porte confers upon him a direct power over the priests and laity of his diocese. Like the catholicos, he has the right to ordain bishops and to consecrate the holy oil. With the exception of the patriarch of Jerusalem, he can appoint metropolitans and bishops throughout Turkish Armenia; remove, exile, and recall them; divide or unite their dioceses. The entire property of the Church is under his control; in the administration of it he is, however, limited by the lay synod, which consists of twenty members elected by the people and confirmed by the Porte. Moreover, he is assisted in the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions by a clerical synod consisting of his officials. As he has also civil jurisdiction, he has, like the Greek patriarch, his own court and a patriarchal prison. He is the civil head not only of the Armenian nation, but also of the Syrian Jacobites. All communications between the Turkish government and the Armenians pass through his hands; and even the Armenian patriarch of Sis and the bishops not directly subject to his jurisdiction receive their *berat* through him. Like the Greek patriarch, he enjoys a number of honorary rights and exemption from taxation, but, in return, has to pay an annual tribute to the Porte. His revenue consists chiefly of taxes of installation and annual contributions from bishops; fees for ordination, for the holy oil, for marriages; inheritances and donations. Besides the patriarch of Constantinople, the Armenian Church of Turkey has patriarchs at Sis, in the vilayet of Adana, at Jerusalem, and at Aghtamar, on the island of Van.

The first patriarch of Sis was elected in 1440, when the clergy of Sis, after the death of the catholicos Joseph III, feared lest the residence of the patriarch, which had been at Sis since 1294, might be removed to Echmiadzin. Without waiting for a general assembly of the Armenian bishops, the clergy of Sis hurriedly proceeded, conjointly with the people of Sis, to the election of a catholicos. The bishops and *vartabeds* met, however, in 1441, at Echmiadzin, and elected as catholicos the monk Kyriakos, who was almost generally recognised by the Armenian churches. In order to prevent a permanent schism, the privilege was conferred upon Sis to be governed by a patriarch, on condition, however, that he receive

the holy oil from the catholicos as a sign of his submission. The condition was accepted, and from that time Sis has had its own patriarchs. According to a concordat concluded between the catholicos of Echmiadzin and the patriarch of Sis, the jurisdiction of the latter was to extend over the Armenian churches of Cilicia, Syria, Egypt, and Palestine; but, as the bishop of Jerusalem made himself independent in the middle of the 17th century, his jurisdiction has since been limited to the Armenian churches of Armenia Minor, Cappadocia, and Cilicia. The patriarch of Sis has the title "Patriarch and Primate of Armenia Minor and the Armenians who are in Cilicia, Syria, and Palestine, Minister of the Right and of the Throne of St. Gregory the Illuminator."

The patriarchate of Jerusalem has been in existence since the middle of the 17th century, when the catholicos Philippos conferred upon the archbishop of Jerusalem the right of consecrating, himself, the holy oil; and the archbishop consequently assumed the title of patriarch, and began to ordain bishops. The patriarch of Jerusalem, however, ceased long ago to exercise these functions; and his powers have been greatly curtailed, as the patriarch of Constantinople calls him to account when he pleases. In order to guard as much as possible his own independence, the patriarch procures from the Turkish government his own *berat*, and supports in Constantinople an agent of his own. He has to pay an annual tribute, not only to the Porte, but to the pasha of Damascus. He is elected by his suffragan bishops, and has his residence in the monastery of St. James at Jerusalem, His income is derived from the same sources as that of the patriarch of Constantinople, the presents from the pilgrims to Jerusalem constituting an element of special importance.

In 1114 bishop David of Tornik made himself patriarch of Aghtamar, in Lake Van, and assumed the title catholicos. The schism has continued to the present day; but the patriarchate is of little importance, since its jurisdiction extends hardly any farther than Lake Van. The patriarch is elected by the bishops and clergy under his jurisdiction, and is supported by the revenue of the monastery on the island of Aghtamar.

The metropolitans, or archbishops, are not distinguished from the bishops by any greater jurisdiction, but only by some honorary rights. The catholicos can only be elected out of their number. The bishops are regularly elected from the unmarried vartabeds, and only occasionally, and by special permission of the catholicos or the patriarchs, from the monks,

since, according to the Church law, a monk is not to become a bishop. The bishop is generally elected by the clergy and the heads of families, and after the election he is presented for confirmation to the catholicos or the patriarchs, who appoint several (generally three) bishops for examining the candidate. It is required that he be fifty years of age, of legitimate descent for three generations, on both father's and mother's side, and well versed in the Holy Scriptures and the canonical law. Many of the metropolitans and bishops have no dioceses, but live in convents, and there hold the office of archimandrite. Many of them are at the same time vartabeds. The patriarch of Constantinople, according to the regulations made by the provincial council on Nov. 20, 1830, has under his jurisdiction 18 archbishops, or metropolitans, and 35 bishops. The patriarchate of Sis embraces three towns and forty villages. Towards the close of the 16th century the patriarch of Sis still had 23 archbishops and bishops under his jurisdiction. The diocese of the patriarch of Jerusalem embraces the churches of Palestine, Syria Akra, and Tripolis. His residence, in the monastery of Mar Yakub on Mount Zion, was built in the 11th century, belonged to the Armenians as early as 1238, and has been in their undisputed possession since 1666. Besides the patriarch, 5 bishops and more than 100 priests, live in the monastery. The total number of suffragan bishops is reported to be 14. The diocese of the patriarch of Aghtamar comprises two towns and thirty villages. In the second half of the 17th century he had under his jurisdiction from 8 to 9 bishops residing in the monasteries on the shore of Lake Van. The population connected with the Armenian Church is estimated at about 2,400,000, of whom about 400,000 are in the European dominions of Turkey. *SEE ARMENIAN CHURCH.*

3. Other Oriental Churches. — Besides the Greeks and Armenians, Turkey has two other Oriental churches the so-called *Nestorians* and *Jacobites*. Both have been fully treated in former volumes of this *Cyclopedia*. *SEE JACOBITES; SEE NESTORIANS.*

4. The Roman Catholic Church in, Turkey. — There are only a few tribes and congregations in the present dominions of the Turkish Empire, which have always been in connection with the Church of Rome. They are chiefly to be found in Albania. The foundation of other congregations dates from the time of the crusades, which established the Latin Church on a permanent basis in Syria, Palestine, and Cyprus. The rule of the Venetians in the Mediterranean Sea, and the commercial intercourse between the Balkan Peninsula and the Catholic nations of Western Europe increased the

number of Latin congregations in all the large cities of the empire. Finally, the unceasing efforts of the numerous missionaries which the Church of Rome has supported in all parts of the empire have won over fractions of all the various Oriental Christian denominations in which the empire abounds. These fractions have been allowed by the pope to retain a number of national and ecclesiastical peculiarities; and, while they have adopted the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, recognize the pope as the head of the Church Universal, and must be recognised themselves, in the fullest sense of the word, as part of the Roman Catholic Church, they appear, especially in consequence of the retention at divine service of a rite different from the Latin, as a kind of semi-independent division of the Church. A correct view of the actual strength of the Roman Catholic Church in the Turkish Empire is best obtained by reviewing the several rites separately.

The Latin *millet* embraces the Roman Catholics of all rites, except the United Armenians, who have their own civil head. The head of the Latin millet is a layman, who has the title *Vekil* (representative). He is assisted by four deputies of the Latin population, with whom he constitutes a permanent council called the Latin Chancery. The functions of this council are similar to those of the Greek patriarch.

(1.) *The Latin Rite.* — A Latin patriarchate was established at Constantinople in 1203, in consequence of the crusades. The occupant received a rank next to the pope. When Constantinople, in 1453, became the residence of the sultan, the Latin patriarchs transferred the seat of the patriarchate to Venice, and sent to Constantinople as their representative a vicar, who for a long time was only a monk. When the Catholics, in consequence of their increasing number, applied for a bishop, the Propaganda prevailed upon the patriarch to appoint an assistant bishop for Constantinople, and to pay him a regular salary. This bishop sometimes called himself patriarchal vicar, sometimes suffragan of the patriarch. After some time, the Propaganda found it necessary to appoint, in its turn, an apostolical patriarchal vicar. When, after the middle of the 17th century, the patriarch took up his residence at Rome, and the patriarchate of Constantinople became a mere title *in partibus infidelium*, which was conferred upon a prelate residing in Rome, the apostolical vicar was invested with full jurisdiction over all Catholics of the Latin rite. The population of his diocese, which extends over Thrace and the opposite coast of Asia Minor, is estimated at about 15,000. The larger portions of

the vicariate apostolic (formerly archbishopric) of Sophia, which had before the late war a Latin population of about 8000, and of the diocese of Nicopolis, which had a population of about 3000 are no longer under Turkish rule. Both the towns of Sophia and Nicopolis lie within the new principality of Bulgaria. A considerable portion of the archbishopric of Scopia, or Uskub, in Macedonia (now the western part of Roumelia) has been annexed to Servia. The whole diocese numbered before the war about 8000 Catholics of the Latin rite. Before the enlargement of the principality in 1878, the entire Roman Catholic population, numbering about 4000 persons, was included in the diocese of Belgrade and Semendria, *SEE SERVIA*, which belonged as a suffragan see to the ecclesiastical province of Antivari. The two vicariates apostolic of Moldavia and Wallachia, numbering in 1878 an aggregate Roman Catholic population of 114,000, now belong to the independent state of Roumania. The two vicariates of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which embrace the entire Roman Catholic population in the two provinces after which they have been called, were in 1878, by the treaty of Berlin, placed under Austrian administration. The Catholic population in these vicariates is numerous, especially in the northern and north-western districts of Bosnia, which before the conquest of the country by the Turks belonged to Hungary. The bishop of Bosnia fled, in consequence of the Turkish conquest, to Hungary, and established his residence at Deacovar. The occupant of this see still has the title bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium; but, as the Turks did not allow the jurisdiction of a foreign prelate, a vicar apostolic was appointed for the Catholics of the Turkish provinces. The Catholic population is estimated at about 140,000, that of Herzegovina at 42,000. In the European provinces remaining under Turkish rule the Roman Catholic Church has its greatest stronghold in Albania. There are two ecclesiastical provinces, in Albania, Antivari-Scutari and Durazzo. The latter has no longer any suffragan see, and consists only of the archdiocese of Durazzo. The archdiocese of Antivari and the diocese of Scutari were united in 1867, at which time they had an aggregate Roman Catholic population of about 33,000. The suffragan sees of Antivari and Durazzo are Sappa, Pulati, and Alessio, all in Albania, with an aggregate population of about 42,000. The diocese of Belgrade, in Servia, which has already been referred to, also belongs to this ecclesiastical province. The island of Scio, which belongs to Asiatic Turkey, has still an episcopal see, although the number of Roman Catholics is less than one thousand. It is a suffragan see of the archdiocese of Naxos, which belongs to the kingdom of Greece. In the Middle Ages, while this

island was under the rule of the Venetians, it was very flourishing, and the Roman Catholic population was numerous; but during the Greek war of independence nearly the entire Christian population was exterminated or sold into slavery. ‘The population of Cyprus, which in 1878 was placed under English administration, has rapidly increased during the last twenty years, and the Roman Catholic Church there numbers about 10,000 Catholics of the Latin and Greek rites, and 3000 Maronites. The flourishing city of Smyrna, in Asia Minor, has an archdiocese with about 15,000, nearly all of whom live in the capital. The archbishopric in this city was restored in 1818, and has now as a suffragan see the diocese of Candia, which, after being long conferred as a title *in partibus infidelium*, was restored in 1874. Besides these dioceses, the Church of Rome has an archbishop of Babylon, who resides at Bagdad. For the Roman Catholics of Jerusalem, who were formerly under the jurisdiction of Franciscan monks, an archbishopric was established in 1847, the occupant of which received the title of patriarch. The number of Roman Catholics in Palestine is estimated at about 15,000. Two “apostolic delegations” have been established, one called “Asiatic Turkey,” and embracing Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, and Armenia Minor, and the other Syria; and two apostolical vicariates, Aleppo and Asia Minor. The number of Roman Catholics in all these dioceses and ecclesiastical districts is small, but the bishops and the comparatively numerous orders display a considerable activity among the Christians of the Oriental rites. Several Catholic congregations have been collected in the commercial towns of the Arabian coast. They are administered by the apostolical vicar of Aden. The number of Catholics in the African dependencies of Turkey is small, but is increasing by immigration from Catholic countries of Europe, especially France and Italy. The French population residing in Egypt in 1877 amounted to 17,000, the Italian to 13,900, the Austrian to 6300; the large majority of all these are Catholics. The patriarchate of Alexandria, like that of Antioch in Asia, is now a mere title conferred upon an Italian prelate who resides in Rome. For the 25,000 Catholics of Tunis there is a vicar apostolic, and for the 5000 of Tripoli a praelect apostolic.

(2.) *The Armenian Rite.* — The Church of Rome began to gain a firm footing among the Armenians at the time of the crusades. *SEE ARMENIAN CHURCH.* Although the bulk of the nation always continued averse to a union with Rome, considerable numbers accepted the union, and, retaining the rites of the national Church, were organized into a

United Armenian Church. The Mechitarists (q.v.) have gained for this ecclesiastical community a greater literary distinction than can be claimed by any other Oriental communion. In regard to their political rights, the United Armenians were subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of the National Armenian Church until pope Pius VIII, in 1830, succeeded, with the aid of France and Austria, in making them independent. He erected at Constantinople the see of an archbishop primate for the Catholic Armenians, who was to be immediately subject to the Holy See. At the appointment of the first primate the pope appears to have taken into consideration the national wishes, and to have conceded to them the right to propose three candidates for the vacant see, from whom the pope chose one. In 1845 the pope appointed Anthony Hassun as successor of the primate, without consulting the nation. By a brief of April 30, 1850, pope Pius IX erected the towns of Ancyra, Artvin, Brousa, Erzfim, Ispahan, and Trebizond into episcopal sees of the United Armenians, and made them suffragans of the Armenian archbishop of Constantinople. The same brief appointed the bishops of these sees without consulting the nation. The United Armenian nation gave its consent to the establishment of the sees, but refused to recognize the bishops, because they had not previously been consulted. After some time, they yielded this point also, in order to prevent a schism; and the Turkish government, through the mediation of France, gave to the new bishops the necessary *berat*. When the pope established the see of an archbishop-primate at Constantinople, it was intended to confer upon him also the secular jurisdiction over the Catholic Armenians; but the Porte did not recognize the primate, and clothed, by a *berat* of 1831, a priest of the Order of Mechitarists with the *praefectura nationalis*. At the request of the French ambassador, after some time, a patriarch was appointed, but without any ecclesiastical functions, and having only those secular rights which are connected with the offices of the Greek and the Gregorian-Armenian patriarchs. The patriarch was to be elected by the United Armenian community, and to be confirmed by the Porte. He was to be assisted by a council of administration consisting of twelve members, who were likewise to be elected by the nation and to be confirmed by the Porte. The *berat* given to the patriarch extended his jurisdiction over all the United Eastern churches; but, in consequence of the religious controversies and inner dissensions which arose, the patriarch lost the right to represent the other Catholic nationalities at the Porte, and this right passed over to the *vekil* of the Latins. In 1866 Hassun, the archbishop-primate of Constantinople, was elected also patriarch of Cilicia, and assumed as such

the name Anthony Peter IX. Thus for the first time the highest ecclesiastical dignity of the United Armenians, the patriarchate of Cilicia, was united in one person with the civil headship of the United Armenian nation which was attached to the office of the primate of Constantinople. Simultaneously with confirming the new patriarch, pope Pius IX, in July, 1867, issued the bull *Reversurus*, which abolished the rights that hitherto the United Armenians had enjoyed with regard to the election of their patriarch and their bishops, and reserved for the pope rights hitherto not exercised by him. The opposition which at once manifested itself against this bull led in 1870 to an open schism. The opponents secured the assistance of the Turkish government; Hassun was exiled from Constantinople and from Turkey, and Kupelian chosen in his stead patriarch of the United Armenians. Besides, a number of bishops sympathizing with Kupelian were appointed for United Armenian dioceses. Notwithstanding repeated excommunications by Rome, the party headed by Kupelian remained in opposition to the pope, and assumed a position similar to that of the Old Catholics. in Western Europe. The Kupelians continued for many years to enjoy the patronage and active support of the Turkish government, but never succeeded in bringing over to their side the majority of the United Armenian laity. In 1876 a general amnesty, granted by the new sultan, Murad, on his accession to the throne, permitted Hassun to return to Constantinople. The schism continued, however, until 1899, when the efforts made by the papal delegates and the ambassador of France secured the submission of Kupelian and the other bishops of the opposition, and the entire end of the schism.

(3.) Other United Oriental Rites. — The Roman Catholic Church has also gained over the entire tribe of the Maronites, as well as portions of the Nestorians and the Jacobites in Asia, and of the Copts in Egypt. The United Nestorians are generally called Chaldeans, while the United Jacobites are designated United Syrians. These United Orientals have already been referred to in the articles *SEE MARONITES*; *SEE CHALDEANS*; *SEE COPTS*; *SEE JACOBITES*. The aggregate number of these religious denominations is not large. The number of Chaldeans (inclusive of the congregations in Persia) is estimated at from 20,000 to 30,000, that of the Syrians at from 9000 to 30,000, that of the Copts at 10,000. From 1870 to 1879 almost the entire community of the Chaldeans, including their patriarch, and, and all their bishops, was in a state of open rebellion against Rome. The patriarch desired to extend his jurisdiction

over the Christians of St. Thomas in British India, who, like the Chaldeans, are United Nestorians, and number about 100,000. Rome objected to this, desiring the Christians of St. Thomas to remain as heretofore under the jurisdiction of the vicar apostolic of Verapoli, who is of the Latin rite. The Chaldeans, moreover, protested against a Roman bull, issued in 1869, which forbade the patriarch to ordain bishops without the previous approbation of the pope. The Chaldeans had possessed and exercised this right from the time when they joined the communion of Rome, and they denied the right of the pope to abolish it without their consent. The patriarch and the bishops long resisted all the efforts made by Rome. One of their bishops visited India and prevailed upon a large portion of the Christians of St. Thomas to place themselves under his jurisdiction, and withdraw from that of the Latin vicar apostolic of Verapoli. At length, however, they relented in their resistance; and, after the death of patriarch and, the pope succeeded, in 1879, in securing the submission of the Chaldeans, and in the election of a new patriarch who declared himself willing to concede all the demands made by Rome. *SEE THOMAS (ST.), CHRISTIANS OF.*

(4.) *Protestantism.* — The most important Protestant churches in the Turkish empire are under the care of American missionary societies. The Rev. Pliny Fisk and the Rev. Levi Parsons were appointed by the American Board in 1818 missionaries to Palestine, and arrived at Smyrna in 1820. In the next year Mr. Parsons went to Jerusalem. A printing-press, designed to print books for, Turkey, was set up at Malta by the Rev. Daniel Temple in 1823, and was removed in 1833 to Smyrna. The Rev. Messrs. William Goodell and Isaac Bird were stationed at Beirut, where they began the Syrian mission in 1823, and opened schools the next year. In the same year the circulation of the Scriptures was forbidden by the government. The station at Jerusalem was suspended for nine years after the death of Mr. Fisk, in 1825, and the mission in Syria was suspended for a short time in 1828. It was soon resumed; the Rev. William Goodell was appointed to Constantinople, and a deputation was sent to visit the Armenian populations of the empire. Mr. Goodell visited the Armenian patriarch and ecclesiastics at Constantinople in 1831, and was at first welcomed by them. Schools were opened near Constantinople, and in 1834 stations were established at Trebizond and Brousa. The Greek and Armenian ecclesiastics became jealous of the progress of the missions, and a strong opposition was instigated against them; but in 1839 the new sultan made

the first of a series of concessions of religious liberty. In 1841 the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin opened a school at Bebek, near Constantinople, which was the beginning of what is now Robert College.

Churches were formally organized at Constantinople, Adabazar, and Trebizond in 1846. In the next year the Protestants were recognised by the government as an independent community, and in 1850 they were accorded a charter, placing them on the same basis as the other Christian communities of the empire. In 1856 the sultan granted, and in 1860 formally proclaimed, the *hutti-humayum* by which religious liberty and equal rights were conferred upon all classes. The missions in Syria were transferred to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in 1870. The churches of the American Board are distributed through a territory extending from Mosul, on the Tigris, to Monastir, in Macedonia. They are arranged into four missions, which are known as the Eastern Turkey (Armenia), Central Turkey (embracing the country south of the Black Sea), Western Turkey (Asia Minor), and European Turkey (Constantinople, Eastern Roumelia, Bulgaria, and Macedonia) missions, and include 90 churches, with 9890 members. The Presbyterian Church has 19 churches in Syria, with 1493 communicants. The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America has a mission at Latakia, with 171 members; the Free Church of Scotland has two missionaries, with 109 members; an independent Baptist missionary reports a few members, and the Friends have 145 members, all in Syria. The Rev. Samuel Gobat, an agent of the Church Missionary Society, went to Palestine in 1841, and was afterwards appointed Bishop of Jerusalem. He founded schools, which passed in 1877 under the control of the Church Missionary Society. This society returns 9 native Protestant congregations in Palestine, having 1616 members. Other societies engaged in Palestine are the London Jewish Mission, the Jewish Mission of Berlin, the Crischona Mission, and the Kaiserswerth Deaconesses Association.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has a mission in Bulgaria, begun in 1857, which included, in 1889, 12 stations, 116 members, and 51 probationers. The Disciples of Christ appointed a missionary to Constantinople in 1878. The mission of the United Presbyterian Church of North America in Egypt, after twenty-five years of development, has 9 churches and 947 communicants. The Protestant churches have in all in the empire about 385 preaching-places, more than 100 ordained missionaries with as many churches, and about 14,500 communicants. Besides these, the Jewish

mission societies of London, the Established and Free Churches of Scotland, and the Irish Presbyterian Church have stations and schools at Alexandria, Smyrna, Beirut, Constantinople, Salonica, Adrianople, and Rustchuk.

The Protestant religious work is supplemented by efficient schools of every grade. The American Board has 300 common-schools, 16 boarding-schools for girls, and 12 seminaries and training-schools, with a total attendance of more than 17,000 pupils; the Presbyterian Mission in Syria has 10 common-schools, 3 high-schools, and 3 female seminaries, with a total of 4950 pupils, a college, and a theological seminary; the Reformed Presbyterian Mission has 659 day-school scholars; the Society of the British Syrian Schools and Bible Mission, 30 schools and 3000 scholars; and in Syria proper, not including Palestine or Asia Minor, there are 11,000 children in evangelical schools, of whom about one-half are girls. In Palestine there are under the control of the Church missionary and other societies some 36 or 37 Protestant schools, which are attended by Mohammedan, Jewish, Druse and Samaritan pupils. The United Presbyterians in Egypt have 82 schools, with 5601 pupils, and 10 theological students in the training-schools. The English Church schools at Cairo and Damietta have 590 pupils. Of the Jewish mission-schools, those of the Church of Scotland return 1792 Jewish and other than British pupils. At the Syrian Protestant College of the Presbyterian Mission at Beirut instruction is given in the English language, while the Arabic is taught as a classic. The college has a faculty of 8 professors, 120 students, and a "medical department which had 23 students in 1877, and which has sent out several graduates, who are practicing as physicians in different parts of the empire. Robert College, near Constantinople, is not immediately connected with any Church organization, but is under Protestant direction, with a board of trustees composed of citizens of the United States. It has a faculty of 15 instructors, including American, European, Armenian, Bulgarian, Greek, and Turkish professors, and registered, in 187879, 151 students, among whom fifteen nationalities and all the religions prevailing in the empire were represented. Instruction is given in the usual collegiate studies and in fifteen ancient and modern languages. The college has a library of 6000 volumes. Central Turkey College, at Aintab, is also an independent Protestant institution, in which instruction is given in the branches of science and literature, the English, Turkish, and Armenian languages.

The American Board has a press at Constantinople, and the Presbyterians have one at Beirut, at both of which religious, educational, and scientific books are published in the languages of the people. The Arabic Bible published at Beirut is circulated in all Mohammedan countries. Other editions of the Bible are published in all the languages spoken in the empire. The whole number of copies of books, tracts, etc., printed at the press of the American Board from the beginning of its operations to 1879 is 2,248,354, comprising a total of 325,503,988 pages, in the Armenian, Armeno-Turkish, Greco-Turkish, and Bulgarian languages; and the whole number of pages printed on the Presbyterian press from the beginning to 1889 is 365,112,219.

The organization of Protestant churches has been generally confined to other than Mussulman populations — chiefly to Greeks, Bulgarians, and Armenians. It was until recently a capital offence, by the Turkish law, for a Moslem to become a Christian. More attention is now given to the evangelization of the Turkish population; but the number of Protestant Turks is still very insignificant. The Protestants have acquired a good reputation in the communities among whom they live, and have gained their esteem and confidence to a degree that is rarely accorded to persons professing a strange religion. *SEE SYRIA, MISSIONS IN.*

VI. Other Religious Denominations. — The most important of the other religious denominations of the Turkish empire are the Jews. Their old native land, Palestine, is now a part of Turkey in Asia, but the overwhelming majority of its population consists at present of Mohammedans, the total number of Jews in all Asiatic Turkey being estimated at only 50,000, it is believed that their first appearance in European Turkey may have been connected with the conquests of Alexander the Great, who planted many colonies of Jews about his empire. Philo mentions Jews in Thessaly, Bceotia, Macedonia, etc. Luke speaks of them at Thessalonica and Bercea. The Jews have probably been settled in Macedonia from the first emigration to the present time. In consequence of their expulsion from Spain, a large number of Spanish Jews settled in Thessalonica. Paul Lucas says that in his day there were 30,000 in that city, with twenty-two synagogues. The descendants of these Spanish Jews spread throughout the empire; they continue to speak among themselves the Spanish language, but their written correspondence is carried on in Hebrew. The great mass of the Jews in Turkey are Talmudists, but there exists a small section of *Karaites* (q.v.). The latter have about a hundred

families at Has-Keui, near Constantinople; there are also many in Galicia, and the Crimea; but the great bulk of the Jews of this persuasion are, outside of the Turkish empire, in Galicia and the Crimea. There is also a curious sect of Jews at Salonica called *Manaim*, which signifies ‘turncoat.’ They believe in the fourteenth false Messiah, Sabati Levi, who, to save his life, became with his followers Mohammedans; but these, again, have their religious differences, and are divided into three sects. They are still Jews at heart, but their trifling with two creeds makes them despised and looked down upon. They marry among themselves only, and live together in a particular quarter of the town. There are others of the same sect in parts of Russia. At Salonica they are Mohammedans in public and Jews in private life. The Jews have no hierarchy, but each congregation is independent, and is governed by its own chief rabbi; but they have a representative head at Constantinople, called the *khakhambashi*, who is chief of the Israelitish nation in the empire. The khakhambashi at Constantinople has a court or council to assist him in administering both ecclesiastical and civil law. It is divided into two parts—first, the *Mejliss-i-rouhani*, or spiritual council, composed of six grand rabbins, which, as its name implies, deals with questions relating to the Jewish religion; and, second, the *Mejliss-i-jesmdni*, or civil council, which deals with questions of civil law, and assists the Turkish courts in any questions relating to Jews. The same organization applies to each grand rabbi, who, in his turn, is assisted by two similar councils. As the Jewish law, like that of the Mohammedan, is explained by the teaching of the sacred books, the establishment of these councils forms a ready means of arriving at a judgment on all religious and civil cases arising in the Jewish community. The khakhambashi takes rank immediately after the Greek and Armenian patriarchs. The Jewish population of the Turkish Empire is estimated at 158,000. The poorer are entirely dependent upon the liberality of the upper classes for education and relief in case of want, and the obligation is met in a most commendable spirit. They possess an institution called the ‘Universal Israelitish Alliance,’ which is charged with the administration of education, etc. In 1875 the alliance had twenty-one schools throughout the empire, which gave instruction to 2094 children of both sexes, and of this number 809 were admitted gratuitously. The teachers of these schools are educated in the Rabbinical Seminary at Paris, and they give their pupils instruction in foreign languages and all the elements of a first-class education. The elementary schools, or *talmudtorla*, are crowded with children of both sexes, who are simply taught to read and write” (Baker). The estimates of

the Jewish population in the Turkish empire vary greatly. It has already been mentioned that Baker, in his work on Turkey, gives the total number as 158,000, and that in the Asiatic possessions they are supposed not to exceed 50,000. The Servian statistician Jakshitch estimates the Jews in the immediate European possessions at only 55,000, distributed as follows among the several vilayets: Constantinople, 22,943; Adrianople, 13,492; Salonica, 7409; Monastir, 2566; Kossovo, 1323; Yanina, 4085; Crete, 3200 total, 55,018. The same statistician gives the number of Jews in Roumelia at 3969, in Bosnia at 6968, in Bulgaria at 8959—total in Turkish empire in Europe, 74,914. In the African dependencies, the Jews are chiefly represented in Tunis, where they are supposed to number 45,000 souls. *SEE JEWS.*

There are a number of sects peculiar to Turkey. The most prominent among them are the *Ansarians* (q.v.) and the *Druses* (q.v.). The number of gypsies is estimated at about 200,000.

VII. Literature. — For information on the religious denominations of Turkey, see Baker, *Turkey* (Lond. and N., Y. 1878); Audouard, *L'Orient et ses Peuplades* (Paris, 1867); Zur Helle von Samo [a Mohammedan dervish, previously an Austrian diplomatist], *Die Volker des osmanischen Reiches* (Vienna, 1877); Ubicini, *Etudes Historiques sur les Populations Chretiennes de la Turquie d'Europe* (Paris, 1867). (A. J. S.)

Postscript. — Since the above was in type, the political situation of Turkey has undergone no material change. The Turks, as well as the natives, made so much opposition to carrying out the provisions of the treaty of Berlin, that a naval demonstration by the great European powers in the Archipelago became necessary in order to compel the surrender to Montenegro of Dulcigno, a seaport of Albania, on the Adriatic. Meanwhile both Greece and Turkey continued their warlike attitude and preparations, both parties declining the mediation of the other powers; but as none of these seemed disposed to aid either of the contestants, the latest advices (April, 1881) are that a compromise of the boundary question will be peaceably effected (by the absolute cession to Greece of a part only of the disputed territory in Albania and Thessaly, as suggested by Turkey and recommended by the other governments), and that thus a new lease of life, for a short time, will be granted to the Turkish rule in Europe.

Turkey, Versions Of

There exist a great many translations of the Scriptures which are used throughout the Turkish empire, but do not properly belong to Turkey alone, as the following list of versions, furnished to us by the Rev. Dr. A. W. Thomson, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society at Constantinople, will show:

Albanian, Ghëg	Judæo-Polish
Albanian, Tosk	Judæo-Spanish
Arabic	Kurdish
Armenian, Modern	Maltese
Azerbaijan	Roumanian
Bulgarian, General	Russ, Modern
Bulgarian, Eastern	Servian
Bulgarian, Western	Syriac, Modern
Croatian	Turkish
Greek, Modern	Turkish, Armeno
Hebrew	Turkish, Graeco
Judæo-German	

These versions have already been treated, more or less fully, in separate articles, or will be found in their proper order in the *Supplement*. Some of the most important translations — such as the Arabic, Turkish, Bulgarian, and Armenian — have been prepared entirely by American missionaries; and it is very interesting to know how their work is appreciated and regarded by scholars of other countries. The *British Quarterly Review*, in its January number, 1878, after speaking of the work done by Americans in the Turkish Empire in respect to explorations, literature, and education, medical practice, and the improved condition of woman, thus goes on concerning the Bible translations:

“The most important contribution, however, which the Americans have made to the literature of Turkey is found in the accurate translations which they have made of the Christian Scriptures. These translations are worthy of special notice, because, apart from the religious influence of the Scriptures, they are making a marked impression upon the intellectual life of the various nationalities of Turkey. Fifty years ago there was no version of the Scriptures in any one of the modern languages of that country. The

task of making these translations was not an ordinary one. Regard must be had, on the one hand, to the uneducated classes — the style must be such that the common people would readily understand the meaning; on the other hand, regard must be had to the educated classes — the style must be sufficiently elegant and idiomatic to commend itself to the taste of those who are proud of the literary excellences of their ancient tongues. The Americans may fairly claim that they have succeeded in this difficult task, in respect, at least, to four of the important languages of the country. We refer to the modern Armenian, the Arabic, the Turkish, and the Bulgarian. The Turkish versions have varied somewhat, according as they have been prepared for the Armenians the Greeks, or the Osmanli Turks. The preparation of the entire Bible in-the Armeno-Turkish language (the Turkish language written with the Armeni character) was the life-work of the late William Goodell, D.D. The Rev. Dr. Schaufier has given many years to the preparation of a version of the Scriptures in the Arabo-Turkish; or Turkish written with the Arabic character; while at the present time a permanent committee, of which the Rev. Dr. Riggs is chairman, is engaged in an attempt to recast all the Turkish versions of the Bible, and form one that may be printed in any character. We understand that there is one English representative on this committee. The translation of the Scriptures into Arabic is the result of the labors of two accomplished American scholars — Rev. Eli Smith, D.D., and Rev. C. V. A. Van Dyck, D.D. We are assured by many who are capable of judging that this Arabic version of the Scriptures is worthy of the highest praise, and reflects great credit upon the scholarship of the translators. The same is said of the translations of the Bible that have been made into modern Armenian and Bulgarian by the Rev. Elias Riggs, D.D. We cannot forbear quoting an extract from a letter from Dr. Riggs in regard to the time spent on this branch of his work: “You ask,” he says, “in regard to the time devoted to the Armenian and Bulgarian translations of the Bible. In both cases the translations were first issued in parts in small editions, intended partly to supply the existing demand and partly to secure criticisms and to leave room for corrections arising from comparison of the different parts of the Bible. In both cases the whole Bible was finally printed in a single imperial octavo volume, with references. To the Armenian Bible (including the two editions) I gave most of my time for seven years, and to the Bulgarian, more than half my time for eleven years. How long our committee will take to complete the Turkish version it is quite impossible to say. We spent a year on the four gospels. When we remember that these translations are all

made from the original Hebrew and Greek; and when we remember, also, that the translations, when put in their permanent form, have been commended by the best Arabic, Turkish, Bulgarian, and Armenian scholars of Turkey; and when we recall, also, the great obstacles the Americans must have met in carrying these translations through the press at Constantinople and Beirut, we cannot refrain from expressing our appreciation, not only of their high scholarship, but of their persevering diligence and steadfastness of purpose; and we are convinced that generations of men yet to come will join in this hearty commendation.”

This speaks well of the work performed by these American scholars. For reasons stated above, we have confined ourselves in this article to the *Turkish* version properly so called, and to its transcription into the Armenian and Greek characters.

I. Turkish. — The Turkish language, in its numerous dialectic varieties, is more or less diffused through the vast regions which extend from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of China, and from the shores of the Frozen Ocean to Hindustan. The nations to which this language is vernacular have acted an important part in history; and though their power has now declined, and the Crescent has fallen like a star from heaven, yet a member of this race still occupies the throne of Constantine. The peculiar dialect of this language to which the name of Turkish is generally, by way of preeminence, applied is spoken in European Turkey by the Ottoman or Osmanli Turks, and is the only language which can be employed as a general medium of communication with all the various kindreds of people inhabiting European and Asiatic Turkey. The most ancient Turkish alphabet is the Ouigour, from which the Mongolian is derived; but the modern Turks use the Arabic and Persian characters. Their present alphabet consists of thirty-three letters, twenty-eight of which are Arabic, four are Persian, and one is peculiar to the Turkish. Like most Oriental languages, Turkish is written and read from right to left two versions of the Scriptures in kindred dialects of the Turkish language appear to have been completed about the same period. One of these versions, executed by Seaman, and printed in England in 1666, will be noticed in the *Supplement*, under KARASS. The other, comprising both the Old and the New Test., was the work of Ali Bey, whose history is rather remarkable. His original name was Albertus Bobowsky, or Bobovius. He was born in Poland, in the beginning of the 17th century, and while a youth was stolen by the Tartars and sold as a slave in Constantinople. After having spent twenty years in

the seraglio, he publicly embraced Mohammedanism, at the same time assuming the name of Ali Bey. He became first dragoman, or translator, to Mohammed IV, and was said to be thoroughly conversant with seventeen languages. At the suggestion and under the direction of the famous Levin Warner, then Dutch ambassador at Constantinople, Ali Bey was induced to translate the catechism of the Church of England into Turkish, and afterwards betook himself to the translation of the entire Scriptures into Turkish. The study of the sacred volume was not without effect on the translator; for it is recorded that Ali Bey entertained thoughts of returning to the Christian Church, and was only prevented by death from accomplishing his design. When his version was corrected and ready for the press, it was sent by Warner to Leyden to be printed. It was deposited in the archives of the university of that city, and there it remained for a century and a half, until baron Von Diez, formerly Russian ambassador at Constantinople, drew the attention of Europe to this long neglected translation. He offered his services in editing the MS. to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society; and, meeting with great encouragement to prosecute his design, Mr. Diez immediately addressed himself to the revision of the Old Test. When four books of the Pentateuch were revised he died, and the work of revision was transferred by the society to Kieffer, professor of the Turkish language at the University of Paris and interpreting secretary to the king of France. The new editor disapproved of the plan pursued by his predecessor, particularly of his insertion of vowel-points, and he therefore commenced the work anew, applying himself, in the first instance, to the New Test. He followed the text of the MS. implicitly, without collating it with the original Greek; and thus several errors in the text were inserted in the printed copies, 'which were, however, soon detected, and gave rise to a printed controversy. The circulation was immediately suspended, the errors were examined and corrected by a sub-committee, and Prof. Kieffer commenced a laborious and thorough revision of the text by collating every portion, not only with the original, but with the English, German, and French versions; with the Tartar of Seaman and of the Scotch missionaries at Karass; with the versions of Erpenius and of Martyn; and with those in the London Polyglot. The revision was carried on from 1820 to 1828, when the entire Bible, with the embodied corrections, was completed, and obtained the attestation of the most eminent Orientalists in Europe. The work was printed at Paris, and the original MS. was afterwards returned to Leyden. An edition of the Turkish New Test, carefully revised by Mr. Turabi under

the superintendence of Dr. Henderson, was completed by the society in 1853. A subsequent revised edition was printed in 1857. A new version was commenced by the Rev. Dr. Schauffler, and the New Test. was printed in 1866. In 1867 the Psalms followed, to which were afterwards added the Pentateuch and Isaiah. These are, at present, the parts published of Dr. Schauffler's translation. The entire Bible was completed in 1873. "This work," says the *Annual Report* of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1873, "is of a somewhat extraordinary character, requiring rare powers of scholarship for its execution. It has occupied many years, and the translator has devoted to it the most conscientious and untiring application. It has been the one thing to which his mind and learning have been consecrated. The question has been frequently mooted, and is again under discussion, whether a distinct translation in Turkish is to be published with exclusive reference to the Osmanlis, or whether one and the same text may not be made available both for Osmanlis and for other nationalities speaking the Turkish tongue, but reading their native characters. The latter was the object proposed, when the translation of Dr. Schauffler was commenced; but the views of the translator became modified in the very early stages of his work, and he has aimed to adapt his translation in style to the taste of the Osmanlis, believing that the style common to the Greeks and Armenians speaking Turkish is too coarse and degraded to be met by a version acceptable to the Osmanlis. It is, moreover, alleged that the different nationalities employ the same terms frequently in widely different senses. This view does not elicit the sympathy or endorsement of many of the missionaries, who still hold to the theory that one text should suffice for all classes, and that two' versions would be injurious to the cause of divine truth, on the ground that it might, with some show of propriety be objected that Protestants had one Bible for the rich and learned and another for the poor and unlearned. It is further contended that the necessity for distinct texts does not exist; that the style of Turkish spoken by the Christian populations has materially improved in dignity, although not level with that of the Osmanlis; and that it would be practicable to educate them to something still higher by means of a version of the Scriptures in pure idiomatic Turkish, without being cast in too lofty and artificial a mould. In order to bring the whole question to some practical and satisfactory solution, it is proposed that a committee be formed, composed of the best Turkish scholars, of which Dr. Schauffler shall be president, and to which the examination of his translation shall be submitted; and that authority be given to call in the aid of such literary

effendis as may be judged desirable.” The committee of joint revisers was formed; but, states the *Report* for 1874, “after a short experiment the venerable translator (Dr. Schauiffier) resigned his position on the Board of Revisers, and handed over the MS. of the Old Test. to the agents of the British and Foreign and of the American Bible Society, at whose expense the translation has been made. It is an understood thing that the forthcoming Turkish Bible will be based on Dr. Schauffler’s work, so that if he should have to regret that the whole will not be printed exactly as it leaves his hand, yet he will enjoy the satisfaction of knowing that he has contributed in a pre-eminent degree to this work, which was the fondest object of his later years; and that his name will go down to future generations associated with one of the hardest tasks ever attempted—the translation of the whole Bible into Osmanli Turkish.” As to the work of the committee, we read in the *Annual Report* of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1879 the following: “The revision of the Turkish Scriptures has been completed, and the version may be fairly considered a new translation. The committee began their work in June, 1873, and the last words of the Old Test. were written at eleven o’clock on May 25, 1878. The object of the committee was to produce a complete Bible for the Turks, which would be simple in language and idiom, and intelligible to the uneducated and acceptable to the learned. The committee was composed of the Rev. Dr. Schauffler (who soon retired from the committee), Dr. Riggs, the Rev. R. H. Weakley, and the Rev. G. F. Herrick, and these called to their help the Rev. Avedis Constantian, pastor of Marash, and two Turkish scholars, one of whom soon withdrew, and was replaced by a very learned man from the banks of the Tigris. One of these Turkish assistants became a firstfruit of the new version. The New Test. was first printed (Constantinople, 1877), and a second edition, in smaller form, was ready in time to send to Russia for the Turkish prisoners; aid the printing of the Old Test. was completed in December, 1878. The Turkish government, to prevent the publication of the version, insisted that each copy should bear the *imprimatur* of the Imperial Council of Public Instruction, so that the copies go forth with the permission of the Turkish government; and what was meant for a hindrance has turned out to the furtherance of the work. The American Bible Society has shared with this society the labors and expenses of this great work.” As to the MS. of Dr. Schauffler, which, as has been stated above, was handed to the agents of the British and Foreign and the American Bible Society, the translator has completed his final revision. “Two parts,” states the same report, “were not ready in time

to be used by the revision committee, as had been intended. The MSS. of the Old Test. (except the Pentateuch and Isaiah already published) are now deposited in the strong-room of the American Bible House, New York, to the joint account of the British and Foreign and the American Bible Society.”

II. *Turkish-Armenian.* — This is, properly speaking, a Turkish version, but printed in Armenian letters, and accommodated to the dialectic peculiarities which prevail among the Armenians of Asia Minor. A Turkish version in their peculiar dialect, and written in their characters, was commenced in 1815 by an Armenian archimandrite named Seraphim, in concert with another Armenian. An edition of five thousand copies of the Testament was printed at St. Petersburg in 1819. Mr. Leeves, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, devoted much time and trouble to the preparation of a revised edition. The work was afterwards taken up by the missionaries of the American Board of Missions; and in 1843 the entire Scriptures were printed in Smyrna at the expense of the American Society, the translation having been made by the Rev. W. Goodell. Subsequent editions of the Armeno-Turkish Scriptures have been printed at the American Mission press on behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

III. *Turkish-Greek.* — This, like the preceding version, is Turkish, but printed in Greek letters. In 1782 the Psalms, translated into Turkish by Seraphim, metropolitan of Karamania, were printed in Greek letters; and in 1810 a Turkish version of the Acts and Epistles was printed in the same character at Venice. In consequence of inquiries instituted in 1818 by Dr. Pinkerton, respecting the state of the Christian inhabitants of the ancient Lydia, Caria, Lycia, Phrygia, Pisidia, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, it was ascertained that these poor people are all Greeks or Armenians, acquainted with no language but that of their Turkish masters. As they were unable to read or write except in their native characters, the British and Foreign Bible Society published the Turkish Testament in Greek letters, the translation having been made by Messrs. Goodell and Bird. This edition was printed at Constantinople in 1828. In order to make it more conformable to the provincial mode of speaking Turkish which prevails among the Greek Christians of Asia Minor, Mr. Leeves, agent of the society, undertook a new and revised version, assisted by Mr. Christo Nicolaides, of Philadelphia, who joined Mr. Leeves in 1832, and from that period to 1839 was uninterruptedly employed in the undertaking. The printing of the entire

Bible was commenced at Syra, and afterwards transferred to Athens. In 1865 the Psalms, revised with great care under the editorial superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Riggs, passed through the press; and in 1870 the whole Bible, with marginal references, was published in Constantinople. See, besides the *Bible of Every Land*, the *Annual Reports* of the British and Foreign and American Bible Societies; and Reed, *The Bible Work of the World* (Lond. 1879). (B. P.)

Turlupins

the French name for the *SEE BRETHREN OF THE FREE SPIRIT* (q.v.). The origin of the word is unknown, though it is thought to be connected with wolfish or predatory habits.

Turner, Daniel

an English Baptist minister, was born at Blackwater, Hertfordshire, March 1, 1710. He first settled at Reading, and after devoting some years to school-teaching, became, in 1748, pastor of the Baptist Church in Abingdon, Berkshire, which position he filled till his death, Sept. 5, 1798. Many of his publications were highly approved; among them were, *Compendium of Social Religion* (1758, 8vo): — *Letters Religious and Moral* (1766, 8vo): — *Meditations on Scripture* (Abing. 1771, 12mo): — *Dissertations on Religion* (1775, 8vo): — *Essays on Religion* (1780, 2 vols.; Oxf. 1787, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Expositions on Scripture* (Lond. 1790, 8vo), See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Turner, Francis

an English prelate of the 17th century, received his education at Winchester School, graduated at New College, Oxford, April 14, 1659, and took his degree of A.M. there in 1663. He received his degree of D.D. July 6, 1669, and in the following December was collated to the prebend of Sneating, in St. Paul's. He succeeded Dr. Dunning to the see of Chichester, and, followed him in, the mastership of St. John's College, Cambridge, April 11, 1670. In 1683 he was made dean of Windsor; was consecrated bishop of Rochester, Nov. 11; and Aug. 23, 1684, was translated to the bishopric of Ely. He was one of the six bishops who joined archbishop Sancroft on May 18, 1688, in refusing to read the *Declaration for Liberty of Conscience*, and with them was committed, June 8, to the Tower, but was acquitted on

the 29th. Refusing to take the oath when William and Mary ascended the throne, he was deprived of his bishopric, and lived in retirement till his death, Nov. 2, 1700. He wrote, *A Vindication of the late Archbishop, Sancroft and his Brethren, etc., Animadversions on the Naked Truth: Letters to the Clergy of his Diocese: — Brief Memoirs of Nicholas Ferrar* (2d ed. 1837, 12mo): — *Sermons* (1681-85). See, Bliss's *Wood, Athen. Oxon.* 4:545; Burnett, *Own Times*; Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, ch. 14:16:xvii; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Turner, James (1)

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bedford County, Va., May 7, 1759. He was converted in 1789, licensed to preach in 1791, and ordained and installed as colleague pastor with the Rev. James Mitchel, July 28, 1792, in what was then called the Peaks Congregation. He also took charge of the New London Congregation. Here he spent the whole of his ministerial life, and died, Jan. 8, 1828. He was exceedingly attractive as a preacher; a man of real genius; acknowledged to be unrivalled among the clergy of Virginia in his power over the passions of men. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit* 3, 581; Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, 2d series.

Turner, James (2)

an English Congregational minister, was born at Oldham, March, 1782. He was educated at Rotherham. College, and ordained at Knutsford in 1808, which place became the chief center of his exertions. He was for years secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society and the Cheshire Union of Independent Ministers. His judgment and clearness of mind were often consulted in private business, and great confidence was reposed in him. He died May 22, 1863. See (Lond.) *Cong. Year-book*, 1864, p. 248.

Turner, Jesse H.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bedford County, Va., Jan. 1, 1788; was educated in Hampden Sidney College, Va.; studied theology in the Union Seminary, Prince Edward, Va.; was licensed by Hanover Presbytery and ordained by the same in 1813. He began his labors as a missionary in Richmond, Va.; he subsequently preached at Fayetteville, N. C.; Manchester, Va.; and in Hanover County, Va. He died March 13, 1863. He

was a sincere, good man, and successful as a preacher; See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 454.

Turner, Joseph M. W.

an English painter, was born at 26 Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London, April 23, 1775. He became a student, in 1789, of the Royal Academy, and as early as 1799 was elected an associate of the Academy, becoming three years after a full academician. In 1807 he was elected professor of perspective, but failed on account of literary qualifications. He traveled in Scotland, France, Switzerland, and the Rhine countries, and paid three visits to Italy. He died at Chelsea, Dec. 19, 1851. He bequeathed a noble collection of his works to the nation, and they were placed in a room in the National Gallery. Among his many works we notice, *The Fifth Plague of Egypt: — Tenth Plague of Egypt: — a Holy Family*. He also wrote a poem, *The Fallacies of Hope*. See Ruskin, *Modern Painters*; Thornbury, *Life of Turner* (Lond. 1862, 2 vols.; new ed. 1874).

Turner, Nathaniel

a Congregational minister, was born at Norfolk, Conn., in 1771; graduated at Williams College in 1798; studied theology with Dr. Catlin; was ordained over the Church in New Marlborough, Mass., in 1799; and died May 25, 1812. See *Cong. Quarterly*, 1859, p. 46.

Turner, Peter

an English Congregational minister, was born at Wiverhampton in 1808. His parents were Wesleyans, and it was in connection with that body that he began to labor, at the age of eighteen, as a local preacher. He continued a liberal and zealous member of the Wesleyan community until 1846, when he joined the Independents, and in 1815 accepted the pastorate of the Independent Church at Evesham, Worcestershire. In 1856 he removed to Southampton, and labored with the Congregational Church until his death, July 26, 1861. Mr. Turner was very devoted to his people and pastoral duties, and his pulpit ministrations were, highly prized by all who knew him. See (Lond.) *Cong. Year-book*, 1862, p. 267.

Turner, Samuel Hulbeart, D.D.

an eminent Episcopal clergyman and scholar, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., Jan. 23, 1790, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1807. He

was ordained deacon in 1811, and priest in 1814; was pastor of a church at Chestertown, Md., from 1812 to 1817; and was elected professor of historic theology in the General Episcopal Seminary, New York, Oct. 8, 1818. He continued with the institution during its stay in New, Haven, Conn., and returned with it to New York in 1821. On Dec. 19 he took the chair of Biblical learning and interpretation of Scripture, in which he continued till his death, Dec. 21, 1861. He was also professor of Hebrew language and literature in Columbia College from 1831. He was the author of, *Notes on the Epistle to the Romans* (N. Y. 1824, 8vo): — with Dr. Whittingham, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, transl. from the Latin and German of John Jahn (1827, 8vo): — *Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation*, transl. from the German of Dr. G. J. Planck (Edinb. 1834, 12mo): *Companion to the Book of Genesis* (N. Y. 1841, 8vo): — *Biographical Notices of some of the Most Distinguished Rabbis*, etc. (1847, 12mo): — *Parallel References Illustrative of the New Testament* (1848, 12mo): — *Essay on Our Lord's Discourse, etc., John 6* (1851, 12mo): — *Thoughts on the Origin, Character, and Interpretation of Scripture Prophecy* (1852, 12mo): — *Epistle to the Hebrews*, in Greek and English (1852, 8vo): *Epistle to the Romans* (1853, 8vo): — *Epistle to the Ephesians* (1856, 8vo). See *Autobiography of Samuel H. Turner, D.D.* (1862, 12mo); *Amer. Quar. Church Rev.* 1862, p. 734; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Turner, Sharon

an English author, was born in London, Sept. 24, 1768. After many years practice as an attorney in the Temple, he retired, in 1829, to Winchmore Hill, where he resided until a few weeks before his death, which occurred in London, Feb. 13, 1847. Mr. Turner is best known by his *History of England from the Earliest Period to the Death of Elizabeth*, etc. (Lond. 1799-1805). He also wrote, *History of Henry VIII*, etc. (1826, 4to): — *History of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth* (1829, 4to): — *Sacred Meditations and Devotional Poems by a Layman* (1810, 12mo):. — *The Sacred History of the World*, etc. (1832, 3 vols. 8vo), See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Turner, Thomas, D.D.

an English divine, was born at St. Giles's, Heckfield, in 1591. He was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1623 was presented by his

college to the vicarage of St. Giles's in Oxford. Laud, when bishop of London, made him his chaplain, and in 1629 collated him to the prebend of Newington, Church of St. Paul, and in October following to the chancellorship of the same church. Charles I made him a canon residentiary, and appointed him one of his chaplains in ordinary, giving him the rectory of St. Olave, Southwark, with which he held the rectory of Fetcham, Surrey. At the request of Charles I he accompanied that prince to Scotland to be crowned. In 1641 he was preferred to the deanery of Rochester; but on the death of the king he was stripped of his preferments and treated with indignity. At the Restoration he entered the deanery of Canterbury, August, 1660. He died in October, 1672.

Turner, William

an English-divine, was born near Broadoak, Flintshire, and for some time previous to going to Oxford he was an inmate of the house of Philip Henry, father of Matthew, the commentator. He took his A.M. at Edmund Hall, Oxford, June 8, 1675. Becoming, afterwards, vicar of Walberton, in Sussex, he resided there in 1697; but the date of his death is uncertain. He published, a *History of All Religions* (Lond. 1695, 8vo): — *Complete History of the Most Remarkable Providences*, etc. (1697, fol.). "This curious collection ranks with the similar performances of Clark, and Wanley in his *History of the Little World*, but is superior perhaps to both in selection and conciseness."

Turner, William Hindley

an English Congregational minister, was born at Beeston, Leeds, in 1784. He was educated at Rotherham College, and became an exceedingly popular preacher. Mr. Turner's first settlement was at Bury, and after seven years' efficient work he removed to Hindley, where he built up a prosperous and manly ministry. In 1862 growing infirmities led him to resign the stated ministry. He was a disinterested, devoted, and faithful minister of Christ. He died Dec. 8, 1868. See (Lond.) *Cong. Year-book*, 1870, p. 324.

Turnus

in ancient Italian mythology, was the king of the Rutuli, and a son of Daunus and Venelia, who was a niece of queen Amata, wife of Latinus. Her daughter Lavinia, having been destined by fate to AENEAS, was the

subject of dispute between the Trojans and the Latins, in which the former were victorious. Turnus, after many wild battles, was finally killed in a duel with Aeneas.

Turpentine-tree

Picture for Turpentine-tree

(*τερέμινθος, τερέβινθος* ; Vulg. *terebinthus*) occurs only once, viz. in the Apocrypha (Ecclus. 24:16), where wisdom is compared with the “turpentine-tree that stretcheth forth her branches.” The *τερέβινθος* or *τέρμινθος* of the Greeks, is the *Pistacia terebinthus, terebinth-tree*, common in Palestine and the East, supposed by some writers to represent the *elâh* (*הַל אֶפ*) of the Hebrew Bible. *SEE OAK*. The terebinth, though not generally so conspicuous a tree in Palestine as some of the oaks, occasionally grows to a large size. See Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 222, 223), who thus speaks of it. “The butm” (the Arabic name of the terebinth) “is not an evergreen, as often represented, but its small lancet-shaped leaves fall in the autumn, and are renewed in the spring. The flowers are small, and followed by small oval berries, hanging in clusters from two to five inches long, resembling much those of the vine when the grapes are just set. From incisions in the trunk there is said to flow a sort of transparent balsam, constituting a very pure and fine species of turpentine, with an agreeable odor like citron or jessamine, and a mild taste, and hardening gradually into a transparent gum. In Palestine nothing seems to be known of this product of the butm!” The terebinth belongs to the natural order *Anacardiaceae*, the plants of which order generally contain resinous secretions. *SEE TEREBINTH*.

Turpin

(or Tilpin), a French prelate of the 8th century, of whose early history nothing definite is known, was a monk of St. Denis, and became bishop of Rheims probably in 753, after a long opposition by Milon. He was one of the twelve French bishops present in 769 at the council called at Rome by pope Stephen to condemn the antipope Constantine. About 786 Turpin founded a chapel dedicated to St. Denis, which afterwards became an abbacy. He died Sept. 2,800. He left a genuine letter to pope Adrian I, and a romantic Latin *Chronicle* of the wars of Charlemagne against the Saracens in Spain, the authenticity of which has been greatly doubted,

although avouched by a declaration of pope Calixtus in 1122. The oldest MSS. of it date from the end of the 11th century, and the first writer who speaks of it is Raoul of Tortoise (1096-1145). The Latin text was published in 1584 by Schard, in his *Germanicarum Rerum Chronographi*, and French versions have appeared by Raguin (Paris, 1527, 4to; Lyons, 1583, 8vo, etc.), and lately by Ciampi (Florence, 1822, with a dissertation on the author) and Reiffenberg (Brussels, 1836). See Gascon Paris, *De Pseudo Turpino* (Paris, 1865).

Turpin, Thomas D.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Somerset County, Md., June 30, 1805. He was converted Sept. 8, 1823; licensed to preach Sept. 12, 1827; admitted on trial in the traveling connection Feb. 7, 1829, and was appointed to Union Circuit; in 1830, to Pendleton; in 1831, to the Savannah mission; in 1832, to the Black Swamp Circuit; in 1833, to May and New River; in 1834, to the Wadmatane and John's Island mission and Orangeburg Circuit; in 1835, to Pee Dee; in 1836, to Laurens; in 1837, again to Pendleton; and in 1838, to the Cambridge and Flat Woods mission, where he died, July 26, 1838. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 2, 665.

Turquoise

a Persian gem of a peculiar bluish green color, which was very generally used in the Middle Ages for the adornment of every species of sacred vessel, e.g. the chalice, ciborium, altar-cross, miter, and pastoral staff.

Turret, Touret, or Turette

a small tower: the name is also sometimes given to a large pinnacle. Turrets are employed in Gothic architecture for various purposes, and are applied in various ways; they also differ very greatly in their forms, proportions, and decorations. In many cases they are used solely for ornament; they are also often placed at the angles of buildings, especially castles, to increase their strength, serving practically as corner buttresses. Occasionally they carry bells or a clock, but one of the most common uses to which they are applied is to contain a *newel*, or spiral staircase: for this purpose they are usually found attached to church towers, forming an external projection, which very frequently terminates considerably below the top of the tower; but in some districts turrets of this kind generally rise

above the tower, and are finished with a parapet or small spire. Turrets of all dates are sometimes perfectly plain and sometimes variously ornamented, according to the character of the prevailing style of architecture, the upper part being the most enriched, and not infrequently formed of open-work. In the *Norman* style the lower part is usually square, and this form is continued to the top, but the upper part is sometimes changed to a polygon or circle. Few turrets of this date retain their original terminations, but they appear to have been often finished with low spires, either square, polygonal, or circular, according to the shape of the turret. In the *Early English* and later styles they are most usually polygonal, but are sometimes square, and occasionally circular. The upper terminations are very various; in the *Early English* style spires prevail, but in the *Decorated* and *Perpendicular* not only spires, but parapets, either plain, battlemented, paneled, or pierced, and pinnacles are used. The peculiar kind of turrets often found attached to small churches and chapels, which have no towers to receive the bells, is designated by the term *Bell-gable*.
SEE SPIRE; SEE TOWER.

Turretini

the name of a family of theologians of Geneva, whose ancestor, Francis Turretin or Turretini, the son of a gonfalonier of Lucca, was expatriated on account of his religion. He came to Geneva in 1579. Among his descendants three men deserve mention in this place.

1. BENEDETTO was born in 1588 at Zurich, became pastor at Geneva in 1612, and professor of theology in 1618. In 1620 he represented the Church of Geneva at the national synod of Alais, which introduced the decrees of Dort into France, and in the following year he was sent to Holland and the cities of the Hanseatic League to solicit aid towards fortifying Geneva, a task in which he was eminently successful. He died in 1631, leaving to the world a number of sermons and theological writings. See Leu, *Allgem., Hist. Lexikon*, 18:375; Senebier, *Hist. Lit. de Geneve*, 2, 136.

2. FRANCOIS was born in 1623, became pastor of the Italian congregation at Geneva, and in 1653 professor of theology. He was sent to Holland on a similar mission to that formerly undertaken by his father Benedetto. He is particularly known as a zealous opponent of the theology of Saumur, **SEE AMYRAUT**, and defender of orthodoxy in the sense of

Dort. He was also one of the originators of the *Helvetic Consensus* (q.v.) He left numerous works, the more important of which, were reprinted at Edinburgh in 1847 sq.

3. JEAN ALPHONSE, the son of François, was born in 1671, and became the pupil of the Cartesian Chouet and of the Arminianizing Louis Tronchin (q.v.) at Geneva. In 1691 he went to Holland to study church history under Spanheim, and in 1692 he visited England, where he became acquainted with Newton and acquired the English language. On his return to the Continent he sojourned for a time in Paris, and was admitted to the society of men like Bossuet, Mabillon, Malebranche, etc. He availed himself of this opportunity to study Arabic under the tuition of the abbé Langueme. In Geneva he was received into the ministry at the age of twenty-two, and soon afterwards into the *Venerable Compagnie des Pasteurs*. His ability as an orator at once commanded attention. He was accustomed to follow the English practice of presenting to the view a leading truth or duty; but he made the application of his discourse with greater unction than the English speakers cultivated, and by thus combining the methods of the Genevan and the English pulpit he became the originator of a new method. The arrangement of his sermons was natural and logical, his statement clear and simple, his manner dignified. In 1697 he was made professor of church history, and in 1701 became rector of the academy. The latter honor was conferred upon him ten times, to which fact we are indebted for ten important addresses delivered on the successive days of promotion. He followed Tronchin, in 1705, as professor of systematic theology, though still retaining his own (historical) chair. He wrote upon almost the whole of dogmatics, and connected with these labors exegetical lectures on parts of the New Test.

The influence of Turretini was especially apparent in the management of the enterprise to bring about the abrogation of the *Helvetic Consensus* as a binding formula. He kept it before the Venerable Company, the council, and the Two Hundred until a majority were gained over to that project; and he induced Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, to urge the abrogation upon 'leading men throughout Switzerland, and also to persuade the king of England to address an appeal to the cantons in behalf of the same measure. He was also prominent in promoting fraternal relations between Lutherans and Reformed Christians in Geneva, in recognition of which fact he was made a member of the Royal Academy of Berlin, and awarded a gold medal by the Prussian king.

The principal theological works of Turretini, from: which his tendency may most readily be learned, are, *Nubes Testium pro Moderato et Pacifico de Rebus Theol. Judicio et Instituenda inter Protestantas Concordia* (1729), with a dissertation on the fundamental articles of the faith annexed. Such articles he describes as “quorum cognitio atque fides ad Dei gratiam salutemque obtinendam necessaria est.” This dissertation exposed Turretini to attack from two different directions: first, from the Jesuit De Pierre, Lyons, 1728, who sought to show that the Reformed Church had no greater reason to renounce the communion of the Church of Rome than that of the Lutheran Church; and, second, from Crinsons, Protestant pastor of Bionens, 1727. A second and more important work is his *Cogitationes et Dissertationes Theologicae*, in which he displays a liberal type of orthodoxy. He emphasizes the importance of natural theology in genuine Reformed fashion, but holds that revealed religion has for its object merely the supplementing and completing of what natural religion teaches. He recognizes the existence of mysteries in revealed religion, but zealously rejects foreign and scholastic additions in theology. With respect to the doctrine of the divine decrees, he avoids, as he does everywhere, all extreme statements, but lays hold on the elements of practical utility in, the teaching. With reference to the doctrine of Divine Providence, he represented the optimistic Leibnitzian theory. He followed that philosopher also in his rejection of innate ideas. The *Cogitationes* contained much apologetical material, and earned for their author an honorable place among apologists (see Pelt, *Encyclop.* p. 391). The form in which his apologetical ideas were given to the French world of readers by Vernet is, it should be noted, revised and altered, in the first editions with the author’s consent, as Vernet claimed; but the improvement progressed with each successive edition, and Vernet clearly reveals the deism of the 18th century in his work.

In 1725 Turretini was commissioned to deliver the so called *Cloture des Promotions*, an address in the French language, together with the charge prescribed by the laws for the occasion, when the Two Hundred and the General Assembly of citizens were to elect the principal magistrates of the State. The twenty-five addresses, which he delivered to these bodies, were highly commended because of the striking and practical ideas with which they were filled. He also took active part in the improvement of the liturgy, in the ordering of week-day services, in the publication of a new edition of the French New Test. (1726), in the forming of a society for the religious

instruction of youth, and finally in the introduction of the public confirmation of catechumens. He rendered important services to the churches of Hungary, Transylvania, the Palatinate, and the Waldenses, and maintained an extensive correspondence with Switzerland, England, Holland, Germany, etc. George II of England and his consort honored him with expressions of their favor, and employed him in works of benevolence. His last years were disturbed by the troubles of Geneva in 1734. He died May 1, 1737. After his death were issued from the press his *Comment. Theoret. pract. in Ep. ad Thessalonic.* (Basle, 1739): — *Prelectiones* on Romans 11 (Geneva, 1741): — and a tractate on the exposition of Scripture (Berlin, 1766). A complete edition of his works appeared in Leeuwarden in 1775. *Sources.* — *Senebier, Hist. Lit. de Genzve*, 2, 259; *Sayous, Hist. de la Lit. Franc. a l'Etranger*, etc. (1853); *Cellerier, L'Academie de Geneve* (1855); *Vernet, Eloge Historique, sur J. A. Tur.* in the *Bibl. Raisonnee*, 21; various biographical dictionaries; and *Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.*

Turri

in the mythology of the Finns, was a god of war and hunting, living in steep rocky caverns, and was worshipped as the god of the nation.

Turrigera (or Turrita)

(*tower-bearer* or *towered*), in Roman mythology, was a surname of Cybele.

Turselin

(Lat. *Tursellinus*), *HORACE*, a learned and indefatigable Jesuit of Rome, was born in 1545, and taught rhetoric in that city twenty years, and was rector of several colleges. He promoted the study of belles-lettres in his society, and died at Rome, April 6, 1599. His principal works are, *Life of St. Francis Xavier* (best ed. 1596, 4to) *History of Loretto* (8vo): *Treatise on the Latin Particles: Abridgment of Universal History from the Creation to 1598*, etc. (best editions are those which have a continuation by father Philip Briet, 1618-61, the best French translations are by abbé Lagneau, Paris, 1757, 4 vols. 12mo).

Turstine

a monk of Caen, in Normandy, who, in 1801, was sent over to England and installed first Norman abbot of Glastonbury Abbey. Through his

influence, William I granted the abbey a charter, restoring its lost lands, and confirming all its privileges. In a general council, he opposed the assumptions of Giso, bishop of Wells, and was so successful that Giso had to go to Glastonbury and there have decided the question of jurisdiction over the two minor monasteries, Muchelney and Etheling. Turstine then turned his attention to the internal arrangements of the abbey, but by his introduction of foreign practices brought about insubordination among the monks. French soldiers were brought in, who slew some of the monks while in the sanctuary. Turstine was obliged to retire to Normandy in disgrace. William II permitted him to return to the abbey on payment of five hundred pounds in silver, but he seems not to have stayed there. See Hill, *English Monasticism*, p. 247, 248, 252.

Turtle, or Turtle Dove

Picture for Turtle 1

($\rho\omega\delta$, *tor*, so called, no doubt, in imitation of its cooing note; $\tau\rho\upsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$), occurs first in Scripture in ⁽⁴¹⁵⁹⁾Genesis 15:9, where Abram is commanded to offer it along with other sacrifices, and with a young pigeon ($\iota\ \zeta\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}$, *gozal*). In the Levitical law a pair of turtle-doves or of young pigeons are constantly prescribed as a substitute for those who were too poor to provide a lamb or a kid, and these birds were admissible either as trespass, sin, or burnt offering. In one instance, the case of a Nazarite having been accidentally defiled by a dead body, a pair of turtle-doves or young pigeons were specially enjoined (⁽⁴¹⁶⁰⁾Numbers 6:10). It was in accordance with the provision in ⁽⁴¹²⁶⁾Leviticus 12:6 that the mother of our Lord made the offering for her purification (⁽⁴¹²⁴⁾Luke 2:24). During the early period of Jewish history there is no evidence of any other bird except the pigeon having been domesticated; and up to the time of Solomon, who may, with the peacock, have introduced other gallinaceous birds from India, it was probably the only poultry known to the Israelites. To this day enormous quantities of pigeons are kept in dove-cots in all the towns and villages of Palestine, and several, of the fancy races so familiar in this country have been traced to be of Syrian origin. The offering of two young pigeons must have been one easily within the reach of the poorest, and the offerer was accepted according to what he had, and not according to what he had not. The admission of a pair of turtle-doves was, perhaps, a yet further concession to extreme poverty; for, unlike the pigeon, the turtle, from its migratory nature and timid disposition, has never yet been kept in a state of

free domestication; but, being extremely numerous, and resorting especially to gardens for nidification, its young might easily be found and captured by those who did not even possess pigeons.

Picture for Turtle 2

It is not improbable that the palm-dove (*Turtur Egyptiacus*, Temm.) may, in some measure, have supplied the sacrifices in the wilderness, for it is found in amazing numbers wherever the palm-tree occurs, whether wild or cultivated. In most of the oases of North Africa and Arabia every tree is the home of two or three pairs of these tame and elegant birds. In the crown of many of the date-trees five or six nests are placed together; and sportsmen have frequently, in a palm-grove, brought down ten brace or more without moving from their post. In such camps as Elim a considerable supply of these doves may have been obtained.

From its habit of pairing for life and its fidelity for its mate, the dove was a symbol of purity and an appropriate offering (comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 10:52). The regular migration of the turtle-dove and its return in spring are alluded to in ²⁴⁸¹⁷Jeremiah 8:7, “The turtle and the crane and the swallow observe the time of their coming;” and ²²¹¹¹Song of Solomon 2:11, 12, “The winter is past... and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.” So Pliny, “Hyeme mutis, a vere vocalibus;” and Aristotle, *Hist. An.* 9:8, “Turtle-doves spend the summer in cold countries, the winter in warm ones,” although elsewhere (8, 5) he makes it hibernate (φωλεῖ). There is, indeed, no more grateful proof of the return of spring in Mediterranean countries than the voice of the turtle. One of the first birds to migrate northwards, the turtle, while other songsters are heard chiefly in the morning or only at intervals, immediately on its arrival pours forth from every garden, grove, and wooded hill its melancholy yet soothing ditty unceasingly from early dawn till sunset. It is from its plaintive note, doubtless, that David, in ¹⁵⁷⁴⁹Psalms 74:19, pouring forth his lament to God, compares himself to a turtle-dove.

From the abundance of the dove tribe and their importance as an article of food, the ancients discriminated the species of *Columbidae* more accurately than of many others. Aristotle enumerates five species, which are not all easy of identification, as but four species are now known commonly to inhabit Greece. In Palestine the number of species is probably greater. Besides the rock-dove (*Columba livia*, L.), very common on all the rocky parts of the coast and in the inland ravines, where it remains

throughout the year, and from which all the varieties of the domestic pigeon are derived, the ring-dove (*Columba palumbus*, L.) frequents all the wooded districts of the country. The stock-dove (*Columba cenas*, L.) is as generally, but more sparingly, distributed. Another species, allied either to this or to *Columba livia*, has been observed in the valley of the Jordan, perhaps *Colleuconota*, Vig. (see *Ibis*, 1, 35). The turtle-dove (*Turtur au'ritus*, L.) is, as has been stated, most abundant, and in the valley of the Jordan an allied species, the palm dove, or Egyptian turtle (*Turtur AEgyptiacus*, Temm.), is by no means uncommon. This bird, most abundant among the palm-trees in Egypt and North Africa, is distinguished from the common turtle-dove by its ruddy chestnut color, its long tail, smaller size, and the absence of the collar on the neck. It does not migrate, but, from the similarity of its note and habits, it is not probable that it was distinguished by the ancients. The large Indian turtle (*Turtur gelastes*, Temm.) has also been stated, though without authority, to occur in Palestine. Other species, as the well-known collared dove (*Turtur risoria*, L.), have been incorrectly included as natives of Syria.

The birds of this subgenus are invariably smaller than pigeons properly so called; they are mostly marked with a patch of peculiarly colored scutellated feathers on the neck, or with a collar of black, and have often other markings on the smaller wing-covers. The species *Columba Turtur*, with several varieties merely of color, extends from the west of Europe through the north of Africa to the islands south of China. The turtle-dove of Palestine is specially the same; but there is also a second, we believe local both migrate farther south in winter, but return very early, when their cooing voice in the woods announces the spring. — Kitto. See Schlichter, *De Turture* (Hal. 1738); Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 217 sq.; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 419 sq. **SEE DOVE.**

Turtle, John

a Wesleyan missionary, was born in the County of Suffolk, England, June 9, 1793. He was converted in 1811, commenced to preach in 1815, at Thetford, and in 1817 he received his appointment for the Bahamas, W. I. His first circuit was Eleuthera; next, New Providence; and after that, successively, Turk's Island, Harbor Island, Abaco, Jamaica (1822), Abaco, Eieuthera, and Turk's Island, where he died, Aug. 16, 1825. Mr. Turtle cut short his life by his indefatigable labors. He had natural abilities of a high

order, and a spiritual life of beauty and consistency. See *Wesleyan Meth. Mag.* 1828, p. 217; *Wesleyan Minutes*, 1826.

Turton, Thomas, D.D.

a bishop of the Church of England, was born in Yorkshire in 1782. He became a pensioner of Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1801; two years thereafter he removed to St. Catharine's College (then known as Catharine Hall), from which he graduated in 1805. In 1806 he was elected a fellow of his college, and in 1807 became a tutor. In 1822 he was appointed Lucasian professor of mathematics, and in 1826 accepted the college living of Gimingham-cum-Trunch, in the County of Norfolk; but was recalled to the university in the following year by his election to the regius professorship of divinity. In 1830 he obtained the degaery of Peterborough, which office he filled until 1842, when he was appointed dean of Westminster. In 1845 he became bishop of Ely. He died at his residence in London, Jan. 7, 1864. As a controversialist, Dr. Turton has been rarely surpassed. His taste in fine arts was exquisite, and he was the composer of several excellent pieces of Church music. See *American Quar. Church Rev.* April, 1864, p. 157.

Turton, William

an English Wesleyan missionaries, was born in the island of Barbadoes, W. I. His father was a planter. His first labors were on the island of Antigua. In 1798 he received an appointment for St. Bartholomew from the English Conference. In 1800 he was sent to New Providence, and labored for the rest of his life on that and adjacent islands. He died at Nassau, May 10, 1818, aged fifty-seven. He was a faithful toiler. See *Wesleyan Meth. Mag.* 1821, p. 3, 81; *Wesleyan Minutes*, 1818.

Tutanus

in Roman mythology, was a deity who was implored in times of peril and danger for help and protection.

Tutiani, Bartolomeo

an engraver on wood, who is said to have executed some cuts marked with a Gothic monogram of his initials. Bartsch describes only one cut with this mark, *Christ Scoffed at by the Jews*, in a book (Nuremb. 1515); but there

is no evidence that it was engraved by Tutiani. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

Tutilina

in Roman mythology, was a goddess who was said to care for the fields of corn and grain. She had an altar and a pillar in the circus-no temple, however, as she could only be worshipped in the open air.

Tutilo

a monk of St. Gall and celebrated artist, was contemporary with the great teachers Notker Balbulus and Radbert of St. Gall, and associated with them in friendship and in the work of making St. Gall the foremost seat of the arts and sciences in their day. He was of gigantic stature and full of joyous humor; a *magister* and *presbyter* according to the necrology, but none the less a born artist and unquestioned genius. Driven into the world by his artist nature, he nevertheless preserved his piously simple and blameless life. In the monastery itself his strength and geniality determined his position. He was its butler and sacristan, and also the host and companion of visiting strangers, serving in the latter capacity down to A.D. 912.

The Irish bishop or presbyter Mark, and his nephew Moengal (the latter preferably called Marcellus by the monks), visited St. Gall in the middle of the 9th century; and Moengal instructed Tutilo, among others, in the art of music until he became a proficient composer. As an instrumentalist and vocalist he captivated the ear and the heart. He became himself a teacher of music, and in a separate room gave regular instruction to the sons of the nobility in the use of stringed instruments. Nor did he confine himself to sacred music only; but his finest laurels were still gathered in that field. He imitated the Scottish custom of associating instrumental music with vocal in the worship of the Church, and carried it further. Some of the instruments used in the small chapel of St. Gall are pictured in old MSS. which are still extant. His own most especial creation were the so called *tropes*, i.e. ornamental melodic additions, with texts, to the hymns of the mass, and particularly to its *Introit*, which were intended to impart a specifically festive character to the hymns for festal days. His Christmas trope *Hodie Cantandus* is well known. These tropes were widely received and used throughout the Church, and were perpetuated, under various

modifications, down to the 17th century. He also composed hymns and litanies (see the St. Gall MSS. Nos. 37 and 380).

The genius of Tutilo was displayed with equal force in the arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture. He had the independence to work from new, indigenous motives as well as from Roman and Byzantine models and after a traditional type. His fame extended widely, and made it the fashion to procure works from his hand. A statue of the Virgin Mary, erected by him at Metz, was wrought in so exalted a manner as to give currency to the report that the Virgin herself was his instructor. Of his carvings the ivory tables, which Charlemagne kept under his pillow, are especially celebrated. They passed into the hands of archbishop Hatto of Mayence, then into those of Solomon, abbot of St. Gall, and from him into the possession of the monastery. One of them was smooth, and upon its upper surface Tutilo carved the Virgin between four angels, while its lower surface received a portrayal of the legend of St. Gall, in which the saint gives bread to his obedient bear in reward for his labor of bearing wood for fuel. Stumpf, the ancient Swiss chronicler, mentions also an astronomical chart of brass upon which the orbits of the heavenly bodies were beautifully marked, as having been one of Tutilo's masterpieces and as being still in existence in his day. It is now, however, lost. On Tutilo's death he was buried in a chapel which was dedicated to his memory and called by his name; and he was venerated as a saint. The documents of the 11th and 12th centuries always speak of him as a saint; but his worship was soon lost. *Sources.* — Ekkehard IV (d. 1056), *Casus Sancti Galli*, reprinted in Pertz, *Monum. Germaniae*, vol. 2; Arx, *Gesch. d. Kantons Sanct Gallen* (1810), pt. 1, p. 97-100; Hefele, *Wiss. Zustandimsw. Deutschlnd u. in d. nordl. Schweiz*, in *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1838, No. 2. See also Dtmmler, *Formelbuch d. Bischofs Salomo III von Constanz*, p. 114; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tuttle, Amos C.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Monckton, Vt., July 28, 1800. 'He pursued his preparatory studies in the Academy at Middlebury, Vt.; graduated at Middlebury College in 1827; studied theology privately; was licensed by the Addison County Association June 30, 1829; ordained by an ecclesiastical council Oct.30, 1829; and became stated supply of the Church in Whitehall, N.Y., Sept. 1, 1830. In 1832 he became pastor of the Congregational Church in Hartford, N. Y.; in 1836 he accepted an agency for the Auburn Theological Seminary; in 1837 became pastor of the

Presbyterian Church in Fayetteville, Onondaga Co., N. Y.; in 1841, of a church at Liverpool, N. Y.; in 1844, of the Congregational Church in Sherburne, Chenango Co., N. Y.; in 1856, of the Church in Paw Paw, Van Buren Co., Mich. in 1859, of the Church in Lapeer, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 24, 1862. Mr. Tuttle was a man of more than ordinary mind, well educated, and popular as a preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 308.

Tuttle, Jacob

a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Vernon, Morris Co., N.J., Aug. 24, 1786. He was educated at the Bloomfield Academy, N.J.; studied theology privately; taught at the Academy at Newton, Sussex Co., N. J., from 1817 to 1820; was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New Jersey April 27, 1820; ordained and installed pastor of the West Milford Church, Passaic Co., Aug. 14, 1821; and removed to Ohio in 1832, where he engaged in home missionary labors, planting several churches, and was everywhere honored as a true man of God. He died Jan. 6, 1866. He was a successful minister, full of concern for his hearers, and honored of God. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 324.

Tuttle, Samuel Lawrence

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Bloomfield, N.J., Aug. 25, 1815. He was converted in 1830; pursued his academical studies in Newark, N.J.; graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1836; studied theology at the Auburn Seminary, N.Y.; was licensed by the Newark Presbytery Oct. 8, 1840; ordained pastor of the Caldwell Church, N.J., March 9, 1841; was in the employ of the American Bible Society from 1849 to 1854; became pastor of the Madison Church, Morris Co., N.J., Jan. 3, 1854; agent of the American Bible Society for Western New York from 1862 to 1863; and assistant to the secretaries until his death, which occurred April 16, 1866. Mr. Tuttle was an eloquent preacher. The Rev. Dr. Taylor, one of the secretaries of the American Bible Society, gave it as his opinion that there was no person so thoroughly and minutely acquainted with the history and workings of the Bible Society as he. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 327.

Tuttle, Timothy

a Congregational minister, was born at East Haven, Conn., Nov. 29, 1781. He graduated at Yale College in 1808; studied theology with Rev. David Smith of Durham, Conn.; commenced preaching at Durham, N. Y.; and was ordained over the Church in Ledyard, Conn., in 1811. Here he labored until his death, June 6, 1864. Mr. Tuttle was plain in appearance and-manners, yet a man of godly sincerity and of considerable influence. He was an instructive preacher. See *Cong. Quar. Rev.* 1864, p. 301.

Twelfth-day, (1) the feast of Epiphany, being the twelfth day after Christmas; (2) the old Christmasday.

Twelfth Day Of The Month.

In the evening service of the Church of England for the twelfth day of any month, the hymn after the second lesson, beginning "God be merciful unto us," etc., is omitted, because it comes in the regular psalm for the day, and would thus occasion an unnecessary and useless repetition. Stanton, *Dict. of the Church*, s.v.

Twelfth-night

the eve of the festival of the Epiphany, which occurs exactly twelve days after the feast of Christmas.

Twelfth-tide

SEE EPIPHANY.

Twells, Leonard

a learned English divine, was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he proceeded A.B. in 1704. In 1733 the University of Oxford conferred on him the degree of A.M. by diploma, in approbation probably of his *Critical Examination*, etc. He was at that time vicar of St. Mary's, Marlborough, but in 1737 was presented to the united rectories of St. Matthew's, Friday Street, and St. Peter's, Cheap. He was also a prebendary of St. Paul's and one of the lecturers of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West. He died Feb. 19, 1741 or 1742. His publications in his lifetime were, *A Critical Examination of the Late New Text and Version of the Testament, in Greek and English* (pts. 1, 2, Lond. 1731; pt. 3, 1732, 8vo): — *A Vindication of the Gospel of St.*

Matthew (1735, 8vo): — *Answer to the Inquiry into the Meaning of Daemoniacs in the New Test.* (1737, 8vo): — *Answer to the Further Inquiry* (1738, 8vo). After his death, his; *Sermons* at Boyle's and lady Mover's lectures were published for the benefit of his family (1743, 2 vols. 8vo). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Nichol, *Lit. Anec.*; id. *Illustr. of Liter.*

Twelve

This number was sacred among the Jews, probably because it was that of the tribes (q.v.), or of the months of the year, or (as some think) of the signs of the zodiac. It was symbolical of just proportion, beauty, and stability. It is sometimes used in the general sense of *a dozen* thus, Jeroboam's garment is 'said to have been rent into twelve pieces (^{<III>}1 Kings 11:30), and Elisha to have ploughed with twelve yoke of oxen, etc. *SEE NUMBER.*

Twesten, August Detlev Christian

a Protestant divine of Germany, was born April 11, 1789, at Gluickstadt. in Holstein. He studied theology and philosophy at Kiel, and in 1812 went to Berlin, where he became one of the earliest followers and an intimate personal friend of Schleiermacher. For some time he was professor of languages in one of the colleges at Berlin, but in 1814 he went back to Kiel as professor of theology and philosophy. After the death of Schleiermacher, in 1834, he was called to Berlin to succeed his teacher in the chair of systematic divinity. In 1850 he was appointed *Oberkirchenrath*, and died Jan. 8, 1876. As a writer, Twesten was the least prolific of all the more eminent German divines. This was owing partly to a certain timidity and conscientiousness, and partly to an unwillingness to publish anything which he had not first thoroughly searched and mastered, and for which there seemed to him no urgent need. He wrote an analytical logic, a critical edition of the three ecumenical creeds and the unaltered Augsburg Confession, essays on Heccius Illyricus, on Schleiermacher's *Ethics*, etc. But his main work is his *Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Hamb. 1837, 2 vols.), which in its unfinished condition has great and abiding excellences; "for he is, perhaps," says Schaff, "the clearest thinker and writer among all the systematic divines of Germany. He possesses the gift of didactic exposition and analysis in an eminent degree. His learning is always accurate, minute, and

thoroughly digested; his style transparent, smooth and polished." The volumes which were published contain-the first, the introductory chapters on religion, revelation, inspiration, the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, the use of reason, the history of dogmatic literature; the second embraces only the doctrine of God, the holy Trinity, the creation and preservation of the world, and angelology. As to his theological standpoint, it is, according to Schaff, "Schleiermacher's system passing over into Lutheran orthodoxy under a modernized form, or the Lutheran scholasticism of the 17th century revived, enlarged, and liberalized by the scientific influence of Schleiermacher and the tolerant spirit of the evangelical union." See *Theol. Universal-Lex. s.v.*; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1353; Schaff, *Germany, its Universities*, etc. p.320 sq. (B. P.)

Twichell, Pliny

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Athol, Worcester Co., Mass., Feb. 25, 1805. He was educated at Washington College, Pa.; studied theology in Auburn Seminary, N. Y.; was licensed by the Genesee Presbytery in 1836; and was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Wyoming, N. Y., in 1841. Here he labored for fifteen years, until 1856, in which year he took charge of East Bethany Church, where he preached until his death, Sept. 15. 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 180.

Twilight, Alexander L.

a Congregational minister and teacher, was born at Corinth, Vt., Sept. 23, 1795. By his own exertions he put himself through Randolph Academy and Middlebury College, graduating in 1823. He taught four years in Peru, N. Y.; was licensed to preach by the presbytery in Plattsburg in 1827; taught and preached one year in Vergennes, Vt.; and for eighteen years was principal of the grammar-school in Brownington, Vt., and again from 1852 to 1855. From 1847 until 1852 he taught in Shipton and Hatley, Ontario. He was ordained in Brownington in 1829, and supplied the pulpit there for many years, but was never a regular preacher. He died July 19, 1857. Mr. Twilight's great work was as a teacher; in this he was successful and influential. He pursued his purposes with undeviating energy, and built up his pupils in both character and knowledge. He was an able and often eloquent preacher. See *Cong. Quar. Rev.* 1867, p. 281.

Twining, Thomas

a learned Anglican divine, was born in 1734, and educated at Sidney College, Cambridge, being contemporary in that university with Gray, Mason, and Bate. Mr. Twining was well versed in the composition, harmony, and history of the art and science of music. In 1760 he took his degree of A.B., and that of A.M. in 1763. He became rector of White Notley, Essex, in 1768, and of St. Mary's, Colchester, to which he was presented by the bishop of London, in 1770. He died Aug. 6, 1804. Sound learning, polite literature, and exquisite tastes in all the fine arts lost an ornament and defender in the death of this scholar and worthy divine.

Twisse, William, D.D.

a distinguished Nonconforming Calvinistic divine, was born at Newbury, Berkshire, England, in 1575. He was educated at, and became subsequently a fellow of, New College, Oxford. He became chaplain to princess Elizabeth, afterwards queen of Bohemia. After this he was appointed to the curacy of Newbury. In 1643 he was elected prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. He confined himself with great thoroughness to the study of theology, and produced numerous works, among which are the following: *Vanitie* (1631, 4to): — *Vindicia Gratiae, Potestatis, ac Providentiae Dei* (Amst. 1632, 4to): — *Dissertatio de Scientia Media, tribus Libris absoluta* (fol.): *Morality of the Fourth Commandment* (Lond. 1641): *Treatise on Reprobation* (1646, 4to): — *Riches of God's Love to Vessels of Mercy Consistent with his Absolute Hatred, or Reprobation of Vessels of Wrath* (Oxf. 1653, fol.). This work was strongly recommended by Dr. Owen, *De Causa Dei contra Pelagium*. He left a number of works in MS. His death occurred July 20, 1646.

Two

This number is sometimes used in Scripture in a symbolical sense it typifies the connection between the magistracy and the ministry in the persons of Moses and Aaron; the two systems of idolatry which were learned in Egyptian and Babylonian bondage; the Old and New Tests.; the Jewish and Christian dispensations; and, among the early fathers, the divine and human natures of Christ. Several of the early heretics endeavored to introduce the Persian duality into the Christian system, and they therefore declared that the number two had a more mystic sanctity than any other; Traces of this

delusion may be found so late as the 9th century of the Church. *SEE NUMBER.*

Twombly, Israel S.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charlestown, Mass., Sept. 1, 1817. He was educated in Marion County, Mo.; graduated at Lane Theological Seminary in 1852; was licensed by Cincinnati Presbytery the same year, and ordained by Athens Presbytery pastor of the Church in Troy, O. He afterwards became pastor of the Church at Pomeroy, O., where he died, Oct. 31, 1860. He was a thorough scholar, and an earnest and impressive preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862; p. 198.

Twyne, Brian

an English divine, was born in 1579, and admitted a scholar of Corpus Christi College in 1594. He was admitted probationer fellow in 1605, and, entering into holy orders, took the degree of B.D. in 1610. In 1614 he was made Greek reader of his college, in which office he acquitted himself with credit, but left his college in 1623. He was afterwards presented to the vicarage of Rye, Sussex, but passed most of his time at Oxford in reading, writing, and contemplation. He died in St. Aldate's, July 4, 1644. He published *Antiquitatis Academicæ Oxoniensis Apologia*, etc. (Oxon. 1608, 4to).

Tyana, Council Of (Concilium Tyanense)

was held in 367 in Tyana, a town of Asia Minor. There were present in this council Eusebius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Athanasius of Ancyra, Pelagius of Laodicea, Gregory Nazianzen the elder, and many others who had declared their belief in the consubstantiality of the Son at Antioch in 363. The letters of pope Liberius and the bishops of Italy, Sicily, Africa, and Gaul were read, which had been written to wipe out the disgrace attaching to them on account of the Council of Ariminum. Eustathius of Sebaste, formerly deposed, was reestablished; and a synodical letter written to all the bishops of the East, exhorting them to testify in writing their rejection of the acts of Ariminum, and their adherence to the faith of Nicea. See Mansi, *Concil.* 2, 836.

Tychacum

the original name of a Temple of Portune at Antioch, which was turned into a church, and called by the name of Ignatius by Theodosius. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 8ch. 3, § 4. Tyche, in Greek mythology, is identical with *Fortuna* of the Romans. Pindar calls her a daughter of Jupiter. She possessed at Thebes, and at numerous other places, temples and monuments.

Tyches

in Egyptian mythology, is one of the four protecting domestic spirits which are allotted to each human being during the period of life.

Tych'icus

(*Τύχικος* for *τυχικός*, *fateful*), a companion of Paul on some of his journeys, and one of his fellow-laborers in the work of the Gospel. A.D. 54-64.

(1.) In ^{400b}Acts 20:4, he appears as one of those who accompanied the apostle through a longer or shorter portion of his return journey from the third missionary circuit. Here he is expressly called (with Trophimus) a native of Asia Minor (*Ἀσιανός*); but while Trophimus went with Paul to Jerusalem (^{402b}Acts 21:29), Tychicus was left behind in Asia, probably at Miletus (20, 15, 38).

(2.) How Tychicus was employed in the interval before Paul's first imprisonment we cannot tell; but in that imprisonment he was with the apostle again, as we see from ^{504b}Colossians 4:7, 8. Here he is spoken of, not only as "a beloved brother," but as "a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord; and he is to make known to the Colossians the present circumstances of the apostle (*τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ πάντα γνωρίσει*), and to bring comfort to the Colossians themselves (*ἵνα παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν*). From this we gather that diligent service and warm Christian sympathy were two features of the life and character of Tychicus. Colossus was in Asia; but from the fact that of Onesimus, who is mentioned immediately afterwards, it is said, *ὅς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν*, whereas Tychicus is not so styled, we naturally infer that the latter was not a native of that city. These two men were doubtless the bearers both of this letter and the following, as well as that to Philemon.

(3.) The language concerning Tychicus in ^{<4072>}Ephesians 6:21,22 is very similar, though not exactly in the same words. It is the more important to notice this passage carefully, because it is the only personal allusion in the epistle, and is of some considerable value as a subsidiary argument for its authenticity. If this was a circular letter, Tychicus, who bore a commission to Colossae, and who was probably well known in various parts of the province of Asia, would be a very proper person to see the letter duly delivered and read.

(4.) The next references are in the Pastoral Epistles, the first in chronological order being ^{<5042>}Titus 3:12. Here Paul (writing possibly from Ephesus) says that it is probable he may send Tychicus to Crete, about the time when he himself goes to Nicopolis.

(5.) In ^{<5042>}2 Timothy 4:12 (written at Rome during the second imprisonment) he says, "I am herewith sending Tychicus to Ephesus." At least it seems natural, with Dr. Wordsworth, so to render ἀπέστειλα, though Bp. Ellicott's suggestion is also worth considering, that this mission may have been connected with the carrying of the *first* epistle. (See their notes on the passage.) However this may be, we see this disciple at the end, as we saw him at the beginning, connected locally with Asia, while also co-operating with Paul. We have no authentic information concerning Tychicus in any period previous to or subsequent to these five scriptural notices. The tradition which places him afterwards as bishop of Chalcedon in Bithynia is apparently of no value. But there' is much probability in the conjecture (Stanley's *Corinthians*, 2nd ed. p. 493) that Tychicus was one of the two "brethren" (Trophimus being the other) who were associated with Titus (^{<5086>}2 Corinthians 8:16-24) in conducting the business of the collection for the poor Christians in Judaea. As arguments for this view we may mention the association with Trophimus, the probability that both were Ephesians, the occurrence of both names in the Second Epistle to Timothy (see ^{<5042>}2 Timothy 4:20), the chronological and geographical agreement with the circumstances of the third missionary journey, and the general language used concerning Tychicus in Colossians and Ephesians. **SEE ASIA; SEE EPHESUS; SEE TROPHIMUS.**

Tycho

in Greek mythology, was a daemon similar to Conisalus, generally found represented in company with Priapus.

Tychonius

a Donatist of the 4th century, who displayed an impartial and sincere desire to arrive at the truth with respect to the controversy between his sect and the Church. He is described as having been learned in the Scriptures, tolerably acquainted with history and with secular literature, and zealously interested in the affairs of the Church. He regarded the Church as the sole divinely provided remedial institution, into which all men must enter if they would attain to salvation; and therefore held that the moral state of the members cannot destroy the value and efficiency of the Church. He was also consistent in protesting against the rebaptism of persons who became Donatists. His views were attacked as heretical by the Donatist Parmenian (q.v.), and drew forth an epistle from Augustine. Tychonius was accused of being a Chiliast, but the charge is probably untrue. A single work from his pen remains, the *Liber Septen Regulis*, first published by Grynneus (Basle, 1569), and afterwards in a better edition by Gallandi in the *Bibl. Vet. Patrum* (Venet. 1772), 8:107-129. The work is designed to serve as a guide to the interpretation of the Scriptures, and some of its rules are still followed by some expositors e.g., the sixth, *De Recapitulatione*, which teaches that the same thing is sometimes repeatedly narrated or described, especially in the Apocalypse, so that successive narratives do not necessarily refer to successive events. The book furnished Isidore of Seville the idea for his work *Sententiarum Libri Tres*. As the earliest endeavor to construct a theory of Christian hermeneutics, the work certainly deserves attention. It would appear from Augustine that Tychonius died about 390; but Gennadius (*De Script. Eccles.* c. 18) fixes a later time. Gallandi furnished a sketch of Tychonius in *Proleg.* to *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* VIII, 2, 5, and a more careful notice is given in Tillemont, *Memoires pour servir a Hist. Eccl. des Six premiers Siecles* (2nd ed. Paris, 1704), 6:81 sq., 145-150. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tychsen, Olaus Gerhard

a German Talmudist, was born Dec. 14, 1734, at Tondern, a town in Sleswick. He studied the classical and Oriental languages in the gymnasium of Altona, with the exception of Arabic, which he acquired from a merchant whose business had caused him to reside during many years in North Africa. He finished his theological course at Halle, and was soon afterwards appointed a teacher in G. A. Franke's Orphanage. While so employed he learned the English, Hindostani, and Tamil languages from a

missionary (Schulz). His favorite study, however, was the Rabbinical Talmud, in whose language he was, so proficient as to be able to speak and write with great ease. He was, in April, 1759, appointed missionary to the Jews and Mohammedans, and traveled in that capacity through North Germany, Prussia, Denmark, and Saxony, but without accomplishing anything. In the synagogue at Altona his sermon even earned for him a severe beating. In 1760 Tychsen went to the University of Butzow, in Mecklenburg, as *magister legens*, and remained there until Butzow was united with the University of Rostock and transferred to the latter place, when he likewise removed thither. He died Dec. 30, 1815. Tychsen had earned a great reputation, as is attested by his election to numerous societies and by many flattering testimonials; but this reputation respected simply the extent, and not at all the thoroughness, of his knowledge. He possessed solid acquirements only in the Rabbinical, and joined with them a keen eye and considerable skill for the detection of foreign written characters; but he was deficient in judgment, ready to venture the most improbable hypotheses, and anxious for notoriety. He is consequently important only as a Talmudist, a numismatist, and an epigrapher. His controversy with Kennicott and Bayer directed attention to him more than any other incident of his careers and it afforded evidence of all the traits described above—his wide learning, obstinate orthodoxy, and want of critical judgment. In this dispute he wrote, *Tentamen de Variis Codicum Hebr. Vet. Test. MSS. Generibus* (Rost. 1772, 8vo), in support of the Masoretic text: — *Befreites Tentarnen*, etc. (1774): — and a supplement (1776). He insisted that the Greek versions had been made from a Hebrew text written in Greek characters, and advocated the no less singular theory that the Samaritan Pentateuch had been copied from a Hebraeo-Jewish (Masoretic) text with the vowel-points—the latter in *Disputatio Hist. — phil. crit. de Pent. Samarit.* etc. (Butzow, 1765, 4to). In 1779 he published a work to demonstrate the spurious character of all Jewish coins bearing Jewish or Samaritan characters, including those of the Maccabean period, which drew forth a reply from the Spanish Jesuit Bayer and occasioned a protracted dispute. ‘In the study of Arabic coins Tychsen rendered real service, and began the systematic study of Oriental numismatics. He showed himself a master in the deciphering of inscriptions (see *Erklärung d. arab. Schrift auf d. rom. kaiserl. Kronungsmantel*, in the *Meckl. — Schwerin. Gelehrten Beitragae*, 1780, Nos. 42, 45, and the *Intepret. Inscript. Cufic. in Alarm. Templ. Patriarch. S. Petri Cathedra* [Rost. 1787]). Tychsen also published editions of Al-Makrizi *A I-Makrizi Hist.*

Monetce Arab. e Cod. Escui'ial. (ibid. 1797, 8vo): — and *Tractat. de Legalibus Arab. Ponderibus et Mensuris* (ibid. 1800, 8vo). His *Elementale Arabicum*, etc., is of inferior value, as is also his *Element. Syriacum*. See Hartmann, *Olaus Gerhard Tychsen*, etc. (Bremen, 1818 sq.); De Sacy, *Biog. Universelle*, 47, 120 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tychsen, Thomas Christian

a German scholar and professor, was born at Horsbyll, in Sleswick, May 8, 1758; studied at Kiel and Göttingen; traveled over the Continent after having completed his studies; and became professor extraordinary of theology in Göttingen in 1784, through the intervention of Heyne, his patron. In 1788 he was made ordinary professor of philosophy; 1806, councilor; 1817, honorary doctor of theology. He was a member of several learned societies, and director of the Royal Scientific Association of Göttingen. He died Oct. 24, 1834. This Trahsen, like Olaus G. Tychsen (q.v.), to whom he was in nowise related, was more prominent as an Oriental and classical scholar and antiquarian than as a theologian. He composed forty-three books and essays, all of which are characterized by learning, thoroughness, and good judgment. We mention, *De Hapovaua Christi et Notionibus de Adventu Christi in N.T. Obviis: De Josephi Auctoritate et Usu*, etc.: — *De Litteratura Hebr.*: — *Illustr. Vatican. Joelis.* c. 3 (Gött. 1788). The dispute of Olaus Tychsen with Bayer led him also to give attention to the study of Jewish coins. In this pursuit he wrote, *De Numis Hebraeo-Samarit.* etc., in *Nov. Comment. Soc. Reg. Gött.* 8:120 sq.: — *De Numis Oriental.* (1789): — *De Numis Hasmoeorum*, etc., in *Nov. Corn.* vol. 12. He furthermore wrote *Geschichte d. hebr. Literatur* (ibid.). In 1791 he became the collaborator of J. D. Michaelis in the Oriental and exegetical library published by the latter, and his successor beginning with vol. 9. He also completed part 4 of Michaelis's *Anmerk. für Ungelehrte* and vol. 6 of his *Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr.* (1792). He edited vol. 6 of Koppe's edition of the New Test., comprising *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, and *Thessalonians* (2nd ed. 1791). A complete list of his works and detailed sketch of his life may be found in *Neuer Nekrolog der Deutschen* (1834, pt. 2; Weimar, 1836), p. 894-900. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Tye, Christopher

an English musician of the 16th century, was born at Westminster, and brought up in the Royal Chapel. He was musical preceptor to prince

Edward, son of Henry VIII. In 1545 he was admitted to the degree of doctor in music at Cambridge, and in 1548 was incorporated a member of the University of Oxford. In the reign of queen Elizabeth he was organist of the Royal Chapel, and a man of some literature. "The Acts of the Apostles," set to music by Dr. Tye, were sung in the Chapel of Edward VI; but the success of them not meeting the expectation of their author, he commenced the composition of music to words selected from the Psalms of David. The former was published with the following title, *The Actes of the Appostles, translated into Englyshe Metre*, etc. (1553, sm. 8vo). He also composed *A Notable Historye of Nastagio and Traversari, no less Pitiefull than Pleasaunt* (Lond. 1569, 12mo), See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Tyler, Bennet, D.D.

an eminent Congregational divine, was born at Middlebury, Conn., July 10, 1783. His parents were in humble circumstances, and he worked on the farm until he was fifteen, when an accident disabled him so that it was resolved to send him to college. His own exertions, with some assistance from his father, enabled him to graduate at Yale College in 1804 free from debt. He was converted while at college in the great revival of 1802, studied theology with Rev. Asahel Hoker, and in 1808 was ordained over the Church in South Britain, Conn., where he remained fourteen years. From 1822 to 1828 he was president of Dartmouth College, also performing the duties of college pastor. In 1828 he succeeded Dr. Payson in the pastorate of the Second Church, Portland, Me., where he was greatly beloved. Dr. Tyler was a clear, logical, and pungent preacher, and he specially delighted in doctrinal themes. About this time Prof. N. W. Taylor, of Yale Divinity School, enounced views which were regarded by many New England theologians as unsafe and unsound. Dr. Tyler was his principal opponent, and the long and able discussion which followed belongs to the history of controversy. To offset the influence of the New Haven theology on the young preachers in the state, the Theological Institute of Connecticut was founded at East Windsor in 1833, and Dr. Tyler was chosen its president and professor of theology. He held these positions until his resignation, July 16, 1857. He died at East Windsor, after only a few hours' sickness, May 14, 1858.

Dr. Tyler was a man of humble and sincere piety, and of a genial and sympathetic nature. In his theological opinions he did not embrace pure

Calvinism, but as modified by Edwards and his school. He was in full sympathy with the traditional theology of New England, and was a straightforward controversialist, avoiding metaphysical speculations and verbal subtleties. In forming his system he began, not with mind, but with the Bible, and he looked for no advances in theology except such as come from a richer Christian experience. His writings are permeated by a spirit of practical religion, and, according to some, checked the influence of Dr. Taylor's views. Dr. Tyler published many sermons and controversial articles and pamphlets. His larger works are as follows: *History of the New Haven Theology in Letters to a Clergyman* (1837): — *A Review of Day on the Will* (1837): — *Memoir of Rev. Asahel Nettleton, D.D.* (Hartford, 1844, 12mo): — *Nettleton's Remains* (ibid. 1845, 12mo): — *The Sufferings of Christ Confined to his Human Nature* (N. Y. 1845): — *A Treatise on New England Revivals* (1846): — *Letters to Dr. Horace Bushnell on Christian Nurture* (1847-48): — *Lectures on Theology* (posthumous), with a *Memoir* by Rev. Nahum Gale, D.D. (his son-in-law) (Boston, 1859, 8vo). See *Cong. Quar. Rev.* 1860, p. 351 sq. (by A. H. Quint); *New-Englander*, August, 1859 (by Prof. Lawrence); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tyler, Edward Royall

a Congregational minister and author, was born at Guilford, Vt., Aug. 3, 1800. He was the son of chief-justice Tyler, two of whose sons became ministers in the Protestant Episcopal Church and one in the Presbyterian. Edward was converted while a clerk in a counting-house in New York, and under the ministry of Dr. Spring. He graduated at Yale College in 1825, studied theology, and was ordained pastor of the South Church in Middletown, Conn., in 1827. Here he was successful in building up the Church, but ill-health induced his resignation in 1832. He was next pastor in Colebrook, Conn., 1833-36. For a year Mr. Tyler was agent of the American Antislavery Society, and from 1838 to its discontinuance in 1842 he was editor of the *Connecticut Observer*. In 1843 the *New Englander* was established under his proprietorship and editorship, and he continued in connection with it until his death, except during the periods of his prostration through illness. He died Sept. 28, 1848. Mr. Tyler contributed twenty-two articles to the first six volumes of the *New Englander* (see these enumerated in that periodical, 6:607). His other publications were, *Slavery a Sin per se*: — *Lectures on Future Punishment* (Middletown, 1829, 12mo): — *Holiness Always Preferable to Sin: a Sermon* (New

Haven, 1829, 8vo). This opposed the position of some of the metaphysical divines of New England, that God sometimes preferred sin to holiness: *The Doctrine of Elections: a Sermon* (New Haven, 1831, 8vo): — *The Congregational Catechism* (ibid. 1844, 18mo). Tyler's writings are able, and some were thought at the time to be unsurpassed in their treatment of the subject in hand. Many were produced under the depressing influence of disease. "He was by nature, by culture, and by the grace of God, one of the best sort of men, in whom the elements of character are ennobled by faith and sanctified by devotion. We have seen his uncomplaining patience, his uniform cheerfulness, his kindness and sympathy, his generous impulses, his childlike piety." See *New Englander*, 1848, p. 603 sq. (by L. Bacon); *Cong. Quar. Rev.* 1866, p. 287.

Tyler, James Endell

an English clergyman, was born at Monmouth in 1789. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford, where he became fellow, dean, and tutor. Presented to the rectory of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, London, in 1826, he became canon residentiary of St. Paul's in 1845. He died in 1852. He wrote, *Indices Attici* (Lond. 1824, 12mo): — *Oaths, their Origin, Nature, and History* (1834, p. 8vo): — *Conversations of a Father with his Children* (5th ed. 1840, 2 vols. 18mo): — *Primitive Church Worship* (1840, 8vo): — *A Father's Letters to his Son on Confirmation* (1843, 12mo): — *Worship of the B. V. Mary is the Church of Rome* (1844, 8vo): — *Image worship of the Church of Rome* (1847, 8vo): — *Meditations from the Fathers of the First Five Centuries* (1849, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Rector's Address to his Parishioners* (1851, 8vo): — *Christian's Hope in Death: — Sermons* (1852, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tyler, Joseph D.

a clergyman and instructor of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Brattleborough, Vt. He graduated at Yale in 1829, and pursued a theological course at Alexandria, Va. His organs of hearing having become impaired by disease, he became connected with the Deaf-and-Dumb Asylum at Hartford, Conn., and subsequently became principal of the Deaf-and-Dumb Institution of Virginia. He died at Staunton, Va., Jan. 28, 1852. He was an excellent scholar, and made some graceful contributions to the literature of the day. See *Amer. Quar. Church Rev.* 1852, p. 142.

Tyler, William

a Congregational minister, was born at Attleborough, Mass., Jan. 7, 1780, and was educated at Brown University in the class of 1800. For some time after leaving college he was engaged in secular pursuits. Having decided to study theology, he placed himself under the tuition of Rev. Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, Mass., and was licensed to preach in 1818. He was ordained in 1819 as junior pastor of the Congregational Church in South Weymouth, Mass., soon-becoming sole pastor. He remained thirteen years in this place (1819-32). He removed to South Hadley Falls, Mass., in 1832, and was pastor of the Church in that place seven years (1832-39). For several years he performed missionary service, under the direction of the Home Mission Society, in the interior of Massachusetts, having his residence at Amherst. He removed to Northampton, Mass., in 1847, and became the editor of the *Courier*, published in that place. For several years he resided in Pawtucket, R. I., and represented that town in the convention which met in 1853 to revise the State Constitution. He removed to Auburndale, Mass., in 1863, where he spent the remainder of his life, and where he died Sept. 27, 1875. "He was well instructed," says Prof. Gammell, "in theology, and was particularly interested in local history and antiquities, and on these subjects he was a frequent contributor to magazines and newspapers." (J.C.S.)

Tympanum

Picture for Tympanum

the triangular space between the horizontal and sloping cornices on the front of a pediment in classical architecture; it is often left plain, but is sometimes covered with sculpture. This name is also given to the space immediately above the opening of a doorway, etc., in mediaeval architecture, when the top of the opening is square and has an arch over it; this arrangement is not uncommon in England in Norman work, and on the Continent is to be found in each of the styles. Tympanums of this kind are occasionally perfectly plain, but are generally ornamented with carving or sculpture. In Continental work the subjects are usually arranged in tiers one above another, and often embrace a great number of figures. Also when an arch is surmounted by a gable-molding or triangular hood mould, the space included between the arch and the mould is termed the *tympanum* of the gable. — Parker, *Gloss. of Architect.* s.v.

Tympe, Johann Gottfried

professor of theology and Oriental languages at Jena, was born in 1699 at Biederitz, near Magdeburg, and died June 28, 1768. He wrote, *Forma Velnborum Perfectorum Hebraeorum, Chaldaicorum, Syriacorum atpue Arabicorum Communis et Harmonica in Tabulis Compendio Exhibita et Descripta* (Jena, 1728-32): — *Progr. quo Indistinctam Antiquorum Ebraeorur Scriptionem esse recens Commentum Morinianum, Certitudini Divinarum Literarum longe Perniciosissimum Ostendit* (ibid. 1730): — *Tabulma Universae Accentuationis Hebr. — Chald. turn Pros. tun Metr.* (ibid. 1740): — *Geneseos Prima quinque Capita et Partern Secti Hebraiae et Singulorum Vocum Rationena Grammaticam Secundum Principio Danziano exposuit in Usum Auditorum* (ibid. 1727): — *De Cultu Divino ad Stata Loca Restricto*, etc. (ibid. 1728): — *Schediasma, quo Iterandca Editiones Concordantiarum Hebraeo-Chaldaicarum Chr. Noldii Novamque Cone. Pronominum* etc. (ibid. eod.): — *Formia Arabicorum Verborum Perfectorum Descripta* (ibid. eod.): — *Diss. let II de Descensu Nubis Glorice in Sanctuarium ante Consecrationem Aaronis Facto, adversus Talindistas et Veteres Ebrceorum Commentatores* (ibid. 1731-33), etc. See First, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3, 456; Winer, *Handb. der theol. Lit.* 1, 115, 121; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Handb.* p. 141. (B. P.)

Tyndale (or Tindal), William

the Bible translator and martyr, was born in the hundred of Berkeley, either at Stinchcomb or North Nibley, Gloucestershire, about the year 1484 (or 1477). At an early period he was sent to Oxford, where he took his degree, and also gave instructions in Magdalen Hall. But he left Oxford for Cambridge, where it is believed that he took a degree. In 1502 he obtained priest's orders, and in 1508 entered the monastery at Greenwich as a friar. He seems to have already formed the design, or even to have actually begun the work, of translating the New Test., and had probably imbibed some of the notions which were beginning to be circulated in favor of reforming the Church. In 1522 (or 1520) Tyndale is next found as tutor in the house of Sir John Welch, of Little Sodbury, not far from Bristol, where he preached in the villages and towns on the Sabbath, and often disputed with neighboring abbots and other Romish ecclesiastics. Here, too, he translated the *Enchiridion Militis* of Erasmus, as a present to his host and his lady. His free opinions and discussions soon got him into troublous examinations before the popish dignitaries, but no penalty was inflicted on

him. He took the hint, however, left the county, and went to London, his mind being now fully occupied with the idea of translating the Scriptures. He soon found, as he himself quaintly says, "that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Test.; nay, no place to do it in all England." In London he sometimes preached at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, while alderman Humphrey Monmouth took him under his protection, and gave, him an annuity of ten pounds a year to enable him to live abroad, for which ten pounds he was in return to pray for the souls of the alderman's father and mother. Tyndale on leaving England went first to Hamburg. It is often said that from Hamburg he proceeded to Wittenberg, where he met Luther, who had now thrown off the last vestige of popish thralldom, and that there he completed his translation of the New Test. The statement is apparently not correct, for during 1524 he seems to have remained at Hamburg, and in 1525 he appears to have been first at Cologne and then at Worms. At Cologne Tyndale seems to have commenced to print his first edition in 4to, but after ten sheets were printed the work was interrupted, and the translator and his coadjutors betook themselves to the Lutheran city of Worms, where the quarto was finished, and an octavo edition also issued from the press (1525)'. The prologue to the quarto has been republished under the name of *A Pathway to the Scriptures*. The translator's name was attached to neither of the two editions, and he assigns a reason for this omission in his *Wicked Mammon*, published in 1527. Copies of these versions early found their way into England. In 1526 Tunstall, bishop of London, fulminated his prohibition of them, and two years afterwards a number of copies were collected, nay, some were purchased by the bishop in Antwerp, and burned at St. Paul's Cross. Warham and Wolsey were also dreadfully enraged, and Sir Thomas More was employed to denounce Tyndale, but his genius was foiled in the attempt, and Tyndale won a victory over the learned chancellor. Of the first edition only a fragment now exists, and of the second only two copies, one of them imperfect. Two editions were afterwards printed at Antwerp, and found their way to England in vessels laden with grain. Endeavors were made to seize Tyndale and punish all who had assisted him, but he removed to Marburg, in Hesse, in 1528, and published there a book of great value — *The Obedience of a Christian Man*. The result of all the English opposition was that, as Fox expresses it, copies of the New Test. came thick and threefold into England. We find Tyndale again at Antwerp in 1529, during which year a fifth edition was printed; the four books of Moses were also translated, printed each at a separate press, and put into

circulation. The enemies of the translator endeavored to decoy him into England, but he was too wary to be so easily entrapped, for he well knew what displeasure Henry VIII felt at his tract called *The Practice of Prelates*, and what penalty the royal indignation would speedily inflict. After the martyrdom of Frith, Tyndale set himself to revise and correct the version of the New Test., and it was soon thrown off, with this remark in the preface, "Which I have looked over again with all diligence, and compared with the Greek, and have weeded out of it many fautes." But his enemies in England, whose power had been shaken by the copious circulation of the English New Test., were the more enraged against him, and conspired to seize him on the Continent, in the name of the emperor. An Englishman named Philips betrayed him, and, acting under such information, the authorities at Brussels seized him, in the house of Pointz, his friend, and conveyed him to Vilvoorden, twenty-three miles from Antwerp. Pointz, who had with difficulty escaped himself, made every effort for him, but in vain. The neighboring University of Louvain thirsted for his blood. Tyndale was speedily condemned, and on Friday, Oct. 6, 1536, in virtue of a recent Augsburg decree, he was led out to the scene of execution. On being fastened to the stake he cried, in loud and earnest prayer, "Lord, open the eyes of the king of England," and, then was first strangled and afterwards burned. The merits of Tyndale must ever be recognized and honored by all who enjoy the English Bible—for their authorized version of the New Test. has his for its basis. He made good his early boast that ploughboys should have the Word of God. His friends all speak of his great simplicity of heart, and commend his abstemious habits, his zeal, and his industry; while even the imperial procurator who prosecuted him styles him *homo doctus, pius, et bonus*. The works of Tyndale and Frith were collected and published (Lond. 1831, 3 vols. 8vo). For information respecting Tyndale, his writings, and editions of his translations of the Testament, Pentateuch, etc., see Bliss's Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* 1, 94; Fox, *Acts and Mn.; Biog. Brit.*; Walter and Offor, *Life of Tyndale*; Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biog.*; Newcome, *English Bible Translations*; Johnson, *Hist. of English Translations of the Bible*; Lewis, *Hist. of Translations of the Bible into English*; Cotton, *List of Editions of the Bible in English*; Anderson, *Annals of the English Bible*; Home, *Introd. to Study of the Bible; Historical Account of English Versions of Scripture*; Watt, *Bibl. Brit.*; *Princeton Rev.* 10:321; *Christian Rev.* 3, 130; *North American Rev.* 67, 322. For fuller list of literature, see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Tyndareus

in Greek mythology, was the husband of the renowned Leda, and was king in Sparta, from which he was driven with his brother Icarius. Hercules placed the fleeing brothers again in possession of their kingdoms. Pausanias saw his grave in Lacedaemonia before the temple of Jupiter Cosmetes (3, 17, 4).

Tyndarides

in Greek mythology, was a surname of the *Dioscuri*.

Tyndaris

in Greek mythology, was a surname of *Helen*.

Tyng, Dudley A.

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md., in 1825. He graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1843; studied at the Alexandria (Va.) Theological Seminary; became deacon in 1846 and priest in 1849; was first settled as a clergyman in Columbus, O., and afterwards was rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati; in 1854 was pastor of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, where he remained one year, resigning and organizing a new parish called the Church of the Covenant, of which he was minister at the time of his death, which occurred at Brookfield, near Philadelphia, April 19, 1858. See *American Quar. Church Rev.* 1858, p. 344.

Type.

I. Name. — The Greek word *τύπος*, from which our *type* is derived, denotes primarily a *blow*, then the *mark left by a blow*, then a *mark or print of any kind*, then a *figure or image*; and finally a *mould or model*, whether that be viewed as the original from which something else has taken its form, or as indicating the form which something not yet existing may assume. In the New Test. the word occurs in several of these senses, and in some passages with a shade of meaning peculiar to itself. In ^{<4125>}John 20:25 it is used to denote the mark which the nails made in our Lord's hands and feet; in ^{<4173>}Acts 7:43 it means a copy or image; in ver. 44 and ^{<5805>}Hebrews 8:5 it signifies a model after which something is made; in ^{<6167>}Romans 6:17 it denotes a mould from which a form is derived; in ver. 14 it conveys the

idea of one person presenting some analogy to another person; and in several places it means an example which others may follow (^{<4606>}1 Corinthians 10:6, 11; ^{<5187>}Philippians 3:17; ^{<5100>}1 Thessalonians 1:7; ^{<5189>}2 Thessalonians 3:9, etc.).

As used by theologians, the word *type* has received a special technical meaning not exactly equivalent to any of these usages, though approaching to that of ^{<4814>}Romans 5:14, where Adam is said to be the type of Christ. They mean by it any object, whether office, institution, person, or action, by means of which some truth connected with Christianity was prefiguratively foretold under preceding dispensations. Such an object the apostles call a **σκιά**, a shadow or adumbration of that which it indicated (comp. ^{<3801>}Hebrews 10:1; ^{<5127>}Colossians 2:17). This shadow became a type because it presented the model or representation of something yet future. Sometimes, also, the term **παραβολή** is used with a similar meaning (^{<3809>}Hebrews 9:9; 11:19),

II. Fundamental Principles. — There are certain notions which must be assumed as lying at the basis of typology.

1. Spiritual truths, ideas, thoughts, may be represented By material symbols, whether actions, institutions, or objects. This the usage of all nations establishes. More especially was this a favorite method of communicating thought among the imaginative Orientals; in general, it is found to prevail most in the earlier stages of a people's history, while as yet the use of objects that appeal to the senses is more effective than the use of written documents. In Scripture, frequent instances occur of such symbolical methods of conveying ideas; as, for instance, the placing of the hand under the thigh for confirmation of an oath; the boring of the ear of the servant who declined to avail himself of the liberty brought by the year of jubilee; the rending of the garments in token of grief; and such acts as those of Abijah when, in announcing to Jeroboam the secession of the ten tribes from the house of Solomon, he tore his garment into twelve pieces and gave to Jeroboam ten (^{<1102>}1 Kings 9:29); that of Elisha when he indicated to the king of Israel the victories which by divine help he should obtain over the Syrians by commanding him to shoot an arrow from the window eastward after he had placed his hand on the king's hand (^{<1234>}2 Kings 13:14-19); and those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel when they were signs to the people (^{<2490>}Jeremiah 19:1-11; ^{<5123>}Ezekiel 12:3-16).

2. Such symbolical representations may be employed to convey religious truth. This usage we find also to have prevailed among all nations, especially in the earlier stages of their history. Among the Jews it was abundantly used; not however, according to human caprice or ingenuity, but always in obedience to the express ordinance of God. The symbolical observances of an earlier age introduced into the service of God, it may be presumed, were also of divine appointment, on the general principle that, as God alone can declare what worship he will receive, it is only as he appoints that any service can be properly offered to him.

3. The true religion has in all ages been essentially the same, so that the truths symbolized by the institutions of the earlier dispensations are identical with those more directly and fully made known to us under the Christian dispensation. The substantial identity of the patriarchal and Mosaic religions with the Christian must be assumed in all attempts to argue from the Old Test. to the New, or *vice versa*, and will not be denied by any who receive these books as divine. From this it necessarily follows that what was taught by *symbol* under the ancient economies as part of religious truth will be found identical with what is taught in *words* under the new dispensation.

4. The religion of Jesus Christ is one resting on the facts of his personal appearance and work. Out of these all its truths flow directly or indirectly; and to these they all have respect. Hence the truths taught symbolically to the Old Test. saints, being identical with those of Christianity, must also rest on, and have respect to these facts.

5. A twofold character was thus of necessity given to the religious institutions of the ancient economies. They were primarily symbolical of religious truth. They were secondarily predictive of facts in the future on which these truths rested.

III. *Nature of Types.* — Proceeding on these data, we may attempt to construct a typology, the design of which shall be to show what are the types in the Old Test. and the correspondence between them and their antitypes in the New Test. The most important step towards this is to determine from the preceding data what is the proper idea of a type. This we would express as follows: A type is an institute or act appointed by God to symbolize a religious truth, and to prefigure by means of analog or

resemblance those facts in the mediatorial work of Christ on which these truths rest. This definition involves the following elements:

1. A type is an *institute* or *act*. We use these terms in a wide sense, understanding under the former not only, formal organizations and religious offices, but times, places, implements of religious service; and under the latter not only rites and ceremonies, but special acts, or series of acts determined by the proper criterion to be typical. By this definition, however, *persons* and *things* simply as such are excluded. A person *per se*, or a thing simply as such, cannot possess a symbolical character; and cannot be the **σκιά**, or prefigurative sign, of another person or thing, much less of a fact or series of facts. A person may sustain atypical office or may perform a typical act, and a thing may be used in a typical service or ceremony, but in and by itself it cannot be a type. This sets aside a whole host of types which the ingenuity of interpreters has constructed out of the historical personages of the Old Test. That many of these sustained typical offices and performed typical acts is admitted; but that they were in themselves-in' their proper individual personality types of our Lord, we cannot believe. The assertion indeed, is to us unintelligible except in a sense which would be profane and untrue —viz. that their personal character and conduct were a representation of the character and conduct of our blessed Lord. It is true that for this doctrine of personal types the authority of the New Test. has been pleaded. But we are unable to find a solitary instance in the New Test. of any historical character mentioned in the Old Test. being brought forward as having been personally a **σκιά** of Christ or his work. In one passage, indeed Adam is called a **τύπος** of Christ, but **τύπος** is not there equivalent to **σκιά**; and, even if it were, it would not follow that it was Adam *as a person* who was the type of Christ, for the apostle is speaking throughout that context of our first parent in his official, federal, or representative character. The words of Peter also (1 Peter 3, 21) have been cited as showing that a simple historical occurrence may be the type of a Christian truth; but, whatever the apostle may mean in that passage by calling salvation by baptism the **ἀντίτυπον** of Noah's salvation by the ark, he certainly cannot mean that the latter was a divinely appointed prefiguration of the former. The utmost that can be drawn from his words is that an analogy subsists between the two, whereby the one is fitted to illustrate the other. The strongest case in favor of the opinion we are opposing is our Lord's representation of himself as the true bread of which the manna was tie prefiguration. We cannot understand this as

intimating less than that the manna was a type of him. Still it was the manna, not as a natural phenomenon; but as a special and peculiar provision made by God for the feeding of the people, that was the type of Christ; and in this divine appointment we find what reduces this under the head of proper types.

2. A type is an institute or act *appointed by God*, and by him adapted to the end — it is designed to serve. Knowing what in due time was to be exhibited to men by the mission and work of his Son, God could not only predict it in words, but also give by means of symbolical acts and institutes such representation of it as would, in some measure at ‘least, bring before the minds of the ancient saints a lively idea of it. As God alone could do this, it is on his appointment that the whole must rest. “To constitute one thing the type of another, as the term is generally understood in reference to Scripture, something more is needed than mere resemblance. The former must not only resemble the latter, but must have been *designed* to resemble the latter. It must have been so designed in its original institution. It must have been designed as something *preparatory* to the latter. The type as well as the antitype must have been preordained; and they must have been preordained as constituent parts of the same general scheme of Divine Providence. It is this *previous design* and this preordained connection which constitute the relation of type and antitype” (Marsh, *Lectures on Criticism and Interpretation*, p. 374). By the earlier typologists this condition was neglected, and resemblance was made the sole criterion of the relation between an event or person of the Old Test. and a fact or doctrine of the New Test. as type and antitype. A once popular book written on this plan is that of M’Ewen, *On the Types and Figures of the Old Test.* But the principle has been carried out to the wildest extent in a work entitled *The Typical Testimony to the Messiah*, by Micaiah Hill (Lond. 1862).

3. Each act or institute designed by God to serve as typical possessed a *symbolical* as well as a *predictive* character. This follows from the position that a type is a sensible emblem or prefigurative token of some spiritual truth, which itself rests upon certain events yet future, but of which events a certain degree of knowledge is possessed by those to whom the type is exhibited. In all such cases a twofold impression is conveyed to the mind: in the first place, that a particular truth already known is symbolically indicated; and, in the second place, that those events on which that truth depends shall certainly take place. In the testimony of God concerning his

So there are two points—one of fact, and one of doctrine—on both of which we must be instructed before we can really believe that testimony in all its fullness. What God calls us in the Bible to believe is, first, “the truth;” and, secondly, that “truth as it is in Christ Jesus.” With regard, for instance, to the doctrine of salvation by the atonement, there is, first, the general principle that such a mode of salvation is reasonable, practicable, and intended by God; and, secondly, the matter of fact that such an atonement has really been presented by our Lord Jesus Christ and accepted by the Sovereign and Judge of all. Now it was, of course, the same under the Old-Testament dispensation there were both the doctrine to be announced and the fact to be predicted before a complete statement of saving truth could be laid before the mind; and it was only as both of these were apprehended that the belief of a Jew in the truth became full and intelligent. Hence every type contained at once a symbol of the truth and a prediction of the fact. It presented to the senses of the beholder an outward sign of a great general truth, and a memorial that in due season the event on which that truth rested would take place. Thus, for instance, in the case of sacrifice, there were both a symbol and a prediction. The slaying of the animal and the burning of its flesh were emblems of the great truth that the sinner whose substitute that animal had become deserved death and subsequent agony, as well as of the general truth that God’s plan of saving men from that desert was by the substitutionary offerings of another. All this, however, would have been of no avail to the sin-burdened Israelite, who knew well that no mere animal could make atonement for the sins of man, had not that act prefigured and predicted the great sacrifice for sin on the part of the Lamb of God. But, pointed forward to this, his faith obtained an object upon which to rest, and he was enabled to rejoice in the salvation of God. So, also, with regard to the immediate consequences of sacrifice. When a Jew had committed a trespass against the Mosaic law, he had to offer certain sacrifices before he could enjoy his civil and political rights. Immediately, however, on presenting these, he stood *rectus in curia*; he was acquitted of the sin he had committed, and restored to his civil privileges. With this a mere carnal and worldly Jew was content. But to the pious believer all this was only the symbol and type of something spiritual. It reminded him that his sins against God had made him guilty and excluded him from the divine favor — it directed him to the need of a sacrifice for sincere God would forgive his transgression; and it assured him—that; just as by sacrifice he had been restored to his place in the Jewish State, so by the great sacrifice he might be restored to the divine favor, and

to a place in that spiritual kingdom of which the Jewish-nation was the type.

4. Though *resemblance* to that which it is designed to prefigure does not constitute the only, or even the primary, condition, of a. type, it is obvious that this must form a very important element in the adaptation of the type to serve its designed end. Hence we may expect to find some obvious analogy not only between the symbol and that which it symbolizes, but also between the divinely appointed act or institute and that which it was designed to prefigure.

On the other hand, as there must be a similarity or analogy between the type and the antitype, so there is also a *disparity* or dissimilitude between them. It is not in the nature of type and antitype that they should agree in all things; else, instead of similitude, there would be *identity*. Hence the apostle, while making Adam a type of Christ. yet shows how infinitely the latter excelled the former (1 Corinthians 15:47). So the priests of old were types of Christ, though he infinitely excelled them both as to his own person and as to the character of his priesthood (see Hebrews 7, 8, 9, 10). Chrysostom observes (*Hom. 61, in Cen.*) that there must be more in the type than in the antitype. Hence the distinction must be observed between *total* and *partial* types. This distinction (Ecumenius also draws in commenting on Hebrews 7 p. 829. He says: τύπος οὐ κατὰ πάντα ἴσος ἐστὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἔπει καὶ αὐτὸς ἀλήθεια εὐρίσκεται, καὶ ταυτότης μᾶλλον ἢ τύπος, ἀλλ' εἰκόνας ἔχει τινὰς καὶ ἰνδάλματα” A type does not express that which it represents. in every minute particular, for then, instead of similitude, there would. be identity, but it contains certain outlines and assimilations of the antitype.” Cyril of Alexandria, *in Amos* 6p. 315, also observes on this subject: τύπος οὐκ ἀλήθεια, μὀρφωσιν δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσφέρει “A type is not the very truth itself, but its representation.”

IV. Relation to other Modes of Teaching. — Having thus indicated the nature of a type, we would now point out the relation' of this mode of teaching divine truth to other modes employed in Scripture more or less akin to it.

1. Relation to Prophecy. — Type stands related to prophecy as its parallel. Like it, it teaches a present, truth, and announces a future fulfillment of it like it, also, it has in its capacity of a type one definite meaning and one definite fulfillment, to both of which it was intended and designed to point.

The difference between a prophecy and a type lies only in this, that the former teaches by words, the latter by things; the former, that is, by an artificial combination of signs, the latter by a scenical representation of the whole truth' at once. A word is the symbol of an idea; a type is the symbol of some principle or law, and the prediction of some great general fact in the economy of redemption. *SEE PROPHECY.*

2. Relation to Parable. — From the word *παραβόλη* being used to designate a type, it may be inferred that the connection between the two is intimate. A type, in fact, may be viewed as a sort of *acted parable*. Let us suppose, for instance, that our Lord, instead of describing in words the conduct and circumstances of the prodigal son, had, by the help of suitable actors and scenes, made the whole to pass before the eyes and ears of his auditors, the lesson would have been conveyed to them much in the same way as the truth concerning himself was conveyed to the ancient Jews by the typical rites of the Mosaic economy. In neither case is the lesson *new*, nor fully to be understood without an elucidatory comment; the object of both being to impress vividly a truth, otherwise reasonable or familiar, upon the minds of those to whom it is presented. There is this difference, however, between such a representation and a type—that the former, being merely doctrinal, would be exhausted in inculcating a present truth, while the latter would, with the doctrine, incorporate a prophetic reference to some great event yet to happen on which the doctrine was based. *SEE PARABLE.*

3. Relation to Comparison. — The New-Test. teachers occasionally, for the sake of illustrating their meaning, introduce a comparison, drawn from some well-known fact in the history of the Jewish people, between which and the point they are discussing there exists some obvious analogy. In this way our Lord makes use of the fact of Moses erecting the brazen serpent in the wilderness for the purpose of illustrating his own character as a deliverer, who was to be “lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (~~434~~ John 3:14, 15). On another occasion he instituted a comparison between his own case, as about to be consigned for a season to the tomb, and that of Jonah, “who had been three days and three nights in the belly of the fish” (~~4024~~ Matthew 12:40). From this it has been hastily concluded that these events, and others alluded to in the New Test. in a similar manner, were real types and prefigurations of the facts they are brought to illustrate. It is obvious, however, that there is a great difference between a historical event — whether occurring in the

natural course of things, or by the special interposition of the divine power, and which a subsequent writer or speaker may make use of to illustrate, by comparison, some fact or doctrine of which he is treating and a symbolic institute expressly appointed by God to prefigure, to those among whom it was set up, certain great transactions in connection with that plan of redemption which, in the fullness of time, he was to unfold to mankind. In the two cases above referred to there is the absence of any express evidence that the events recorded possess any other than a simple historical character. In the case of the brazen serpent, indeed, we have divine appointment; but along with the appointment we have the specific mention of the purpose for which it was set up, which was not to teach any religious truths at all, or to form any part of religious worship, but simply that it might act as an instrument of cure to the Israelites who were bitten by the fiery flying serpents. *SEE BRAZEN SERPENT*. Yet even in this case it is clear from the whole tenor of the narrative that the act was significant of more than a mere physical remedy; and our Lord's reference to the event confirms its higher import. — It is also possible that such a thing as the brazen serpent, *might* possess a symbolical character; but if any will from this argue that it really had such a character, and that it was a symbol of Christ, it will be incumbent upon him, in the first place, to show some evidence in favor of his inference, and in the next, to explain how it should come to pass that the express symbolical antithesis of the Messiah, the *serpent*, could form part of an institute intended to prefigure his work as the Savior of men. As to the case of Jonah, we do not find in it so much as the appearance of anything typical; and, indeed, it would have been very strange had God caused the prophet to perform an actions typical of the burial and resurrection of Christ, under circumstances in which there was no human being to receive any instruction by it except himself. A type is an acted lesson visible representation of invisible truths. To its utility, therefore, spectators are as indispensable as actors; and where the former are not present, to say that God appoints the latter to go through their performance is to charge him with doing something in vain. *SEE SIMILITUDE*.

4. Relation to Allegory. — “An allegory,” says bishop Marsh, “according to its original and proper meaning, denotes a representation of one thing which is intended to excite the representation of another thing.” Adopting this as a just explanation, it is obvious that type and allegory are closely allied. In both there is an original representation which has a meaning of its

own, and there is the use of that for the purpose of calling up to the mind the conception of another thing analogous to the former. The two, however, are very distinct. They differ in two respects: the one is that the subject of an allegory is a mere historical event occurring in the ordinary course of things, whereas a type is an act or institute expressly appointed by God to teach some important truth; the other is, that the allegorical sense is a fictitious meaning put upon a narrative for the sake of illustrating something else, whereas the explanation of a type is its true and only meaning, and is adduced solely for the sake of unfolding that meaning. Thus Paul, in order to explain the doctrine of the covenants, allegorizes the anecdote of Sarai and Hagar recorded by Moses, making Sarai represent the Abrahamic or new or everlasting covenant, and Hagar the Sinaitic or old covenant (~~402~~ Galatians 4:24, 25). In the same way he allegorizes the fact of the water from the rock following the Israelites through the wilderness, speaking of it as representing Christ in the blessings he coifers upon his church (~~402~~ 1 Corinthians 10:4). These allegorizings, (*ἀλληγορούμενα*) are only comparisons without the form; and their use is obviously merely to explain one thing by another. The radical difference between the exposition of a type and an allegorical interpretation of history, is apparent from 'the use which the apostle makes of them respectively, His allegorizings are mere illustrations on which, by themselves, nothing is built; whereas his typical explanations are all brought forward as forming the basis of arguments addressed to those who, admitting the type, were thereby pledged to the admission of the truths it embodied. *SEE ALLEGORY.*

V. Interpretation of Types. — As a general rule it may be laid down that we should always expect to find in the antitype something higher and more glorious than in the type (Chrysost. *in Genes. Horn.* 35. *μη πάντα ἀπάτει ἐν τῷ τύπῳ: οὐδὲ γὰρ ν εἶη τύπος εἰ μέλλοι παντὰ ἔχειν τὰ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ συμβαίνοντα*). This follows from the nature of the case. For if the design of a type be by outward symbols to foreshadow spiritual truths, it follows that, in proportion as the thing signified is more valuable than the mere sign, and as things spiritual and eternal are more glorious than things material and transitory, the type must be inferior in value and in majesty to that which it is designed to prefigure.

More specific rules having reference especially to the Mosaic ritual are—

1. The symbolical ritual, as a whole and in its individual parts, can set forth only such ideas and truths as accord with the known, and elsewhere clearly announced, principles of Old-Test. theology.
2. An accurate knowledge of the outward constitution of each symbol is an indispensable condition of its interpretation; for, as the sole object of the symbol is to convey spiritual truth by sensible representations, to attempt to discover the former before we understand the latter is to endeavor to reach an end without using the means.
3. The first step in the interpretation of a symbol is the explanation of its *name*; for, as this is generally given with a direct reference to the idea symbolized, it forms of itself a sort of exponent of the symbol to which it is affixed.
4. Each symbol expresses, in general, only *one* grand idea; at the same time, of course, including all subordinate ideas that may be involved in it. Thus, in the case of sacrifices, a variety of truths are presented to the mind, but all going to make up the one grand truth, which that rite symbolized.
5. Each symbol has always the same fundamental meaning, however different may be the objects with which it is combined. Thus, for instance, the act of purification has the same symbolical meaning, whether it is performed upon a person or an animal, or upon a material object.
6. In interpreting a symbol, we must throw out of view all that is merely necessitated by the laws of its physical condition, and that does not serve to help out the symbolical representation. Symbols have often accessories of two kinds the one consisting of such as are in themselves symbolical, and which go to make up the sum total of the representation; the other, of such as are, from the nature of things, required by the material objects composing the symbol for their continued existence. Thus, in the case of the candlestick in the sanctuary, it was provided that it should have branches and knops and flowers, and also that it should be supplied with snuffers and snuff-dishes. Now, of those accessories the former were not indispensable to its serving the purpose for which it was designed — that of giving light; but they, having each a symbolical meaning, added to the symbolical effect of the whole; whereas the latter were merely required in order to prevent the lights from dying out for want of cleansing. Keeping this distinction in view, we need not be afraid of going too minutely into the explanation of the Mosaic rituals Everything, in fact, of which it was

composed was a symbol; with the single exception of such things as the earthly, physical condition of the substance or persons employed rendered indispensable. Nay, even these, from belonging to a typical institute, such as the nation of Israel was, acquired a sort of secondary typical character; just as the ordinary events of Israelitish history have for the same reason a spiritually doctrinal character. *SEE SYMBOL.*

VI. *Examples of Types.* — In tracing out *who* and *what* typified or shadowed forth Christ and his salvation under the antediluvian, patriarchal, and Mosaic dispensations, we must be careful not to substitute the suggestions of our own imaginations for the intimations of Scripture. We must endeavor to learn the mind of God as to what actually constitutes a type, either by the express declarations of Scripture, or by the obvious analogy, which subsists between things under the Gospel and its antecedent dispensations. Thus guarding ourselves, we may notice the various types by which God was pleased, at all times, in a sense, to preach the Gospel to mans kind.

1. Among *individual persons*, before the law, Adam, Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, Abraham, Isaac, and Joseph were eminently typical of Christ, but only in certain relations. Again, under the law, Moses, Joshua, Samson, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Jonah, Zerubbabel, and Joshua the high-priest were, in many points, singularly types of Christ.
2. The first-born, the Nazarites, prophets, priests, and kings were *typical orders of persons*.
3. Under the head of *things typical* may be noticed Jacob's ladder, the burning bush, the pillar of cloud and fire; and, in the opinion of some, the manna, the rock, and the brazen serpent.
4. *Actions typical* were the deliverance out of Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, the sojourn in the wilderness, the passage over the Jordan, the entrance into Canaan, and the restoration from Babylon.
5. *Rites typical* were circumcision, various sacrifices, and sundry purifications.
6. *Places typical* were the land of Canaan, the cities of refuge, the tabernacle, and the temple.

The above types were designed to shadow forth Christ and the blessings of his salvation; but there were others also which pointed at our miseries without him. There were ceremonial uncleannesses the *leprosy*, for instance was a type of our natural pollution.

See Michaelis, *Eltwurf der typischen Gottesgelahrtheit* (Gött. 1763); Keach, *Tropologia*, p. 225-237; Suicerj *Thesaur.* 2, 1337; Mather, *Types of the Old Test.* (Lond. 1705) Bahr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelb. 1837, 2 vols.); Chevallier, *Hulsean Lecture* for 1826; Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture* (Edinb. 1854, 2 vols.); and other works cited by Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* col. 1803 sq., and by Maicom, *Theol. Index*, s.v. **SEE MESSIAH.**

Typhoeus

TYPHON **SEE TYPHON** (q.v.).

Typhon

(*Typhos*, *Typhoem*, *Typhoeus*, and *Typhaon*), in Greek mythology, was a monster of remote antiquity, at one time thought to have been a destructive gale of wind, at another time represented as a giant of the earth, ejecting volcanic-flames. Homer places him in the country of Arim, buried in the earth, which Jupiter strikes with lightning. Hesiod represents Typhaon and Typhocus as two different and distinct beings. Typhaon is the son of Typhocus, a mighty wind, who with Echidna begets the dog Orthrus, Cerberus the Lernsean hydra, and Chimsera. Typhocus is the youngest son of Tartarus and Ga. with one hundred dragon-heads, frightfully sparkling eyes, and hideous voice. He attempted to gain sovereignty over gods and men, but Jupiter bound him with lightning, and he now lies under Etna. In Egyptian mythology Typhon is the Greek name for the evil spirit represented by the dog-star, originally the influence that brought to Egypt the blessing of a yearly overflow of the banks of the river Nile, without which the country could not flourish. When the worship of Isis and Osiris came into practice, the dog-star was designed to be the destroyer of the life of nature by heat and now Typhon became an evil god, whose names and titles upon monuments were destroyed, because he was believed to be the enemy and persecutor of Osiris (q.v.). Typhon owned Nephthys as his wife, who by him gave birth to Anubis. His real Egyptian name is stated differently as *Set* or *Sutekh*.

Typhrestus

in Greek mythology, was the son of Sperchins, after whom a city in the Trachinian province was named.

Typicum

(Gr. **Τύπικον**), a Greek term for (1) a book of rubrics; (2) a selection from the Psalter; (3) a Sunday service in the Oriental Church.

Tyr

in Norse mythology, is one of the supreme deities of Northern antiquity, a son of Odin and Frigga, and brother of Thor. As the god of boldness, wisdom, and strength, he was implored by the Heldians as well as by the Skaldians for his favor, and was worshipped with Thor and Odin. At the end of the world he will combat with the hell-dog Garm, and each will kill the other. Several antiquarians are inclined to identify him with Tuiscon.

Tyran' nus

(**Τύραννος**, *sovereign*), the name of a man in whose school or place of audience Paul taught the Gospel for two years, during his sojourn at Ephesus (see ^{<480>}Acts 19:9). A. D. 52, 53. The halls or rooms of the philosophers were called **σχολαί** among the later Greeks (Liddell and Scott, *s.v.*); and as Luke applies that term to the *auditorium* in this instance, the presumption is that Tyrannus himself was a Greek, and a public teacher of philosophy or rhetoric. He and Paul must have occupied the room at different hours; whether he hired it out to the Christians or gave them the use of it (in either case he must have been friendly to them) is left uncertain. Meyer is disposed to consider that Tyrannus was a Jewish rabbi, and the owner of a private synagogue or house for teaching (**vrđīnæ tyBæ**). But, in the first place, his Greek name, and the fact that he is not mentioned as a Jew or proselyte, disagree with that supposition; and, in the second place, as Paul repaired to this man's school after having been compelled to leave the Jewish synagogue (^{<480>}Acts 19:9), it is evident that he took this course as a means of gaining access to the heathen; an object which he would naturally seek through the co-operation of one of their own number, and not by associating himself with a Jew or a Gentile adherent of the Jewish faith. In speaking of him merely as a certain Tyrannus (**Τυρ ννου τινός**), Luke indicates certainly that he was not a

believer at first; though it is natural enough to think that he may have become such as the result of his acquaintance with the apostle. Hensen (*Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 218) throws out the idea that the hall may have belonged to the authorities of the city, and have derived its name from the original proprietor. See Seelen, *De Schola Tyranni*, in his *Medit. Exeg.* 3 615 sq.; Wallen *Acta Pauli Ephesin.* (Gryph. 1783). **SEE PAUL.**

Tyrannus

in Greek mythology, was one of the Pterelaidse, who were slain in the contest against the sons of Electryon.

Tyrbenus

in Greek mythology, was a surname of Apollo.

Tyre

(Heb. *Tsôr*, רַמְסֵס [ר רֶסֶס] ^{<1100>} 1 Kings 5:1; ^{<1887>} Psalm 83:7; 87:4; ^{<3515>} Ezekiel 26:15; 27:3, 8, 32; 28:12; ^{<3093>} Hosea 9:13; ^{<3008>} Zechariah 9:3; the form likewise found in inscriptions, Gesenius, *Monum. Phrien.* p. 261]; Sept., New Test., Josephus, and other writers, Topot; A.V. “yrus” [q.v.] in Jeremiah, Ezekiel [usually], and the minor prophets [except Joel]; **SEE TYIAN**), a celebrated commercial city of antiquity (^{<1629>} Joshua 19:29; ^{<1047>} 2 Samuel 24:7; ^{<3321>} Isaiah 23:1; ^{<3515>} Ezekiel 26:15; 27:2, etc.), situated in Phoenicia, on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea, in latitude 33° 17' N. (Smythe, *Mediterranean*, p. 469). Although not the oldest, it was the greatest of the Punic cities, both in size and power. **SEE PHOENICIA.**

I. The Name. — Its Hebrew name, *Tsôr*, signifies a *rock*, which well agrees with the site of Sur. the modern town on a rocky-peninsula, formerly an island. From the word “*Tsôr*” were derived two names of the city, in which the first letters differed from each other, though both had a feature of their common parent 1st, the Aramaic word *Tura* (*arfu*) whence the Greek word *Turos*, probably pronounced *Tyros*, which finally prevailed in Latin, and, with slight changes, in the modern languages of the West; and, 2nd, *Saca*, or *Sarra*, which occurs in Plautus (*Truc.* 2, 6, 58, “purpuram ex Sara tibi attuli”), and which is familiar to scholars through the well-known line of Virgil, “Ut gemma bibat, et Sarrano dormiat ostro” (*Georg.* 2, 506; comp. Aul. Gell. 14:6; Silius Italicus, 15:203; Juvenal, 10:30). According to a passage of Probus (ad Virg. *Georg.* 2, 115), as quoted by Grote (*Hist.*

of Greece, 3, 353), the form “Sara” would seem to have occurred in one of the Greek epics now lost, which passed under the name of Homer. Certainly this form accords best with the modern Arabic name of *Sur*.

Picture for Tyre 1

II. Ancient Relations. —

1. *Old Tyre.* — There is no doubt that, previous to the siege of the city by Alexander the Great, Tyre was situated on an island; but, according to the tradition of the inhabitants, if we may believe. Justin (11, 10), there was a city on the mainland before there was a city on the island; and the tradition receives some color from the name of Palaetyrus, or Old Tyre, which was borne in Greek times by a city on the continent, thirty stadia to the south (Strabo 12, 11, 24). But a difficulty arises in, supposing that Palaetyrus was built before Tyre, as the word Tyre evidently means “a rock,” and few persons who have visited the site of Palaetyrus can seriously suppose that any rock on the surface there can have given rise to the name. To escape this difficulty, Hengstenberg makes the suggestion that Palaetyrus meant Tyre that formerly existed, “*quae q uo udam fuit;*” and that the name was introduced after the destruction of the greater part of it by Nebuchadnezzar, to distinguish it from that part of Tyre which continued to be in existence (*De Rebus Tyriorum*, p. 26). Movers, justly deeming this explanation unlikely, suggests that the original inhabitants of the city on the mainland possessed the island as part of their territory, and named their city from the characteristic features of the island, though the island itself was not then inhabited (*Das phoeniische Alterthum*, II, 1, 173). This explanation is possible; but other explanations are equally possible. For example, the Phoenician name of it may have been the Old City’ and this may have been translated “Palaetyrus” in Greek. Or, if the inhabitants of the mainland migrated to the island, they may afterwards, at some time or other, have given to the city which they left the name of Old Tyre, without its being necessarily implied that the city had ever borne simply the name of Tyre. Or some accidental circumstance, now beyond the reach of conjecture, may have led to the name. This again would tally with the remark of Grote, who observes (*loc. cit.*) that perhaps the Phoenician name which the city on the mainland bore may have been something resembling Palaetyrus in sound, but not coincident in meaning. It is important, however, to bear in mind that this question regarding Palaetyrus is merely archaeological, and that nothing in Biblical history is affected by it.

Nebuchadnezzar necessarily besieged the portion of the city on the mainland, as he had no vessels with which to attack the island; but it is reasonably certain that, in the time of Isaiah and Ezekiel the heart or core of the city was on the island. The city of Tyre was consecrated to Hercules (Melkarth), who was the principal object of worship to the inhabitants (Quintus Curtius, 4:2; Strabo, 16:757); and Arrian, in his *History*, says that the temple on the island was the most ancient of all temples within the memory of mankind (2, 16). It cannot be doubted, therefore, that the island had long been inhabited. With this agree the expressions as to Tyre being “in the midst of the seas” (^{<3725>}Ezekiel 27:25, 26); and even the threat against it that it should be made like the top of a rock to spread nets upon (see Des Vignoles, *Chronologie de L’histoire Sainte* [Berlin. 1738], 2, 25). As, however, the space on the island was limited, it is very possible that the population on the mainland may have exceeded the population on the island (see Movers, *loc. cit.* p. 81).

Picture for Tyre 2

2. Connection with Sidon. — Whether built before or later than Palaetyrus, the renowned city of Tyre, though it laid claims to a very high antiquity (^{<2207>}Isaiah 23:7; Herod. 2, 14; Quintus Curtius, 4:4), is not mentioned either in the *Iliad* or in the *Odyssey*; ‘but no inference can be legitimately drawn from this fact as to the existence or non-existence of the city at the time. when those poems were composed. The tribe of Canaanites that inhabited the small tract of country which. may be called Phoenicia proper was known, by the generic name of Sidonians (^{<0782>}Judges 18:7; ^{<2312>}Isaiah 23:2, 4, 12; ^{<6316>}Joshua 13:6; ^{<3521>}Ezekiel 32:30); and this name undoubtedly included Tyrians, the inhabitants being of the same race, and the two cities being less than twenty English miles distant from each other. Hence when Solomon sent to Hiram king of Tyre for cedar-trees out of Lebanon, to be hewn by Hiram’s subjects, he reminds Hiram that “there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber like the Sidonians” (^{<1116>}1 Kings 5:6). Hence Virgil, who, in his very first mention of Carthage, expressly states that it was founded by colonists from Tyre (En. 1, 12), afterwards, with perfect propriety and consistency, calls it the Sidonian city (*ibid.* 1. 677, 678; 4:545; see Des Vignoles, *loc. cit.* p. 25). In like manner, when Sidonians are spoken of in the Homeric poems (*I7.* 6:290; 23:743; *Od.* 4:84; 17:424), this might comprehend Tyrians; and the mention of the city Sidon, while there is no similar mention of Tyre, would be fully accounted for if it were necessary to account for such a circumstance at all in a poem

by Sidon's having been in early times more flourishing than Tyre. It is worthy, likewise, of being noted that Tyre is not mentioned in the Pentateuch; but: here, again, though an inference may be drawn against the importance, no inference can be legitimately drawn against the existence, of Tyre in the times to which the Pentateuch refers. *SEE SIDON.*

3. General Characteristics. — As already intimated, Tyre was composed of two distinct parts or towns in historical times; the one situated on the mainland, or continental Tyre, and one on the island opposite, from four to thirty stadia (Pliny, Strabo) distant from each other. According to Pliny, the circumference of both was reckoned at about nineteen Roman miles, the island town comprising about twenty-two stadia. The town on the shore was called Palaetyrus, not from its having been founded before Island Tyrus for this, indeed, we may assume to have been the first of the two (Reland, Vitranga, Hengstenberg, etc.) — but from the circumstance of its having achieved a high renown long before its much less favorably situated island-sister. Constantly exposed to earthquakes and deluges-occupying a space naturally circumscribed, and rendered still more so by the erections necessary for the purple-fisheries and manufactories-and cut off from the easy means of export and import by caravans that belonged to the opposite city, Island-Tyrus was by far inferior in importance. In fact, only one (the western) part of the island had been built over up to the time of Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon —viz. the “Old Town” (τὸ ἄστυ), which probably served as harbor, a place for arsenals and magazines, to Palaetyrus, that by this time had sent out colonies already to Tartessus and the northern coast of Libya. The other part of the island, or rather a small island by itself, which has now ceased to be such, and which was first joined to the *city* as the “New Town” by Hiram, had till then probably been inhabited only by the priests attached to the sanctuary of Melkart. Besides these two there was a third town or suburb, the Eurychoros (esplanade), formed by means of substructions on the eastern side of the rock. Palaetyrus, extending from the river Leontes on the north to the Ras el-Ain on the south, covered with all its outlying parts the whole available maritime strip of land, and lay in one of the most fertile and blooming plains of Phoenicia (comp. ^{<XIII>}Hosea 9:13, *hwnb hl wfç*, “planted in a pleasant place;” or William of Tyre, *Fertilitate prsecipua et amcenitate quasi singularis, habet planitiem sibi continuam divitis glebse et opimi soli,*” 13:3). It was watered by several aqueducts, which carried the stream from the fountain-group situated in ‘the plain itself (head of the well, Ras al-

Ayin), not only through the whole territory of the continental city, but, probably by means of subterranean pipes, also into the island-city. Without this supposition it would hardly be credible how the latter, which, up to the siege by Shalmaneser (before the 8th century), had subsisted on rain-water only collected in cisterns and open canals (ὕδραγωγοί) from the Ras, could have stood the long sieges by Nebuchadnezzar (thirteen years) and of Alexander, who naturally stopped the over ground supplies, without apparently once suffering from want of water. Possibly we may, in a certain annual rite called the “Wedding of the land-water to the sea-water,” still kept up by the inhabitants, see a faint reminiscence of this ancient juncture. Here also stood the ancient royal palace and the first sanctuary of Hercules, though the most celebrated one lay on the island opposite. The happy mixture of land and sea scenery thus exhibited by the two cities in the time of their prosperity is graphically described by Nonnus, a learned Egyptian antideologist of the end of the 4th Christian century: “The sailor furrows the sea with his oar, as the ploughman the soil; the lowing of oxen and the song of birds answer the deep roar of the main; the hamadryad among the tall trees hears the voice of the Nereid calling to her from the waves; the breeze from Lebanon, while it cools the rustic at his midday labor, speeds the sailor seaward.” “O Tyrus,” exclaims the prophet (Ezekiel 27:3, etc.), “thou hast said, I am of perfect beauty; thy borders are in the midst of the sea, thy builders have perfected thy beauty.” The poets call her “a virgin bathing in the sea, a Tartessus-ship swimming upon the ocean, an island on shore, and a city in the sea withal,” etc. Above all, however, Nonnus makes his Indian hero get into ecstasies at the primeval fountains, especially those where the water ‘gushing out of the depths of the earth, returns every hour;’ and he mentions three distinct sources or water-nymphs “Abarbera, the fertile; Kallirrhoe, the sweet; and Drosera, the rich and bridal one.”

The description of Tyre in the prophecy of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 27;10) receives striking illustration from what we believe to be its earliest coins. These coins were held to be most probably of Tyre or some other Phoenician city, or possibly of Babylon, on numismatic evidence alone, by Mr. Burgon, of the British Museum. They probably date during the 5th century B.C. — they may possibly be a little older-but it is most reasonable to consider them as of the time of, and issued by, Darius Hystaspis; The chief coins are octodrachms of the earlier Phoenician weight, bearing, on the obverse, a war-galley beneath the towered walls of a city, and, on the reverse, a king

in a chariot, with an incuse goat beneath. This combination of galley and city is exactly what we find in the description of Tyre in Ezekiel, which mainly portrays a state-galley, but also refers to a port, and speaks of towers and walls. *SEE NAVIGATION.*

Picture for Tyre 3

III. History. —

1. The early history of Tyre is so completely shrouded in mythical mystery that a rational reconstruction of it is next to impossible. We hear of kings of Phoenicia whose very names mostly prove them to be mere types of deities, or special tribes, such as Agenor, Phoenix, Phalis, Sidon, Tetramnestus, Tennes, Strato, Abdalominus (a word spelled in many different ways, the only reasonable orthography of which, however, must be Abd-Alonim [Heb. Elyonim], *ynwyl [db]*, “servant of the highest ones, or gods”). Abibal, however, is called the first king of Tyre, and the predecessor of Hiram (Hierom, Suram, etc.), the Biblical Chiram, with whom, indeed, begins what to us is approximately the historical period of Phoenicia. We have already mentioned the calamity in consequence of which the Sidonians, hitherto the mightiest power of Phoenicia, were obliged to leave their capital and seek refuge in neighboring Tyre. This took place about B.C. 1200, and very soon after that period Tyre assumed the hegemony. Before the time of Samuel we already hear of the princes (Suffetes) of Tyre oppressing the Israelites (^{<0702>}Judges 10:12).

In the Bible, Tyre is named for the first time in the book of Joshua (19, 29), where it is adverted to as a fortified city (in the A. V. “the strong city”), in reference to the boundaries of the tribe of Asher. Nothing historical, however, turns upon this mention of Tyre; for it is indisputable that the tribe of Asher never possessed the Tyrian territory. According to the injunctions of the Pentateuch, indeed, all the Canaanitish nations ought to have been exterminated; but, instead of this, the Israelites dwelt among the Sidonians or Phoenicians, who were inhabitants of the land (^{<003E>}Judges 1:31, 62), and never seem to have had any war with that intelligent race. Subsequently, in a passage of Samuel (^{<0247>}2 Samuel 24:7), it is stated that the enumerators of the census in the reign of David went in pursuance of their mission to Tyre, among other cities, which must be understood as implying, not that Tyre was subject to David’s authority, but merely that a census was thus taken of the Jews resident there.

2. But the first passages in the Hebrew historical writings, or in ancient history generally, which afford glimpses of the actual condition of Tyre are in the book of Samuel (^{<1051>}2 Samuel 5:11), in connection with Hiram king of Tyre (B.C. 980-947) sending cedar-wood and workmen to David, for building him a palace; and subsequently in the book of Kings, in connection with the building of Solomon's temple. One point at this period is particularly worthy of attention. In contradistinction from all the other most celebrated independent commercial cities out of Phoenicia in the ancient and modern world, Tyre was a monarchy, and not a republic; and, notwithstanding its merchant princes, who might have been deemed likely to favor the establishment of an aristocratical commonwealth, it continued to preserve the monarchical form of government until its final loss of independence. Another point is the skill in the mechanical arts which seems to-have already been attained by the Tyrians. Under this head, allusion is not specially made to the excellence of the Tyrians in felling trees; for, through vicinity to the forests of Lebanon, they would as naturally have become skilled in that art as the backwoodsmen of America. But what is peculiarly noteworthy is that Tyrians had become workers in brass or copper to an extent which implies considerable advancement in art. In the enumeration of the various works in brass executed by the Tyrian artists whom Solomon sent for, there are lilies, palm-trees, oxen, lions, and cherubim (^{<1073>}1 Kings 7:13-45). The manner in which the cedar-wood and fir-wood were conveyed to Jerusalem is likewise interesting, partly from the similarity of the sea voyage to what may commonly be seen on the Rhine at the present day, and partly as giving a vivid idea of the really short distance between Tyre and Jerusalem. The wood was taken in floats to Joppa (2 Chronicles 2, 16; ^{<1073>}1 Kings 5:9), a distance of less than seventy-four geographical miles. In the Mediterranean, during summer, there are times when this-voyage along the coast would have been perfectly safe, and when the Tyrians might have reckoned confidently, especially at night, on light winds to fill the sails which were probably used on such occasions. From Joppa to Jerusalem the distance was about thirty-two miles, and it is certain that by this route the whole distance between the two celebrated cities of Jerusalem and Tyre was not more than 106 geographical, or about 122 English, miles, Within such a comparatively short distance (which by land, in a straight line, was about twenty miles shorter). It would be easy for two sovereigns to establish personal relations with each other, more especially as the northern boundary of Solomon's kingdom, in one direction, was the-southern boundary of Phoenicia. Solomon and Hiram

may frequently have met, and thus laid the foundations of a political alliance in personal friendship. If by messengers they sent riddles and problems for each other to solve (Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 5, 3; *Cont.* — *Apion.* 1, 17.), they may previously have had, on several occasions, a keen encounter of wits in convivial intercourse. In this way, likewise, Solomon may have become acquainted with the Sidonian women who, with those of other nations, seduced him to polytheism and the worship of Astarte in his old age. Similar remarks apply to the circumstances which may have previously occasioned the strong affection of Hiram for David (~~1~~1 Kings 5:1). However this maybe, it is evident that under Solomon there was a close alliance between the Hebrews and the Tyrians. Hiram supplied Solomon with cedar-wood, precious metals, and workmen, and gave him sailors for the voyage to Ophir and India; while, on the other hand, Solomon gave Hiram supplies of corn and oil, ceded to him some cities, and permitted him to make use of some havens on the Red Sea (9:11-14, 26-28: 10:22). Under Hiram, Tyre not only attained to its fullest glory and renown among its sister-states, but the capital itself, enlarged by him into three distinct towns, received its fullest share of palaces, temples, and public edifices, and its two roadsteads and two harbors probably date from this period. It is at this period also when the joint trading expeditions to Ophir are recorded to have taken place, in which the Tyrians furnished the pilots and mariners. Hiram himself seems altogether to have been a very refined, pious, and peaceful monarch. Hardly any wars are recorded during his lifetime, and his reported interchange of problems with the “wisest of mankind” points to his renown as a *bel esprit*. These friendly relations survived for a time the disastrous secession of the ten tribes, and a century later Ahab married a daughter, of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians (16:31), who, according to Menander (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:13, 2), was a daughter of Ithobaal, king of Tyre.

3. Hiram was followed, according to Menander (in Josephus) and Theophilus, by Baleastartus, whose four sons reigned after him for short periods. First came, Abdastartus (939-931), who, in consequence of a palace revolution, was followed on the throne for twelve years by a son of his nurse—a period of internal sedition and general lawlessness having intervened, during which (so Justin tells us) all the free citizens of Tyre were murdered by the slaves. Astartus, the eldest son of Baleastartus, succeeded to the government, and ruled from 918 to 907, when a third brother, Astarymus, was made king. He was murdered nine years later by

Phaletus, his youngest brother, who, after a brief reign of nine months, was put to death by Ithobaal, priest of Astarte, in whose family the kingdom henceforth became hereditary. This Ithobaal, the Ethbaal of Scripture, whose daughter was married to Ahab, is called by Josephus “king of Tyre and Sidon,” a sign of the supremacy which Tyre had acquired in his day. The drought reported to have taken place in Judaea under Ahab seems to have also touched Phoenicia, and such was Ithobaal’s piety that at his supplication thunder-claps were heard, followed by copious rains. It was chiefly before his reign (898-866) that Tyre commenced to spread its colonies as far as Africa, Spain, etc. owing, in the first instance, probably to the danger of life and uncertainty of circumstances into which the country had been plunged by the internal conflicts. But Ithobaal himself seems to have, encouraged colonization, and, in order to prevent the overcrowding of the old cities, to have built a number of new cities. Balezor, his son, succeeded in 865, and was followed by his son Mutton, the office of high-priest devolving on his second son, Sicharbaal. Mutton died in 833, and left two children, Elissa (Dido) and Pygmalion, who were to share the kingdom between them, while Elissa by her marriage with Sicharbaal, was to unite the high-priesthood with the crown. To this arrangement, however, the people, averse to the supreme priestly power, demurred, and Pygmalion was declared sole king. Elissa’s husband having been killed, for the sake of his treasures, by the new king, and herself being-deprived of her dominion, she is said to have entered into a conspiracy with the aristocratic party, and, in the ninth year of Pygmalion’s reign, assisted and followed by her brother Barca and the principal families of the land, to have reached Carthage (New Town, [açdj trq](#)), a colony founded some time, before by the Sidotians (about B.C. 813), and to have completely rebuilt it and laid the foundation for a power which contended with mighty Rome for the empire of the worlds.

4. The political existence of Palestine, Syria, and Phoenicia, which instead of making a joint desperate stand, kept on intriguing and plotting against each other Phoenicia, moreover, being hated and despised by her allies for her iniquitous trade in slaves kidnapped among her neighbors, chiefly in Judaea-was henceforth doomed. From this time commenced denunciations, and, at first, threats of retaliation (~~2001~~ Joel 3:4-8; Amos 1:9, 10); and, indeed, though there might be peace, there could not be sincere friendship between the two nations. But the likelihood of the denunciations being fulfilled first arose from the progressive conquests of the Assyrian

monarchs. It was not probable that a powerful, victorious, and ambitious neighbor could resist the temptation of endeavoring to subjugate the small strip of land between the, Lebanon and the sea so insignificant in extent, but overflowing with so much wealth, which by the Greeks was called Phoenicia. Accordingly, when the king of Assyria had taken the city of Samaria, had conquered the kingdom of Israel and carried its inhabitants into captivity, he turned his arms against the Phoenician cities. At this time Tyre had reached a high point of prosperity. It possessed the island of Cyprus, with the valuable mines of the metal “copper” (so named from the island), and apparently the city of Sidon was subject to its sway. But the Assyrian king seems to have taken advantage of a revolt of the Cyprians; and what ensued is thus related by Menander, who translated the archives of Tyre into the Greek language (see Josephus, *Ant.* 9:14, 2):” Elulæus reigned thirty-six years (over Tyre). This king, upon the revolt of the Kittæans (Cyprians), sailed with a fleet against them, and reduced them to submission. On the other hand, the king of the Assyrians attacked in war the whole of Phoenicia, but soon made peace with all, and turned back. On this, Sidon and Ace (i.e. Akko or Acre) and Palsetyrus revolted from the Tyrians, with many other cities, which delivered themselves up to the king of Assyria. Accordingly, when the Tyrians would not submit to him, the king returned and fell upon them again, the Phoenicians having furnished him with sixty ships and eight hundred rowers. Against these the Tyrians sailed with twelve ships, and, dispersing the fleet opposed to them, they took five hundred men prisoners. The reputation of all the citizens in Tyre was hence increased. Upon this the king of the Assyrians, moving off his army, placed guards at their river and aqueducts to prevent the Tyrians- from drawing water. This continued for five years, and still the Tyrians held out, supplying themselves with water from wells.” But there can hardly be a doubt that Tyre, as well as the whole of Phoenicia, very soon was made tributary to Assyria, like all the neighboring countries, and the calamities brought upon them all alike by the uninterrupted war expeditions of the Assyrian monarchs could not but be felt also by the dependencies and colonies. These fell more or less about this time into the hands of new settlers, from whom again Carthage, somewhat later, wrested a part for herself.

5. After the siege of Tyre by the Assyrians (which must have taken place not long after B.C. 721), Tyre remained a powerful state with its own kings (²⁴⁵²Jeremiah 25:22; 27:3; ²⁴⁵³Ezekiel 28:2-12), remarkable for its

wealth, with territory on the mainland, and protected by strong fortifications (ver. 5; 26, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 27:11; ~~380B~~ Zechariah 9:3). Our knowledge of its condition thenceforward until the siege by Nebuchadnezzar depends entirely on various notices of it by the Hebrew prophets; but some of these notices are singularly full, and especially the twenty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel furnishes us, on some points, with details such as have scarcely come down to us respecting any one city of antiquity, excepting Rome and Athens. One point especially arrests the attention, that Tyre, like its splendid daughter, Carthage, employed mercenary soldiers (~~327D~~ Ezekiel 27:10, 11). This has been the general tendency in commercial cities on account of the high wages which may be obtained by artisans in a thriving community, compared with the ordinary pay of a soldier, and Tyre had been unable to resist the demoralizing temptation. In its service there were Phoenicians from Arvad, Ethiopians obtained through the commerce of Egypt, and hardy mountaineers from Persia. This is the first time that the name of Persia occurs in the remains of ancient literature, before its sons founded a great monarchy on the ruins of the Chaldean empire. Independently, however, of this fact respecting Tyrian mercenary soldiers, Ezekiel gives interesting details respecting the trade of Tyre. On this head, without attempting to exhaust the subject, a few leading points may be noticed. The first question is as to the countries from which Tyre obtained the precious metals, and it appears that its gold came from Arabia by the Persian Gulf (5, 22) just as in the time of Solomon it came from Arabia by the Red Sea. *SEE OPHIR*. Whether the Arabian merchants, whose wealth was proverbial in Roman classical times (Horace, *Od.* 1, 29, 1), obtained their gold by traffic with Africa or, India, or whether it was the product of their own country, is uncertain; but so far as the latter alternative is concerned, the point will probably be cleared up in the progress of geological knowledge. On the other hand, the silver, iron, lead, and tin of Tyre came from a very different quarter of the world, viz. from the south of Spain, where the Phoenicians had established their settlement of Tarshish, or Tartessus. As to copper, we should have presumed that it was obtained from the valuable mines in Cyprus; but it is mentioned here in conjunction with Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, which points to the districts on the south of the Black Sea, in the neighborhood of Armenia, in the southern line of the Caucasus, between the Black Sea and the Caspian. The country whence Tyre was supplied with wheat, was Palestine. It may be added that the value of Palestine as a wheat country to Tyre was greatly enhanced by its proximity, as there was scarcely a part of

the kingdom of Israel on the west of the river Jordan which was distant more than a hundred miles from that great commercial city. The extreme points in the kingdom of Judah would be somewhat more distant, but the wheat probably came from the northern part of Palestine. Tyre likewise obtained from Palestine oil, honey, and balm, but not wine apparently, notwithstanding the abundance of grapes and wine in Judah (^{<0491>}Genesis 49:11). The wine was imported from Damascus, and was called wine of Hebron, which was probably not the product of the country adjoining the celebrated city of that name, but came from the neighborhood of Damascus itself (see Porter, *Handbook for Syria*, 2, 495; comp. Athenaeus, 1, 51). The Bedawin Arabs supplied Tyre with lambs and rams and goats, for the rearing of which their mode of life was so well adapted. Egypt furnished linen for sails, and doubtless for other purposes, and the dyes from shellfish, which afterwards became such a source of profit to the Tyrians were imported from the Peloponnesus (comp. the *Laconicas purpuras* of Horace, *Od.* 2, 18, 7, and Pliny, 9:40). Lastly, from Dedan, in the Persian Gulf, an island occupied possibly by a Phoenician colony, horns of ivory and ebony were imported, which must originally have been obtained from India (Ezekiel 27). *SEE COMMERCE.*

6. When the iron grasp of Assyria began to relax, the Chaldaeo-Egyptian contest brought still greater miseries upon that unfortunate Syro-Phoenician coast, and Phoenicia, still nominally ruled by Tyre. The Phoenicians, it would appear, had allied themselves to the Egyptians, who under Psammetichus had seized upon Philistia, and were about to assist Pharaoh-Necho in his further conquest of the Tyro-Palestinian states. When, therefore, at Carchemish, the Egyptians had been defeated by the Chaldaeans, the latter instantly followed up their victory by occupying Syria, Palestine, and Phoenicia, and selling a great number of the inhabitants of the latter, about B.C. 605. A league having been formed between these states to throw off the foreign yoke, gave rise to a new Chaldean expedition against them under Nebuchadnezzar (^{<0452>}Jeremiah 25:22; 27:3; 47:4), which ended with the destruction of Jerusalem (B.C. 588) and the reduction of the sea-coast except Tyre. For thirteen years Nebuchadnezzar besieged it by water and by land, but with what degree of success is still a matter of debate. Hitzig, Gesenius, Heeren, Winer, Kenrick and others hold that the siege was a failure. It is certain that the fall of Tyre is mentioned in no ancient history—neither by Josephus, nor by the Tyrian historian Menander, nor by Philostratus. Berosus, indeed,

affirmed that Nebuchadnezzar “subdued all Syria and Phoenicia,” but Tyre is not expressly mentioned. Nay, Jerome says persons who had examined Greek and Phoenician histories, especially the writings of Nicolaus Damascenus, find no mention of the siege at all, but the reply of the father is only a retort upon the *peifidia et mendacia* of profane writers. Jerome’s own assertion is, “Deus praedixerat, hoc sufficit.” The question then comes to be, whether the oracle of Ezekiel implies the capture of Tyre. The most graphic descriptions of this siege are found in ⁽³³⁰⁷⁾Ezekiel 26:7-12, 17; 28:2; 29:18, etc. The prophet’s language, “Son of man, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled; yet he had no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, “Behold I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and he shall take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey and it shall be the wages for his army. I have given him the land of Egypt for his labor wherewith he served against it, because they, wrought for me, saith the Lord God” (⁽³²⁰⁸⁾Ezekiel 29:18-20), would seem to imply that Nebuchadnezzar had failed; that his army had put forth all its energies, till “every head was bald” by the constant pressure of the helmet, and “every shoulder peeled” by the hard labor of the trenches and siege work, but that he had been disappointed, that he got no wages that the rich booty of the city did not fall into his possession, and that therefore Egypt was to afford him compensation “as a spoil,” “a prey,” “and wages for his army.” But surely the author or the collector of these oracles could not so contradict himself and his own utterances as to affirm, as in 26:7-21, and then deny, the capture of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar. The narrative of Berossus and Jerome is accepted by Movers, and Ewald, the latter of whom says that Jerome’s statement “quite agrees with the brief words of Ezekiel.” It may also be replied, with Havernick, Hengstenberg, Fairbairn, and others, that the meaning is that Nebuchadnezzar, though he took the city, yet found no fitting recompense, as, according to Jerome, the inhabitants had removed all their valuable property to the island. That he took Palaetyrus seems certain, though there is no proof of Jerome’s assertion that, in his assault upon the island, he had nearly completed a dam, and had erected warlike engines on it. It is plain, too, that Tyre made submission to the Chaldaean king. Many of the Tyrian royal family resided afterwards at Babylon, perhaps as hostages, and several of them were asked by the Tyrians at different times and crises to come and reign over them. These facts are proofs of the Chaldaean conquest, and that it was

more than such' a capitulation as is admitted by Niebuhr, Dunker, Kenrick, and others (Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assur's*, p. 216; Dunker, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, 1, 172; Kenrick, *Phoenicia*, p. 390; see Pusey, *On Daniel*, p. 288). Moreover, Isaiah, in his oracle against Tyre, specifically declared that it should be destroyed, not by the power which then threatened, but by the Chaldaeans, a people "formerly of no account" (23:13). The more detailed predictions of the prophet Ezekiel were delivered a hundred and twenty years later, B.C. 588. Tyre was not taken till the fifteenth year after the captivity, B.C. 573, more than seventeen hundred years, according to Josephus, after its foundation. Its destruction then must have been entire; all the inhabitants were put to the sword or led into captivity, the walls were razed to the ground, and it was made a "terror" and a desolation. It is remarkable that one reason assigned by Ezekiel for the destruction of this proud city is its exultation at the destruction of Jerusalem. "I shall be replenished now she is laid waste" (^{23:12}Ezekiel 16:2). This clearly indicates that its overthrow was posterior to that event and, if we take the seventy years during which it was; predicted by Isaiah (^{23:15}Isaiah 23:15) that Tyre should be forgotten to denote a definite term (which seems the most natural sense), we may conclude that it was not rebuilt till the same number of years after the return of the Jews from Babylon. That it was continental Tyre, and not insular Tyre, which Nebuchadnezzar besieged appears from the description of the siege which we have given us by Ezekiel; for we find that the king: cast up a mound against it, and erected engines to batter down the walls (^{28:8-10}Ezekiel 28:8-10). But that the city on, the island then, escaped this fate is manifest; from the Phoenician histories. But as to the latter also, at least; a show of submission, if not a subjection — leaving the native sovereigns on the throne, and their wealth and naval power untouched — was what Nebuchadnezzar gained when he ended the "wageless" siege (comp. 29:17). Once more Nebuchadnezzar armed, at the end, of this war, against Egypt, but Pharaoh. Apries, swiftly marching upon Phoenicia, subduing it, and destroying its fleet, prevented this expedition. In this expedition; Apries besieged Sidon, fought a naval battle with Tyre, and reduced the whole of the coast of Phoenicia, though this could not have had lasting effects (Herod. 2, 161; Diod. 1, 68, *Movers, as phonische Alterthum*, 2, 451). The rule of Nebuchadnezzar over Tyre, though real, may have been light and in the nature of an; alliance; and it may have been in. this sense that Merbal, a subsequent Tyrian king, was sent for to Babylon (Josephus, *Cont. Apion.* 1, 21). At this time the ancient constitution of Tyre was changed. Ithobaal had been followed by Baal, but

after Baal two judges (suffetes) took for a certain period the place of the monarch. We hear of, internal commotions-natural enough in a country: and city upon which calamity after calamity had fallen in, so short a time and the existence of two parties in the, commonwealth that looked respectively to Chaldoea and to Egypt could not but foster those internal dissensions., In 538, while Eiomus stood at the head of the Tyrian or Phoenician affairs, Cyrus captured Babylon, and thus, became master also of Phoenicia, which had reverted to; this power. At that time Sidon, being made the royal; residence, again resumed the hegemony.

Picture for Tyre 4

7. During the Persian domination the Tyrians were subject in, name to the Persian king and may have given him tribute. With the rest of Phoenicia, they had submitted to the Persians without striking a blow; perhaps through hatred of the Chaldees, perhaps solely from prudential motives. But their connection with the Persian king was not slavish. Thus, when Cambyses ordered them to join in an expedition against Carthage, they refused compliance, on account of their solemn engagements and parental relation to that colony; and Cambyses did not deem it right to use force towards them (Herod. 3, 19). Afterwards they fought with Persia against Greece, and furnished vessels of war in the expedition of Xerxes against Greece (ibid. 12, 98); and Mapên, the son of Sirom the Tyrian, is mentioned among those who, next to the commanders, were the most renowned in the fleet. It is worthy of notice that at this time Tyre seems to have been, inferior in power to Sidon. These two cities were less than twenty English miles distant from each other; and it is easy to conceive that in the course of centuries their relative importance might fluctuate, as would be very possible in modern times with two neighboring cities, such, for example, as Liverpool and Manchester. It is possible, also, that Tyre may have been seriously weakened by its long struggle against Nebuchadnezzar. Under the Persian dominion, Tyre and Sidon supplied cedarwood again to the Jews for the building of the second Temple and this wood was sent by sea to Joppa, and thence to Jerusalem, as had been the case with the materials for the first Temple in the time of Solomon (^{<small>Ezra 3:7</small>} Ezra 3:7). Under the Persians, likewise, Tyre was visited by a historian, from whom we might have derived valuable information respecting its condition (Herod. 2, 44). But the information actually supplied by him is scanty as the motive of his voyage seems to have been solely to visit the celebrated Temple of Melkarth (the Phoenician).

Hercules), which was situated in the island, and' was highly venerated. He gives no details as to the city, and merely specifies two columns which he observed in the temple, one of gold and the other of emerald; or, rather, as is reasonably conjectured by Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, of green glass (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 2, 81,82). Under the successive Persian rulers Phoenicia was allowed to retain many of its national institutions, and even a certain amount of independence, in return for which it paid a comparatively small tax and placed its again powerful fleet at the disposal of the conquerors, who entirely lacked that most vital element of naval power. Together, with Philistia and Cyprus, it was incorporated under Darius Hystaspis in the fifth nomos, or circle, of the empire; and up to the time of Xerxes the relations between the conquerors and the conquered were of a perfectly friendly nature. But when this king, during his Greek invasion, had managed to destroy the highly prized Phoenician fleet almost completely, and to this calamity added galling measures and humiliations without end, the people became so exasperated that they took part, under Sidon's leadership, in the revolt of Egypt against Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, about the middle of the 4th century, which ended most disastrously for the whole country, and particularly for Sidon, which, wealth and all, was fired by its own inhabitants. Tyre afterwards (350) again resumed the sway, until, after the battle on the Issus, all the Phoenician cities except herself paid their allegiance to the Macedonian warrior.

8. It was in consequence of this contumacy that Tyre was assailed for the third time by a great conqueror; and if some uncertainty hangs over the siege by Nebuchadnezzar, the results of the siege by Alexander were clear and undeniable. It was essential to the success of his military plans that the Phoenician fleet should be at his command, and that he should not be liable through their hostility to have his communications by sea with Greece and Macedonia suddenly cut off; and he accordingly summoned all the Phoenician cities to submit to his rule. All the rest of them, including Aradus, Byblus, and Sidon, complied with his demands, and the seamen of those cities in the Persian fleet brought away their ships to join him. Tyre alone, calculating probably at first on the support of those seamen, refused to admit him within its walls; and then ensued a memorable siege which lasted seven months, and the success of which was the greatest of all the achievements which Alexander up to that time had attempted. At that time Tyre was situated on an island nearly half a mile from the mainland; it was completely surrounded by prodigious walls, the loftiest portion of which on

the side fronting the mainland reached a height not less than one hundred and fifty feet;" and, notwithstanding his persevering efforts, he could not have succeeded in his attempt, if the harbor of Tyre to the north had not been blockaded by the Cyprians, and that to the south by the Phoenicians. Moreover, owing to internal disturbances, Carthage was unable to afford any assistance to its parent state. For seven months Tyre sustained one of the most remarkable sieges ever recorded (B.C. 332). Palbetyrus having been razed to the ground, the island-city was connected by the conqueror with the mainland by means of a mole, which, once destroyed, had to be reconstructed entirely anew. An immense fleet was collected, the ablest engineers of Phoenicia and Cyprus exercised all their skill on the construction of new battering and other machines; while the means of defense on the part of the Tyrians were as cunning as they were successful, and fearfully galling to the besiegers. At last Tyre fell under a furious double attack, and, provoked by their desperate resistance even after the town was already taken, the soldiery fired it and massacred an immense number of the inhabitants. In accordance with the barbarous policy of ancient times, 30,000 of its inhabitants; including slaves, free females, and free children, were sold as slaves (Arrian, 4:24, 9; Diodorus, 17:46). Alexander replaced the population by new colonists, chiefly Carians, and soon again the exceptionally favorable position of the place regained for it part of its ancient prosperity, though its trade is said to have suffered by the vicinity and rivalry of Alexandria.

9. Ptolemy had, after Alexander's death, annexed Phoenicia to his kingdom; but when, in B.C. 315, Antigonus returned from Babylonia, he easily expelled his garrisons from all the Phoenician cities save Tyre, which only surrendered after an eighteen months siege. The boundaries of its territory at that period were: Sarepta to the north, the "Tyrian Ladder" to the south, and Kedes and Baka in Galilee to the east. Under the Macedonian successors of Alexander, it shared the fortunes of the Seleucide, who bestowed on it many privileges; and there are still in existence coins of that epoch with a Phoenician and Greek inscription (Eckhel, *Doctr. Nusmmorum Vet.* 3, 379, etc.; Gesenius, *Mionum. Phoen.* p. 262-264, and Tab. 34).

Picture for Tyre 5

10. Beyond this nothing particular is known of Tyre from this time forth to the time of the civil wars of Rome-with which empire Phoenicia had been

incorporated together with Syria by Pompey-when Cassius divided Syria into small provinces and sold them separately. Tyre for a short period thus became a principality again with a king of her own. Under the Romans it thus at first continued to enjoy a kind of freedom; for Josephus mentions that when Cleopatra pressed Antony to include Tyre and Sidon in a gift of Phoenician and Jewish territory which he made to her, he steadily refused, knowing them to have been “free cities from their ancestors” (*Ant.* 15:4, 1). Subsequently, however, on the arrival of Augustus in the East (A.D. 20), he is said to have deprived the two cities of their liberties for seditious conduct (ἔδουλώσατο, Dion Cassius, 64, 7). Still the prosperity of Tyre in the time of Augustus was undeniably great. Strabo gives an account of it at that period (16, 2, 23), and speaks of the great wealth, which it derived from the dyes of the celebrated Tyrian: purple, which, as is well-known were extracted from shell-fish found on the coast, belonging to a species of the gelius Murex. In the days of Ezekiel, the Tyrians had imported purple from the Peloponnesus; but they had since learned to extract the dye for themselves; and they had the advantage of having shell-fish on their coast better adapted for this purpose even than those on the Lacedaemonian coast (Pausaniasn 3, 21, 6); Strabo adds that the great number of dyeing-works rendered the city unpleasant as a place of residence. He further speaks of the houses as consisting of many stories even of more than in the houses at Rome-which is precisely what might be expected in a prosperous fortified city of limited area, in which ground-rent would be high. Pliny the Elder gives additional information respecting the city, for in describing it he says that the circumference of the city proper (i.e. the city on the peninsula) was twenty-two stadia, while that of the whole city, including Palaetyrus, was nineteen Roman miles (*Fist. Nat.* 5, 17). The accounts of Strabo and Pliny have a peculiar interest in this respect, that they tended to convey an idea of what the city must have been when visited’ by Christ (ⲁⲓⲛⲧⲁⲩⲏ Matthew 15:21; ⲁⲓⲛⲧⲁⲩⲏ Mark 7:24). It was perhaps more populous than Jerusalem; and if so, it was undoubtedly the largest city which he is known to have visited. It was not much more than thirty miles distant from Nazareth, where Christ mainly lived as a carpenter’s son during the greater part of his life (ⲁⲓⲛⲧⲁⲩⲏ Matthew 2:23; 4:12,13,18; ⲁⲓⲛⲧⲁⲩⲏ Mark 6:3). We may readily conceive that he may often have gone to Tyre while yet unknown to the world; and whatever uncertainty there may be as to the extent to which the Greek language was likely to be spoken at Nazareth, at Tyre and in its neighborhood there must have been excellent opportunities for conversation in that language, with which he seems to have been

acquainted (^{<40725>}Mark 7:26). At an early period a Christian community was formed there (^{<4018>}Acts 21:3, 7). It was early the seat of a Christian bishopric, and Cassius, bishop of Tyre, is named as having been present at the Council of Caesarea towards the close of the 2nd century (Reland *Palestina*, p. 1054).

For a long time Tyre retained her manufactures and trade, though a mere shadow of what these once had been. Chiefly with regard to her dyeing produce Hadrian granted Tyre the title of metropolis, and it formed the principal naval station on the Tyrian coast. Once again it was fired in A.D. 193, when it took part with Septimius Severus against Pescennius Niger in their contest for the crown, and Severus gratefully bestowed upon the place, which he peopled with his third legion, the title of colony and the *Jus Italicum*. Such was its elastic vitality that at the time of Constantine it again equaled all the Eastern cities in wealth and commercial prosperity. Jerome, in the 4th century, calls it the noblest and most beautiful city of Phoenicia, and expresses his astonishment at the apparent nonfulfilment of the prophecy which threatened its eternal desolation (“*Nec edificaberis ultra videtur facere quæstionem, quomodo non sit aedificata? quam hodie cernimus Phœnicen nobilissimam et pulcherrimam civitatem*”).

11. In the 7th century took place the extraordinary Arabian revolution under Mohammed which has given a new religion to so many millions of mankind. In the years A.D. 633-638, all Syria and Palestine, from the Dead Sea to Antioch, were conquered by the caliph Omar. This conquest was so complete that in both those countries the language of Mohammed has almost totally supplanted the language of Christ. In Syria there are only three villages where Syriac (or Aramaic) is the vernacular language. In Palestine it is not the language of a single native; and in Jerusalem, to a stranger who understands what is involved in this momentous revolution, it is one of the most suggestive of all sounds to hear the muezzin daily call Mohammedans to prayers in the Arabic language of Mohammed within the sacred precincts where once stood the Temple in which Christ worshipped in Hebrew or in Aramaic. (As to the Syriac language, see Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, 2, 551.) But even this conquest did not cause the overthrow of Tyre. The most essential conditions on which peace was granted to Tyre, as to other Syrian cities, were the payment of a poll-tax, the obligation to give board and lodging for three days to every Moslem traveler, the wearing a peculiar dress, the admission of Moslems into the churches, the doing away with all crosses and all sounds of bells

the avoiding of all insulting expressions towards the Mohammedan religion, and the prohibition to ride on horseback or to build new churches (see Well, *Gesch. der Chalifen*, 1, 81-82). Some of these conditions were humiliating and nearly heart-breaking; but if submitted to, the lives and private property of the inhabitants remained untouched.: Notwithstanding the establishment of an imperial dyeing manufactory at Constantinople, Tyre yet retained her ancient celebrity for her purple, which was imported into Lombardy at the time of Charlemagne. Under the caliphs it enjoyed the benefits of a mild and enlightened dominion, and during the crusades was much admired both for its natural beauty and its fine edifices and its generally prosperous aspect. It again had at that time to sustain a long siege, but finally surrendered (1124), and was made an archbishopric, bestowed four years afterwards upon William of Tyre, the chronicler of the crusades. In August, 1192, it was fixed as the northern boundary of the Christian 'territories in Palestine, and continued to flourish, chiefly through the Venetian trade, as a commercial city until the conquest of Syria by Selim I in 1516, from which time forth its decline, further aided by the discovery of the New World and the route to Asia by the Cape of Good Hope, has been rapid and complete.

Picture for Tyre 6

IV. Present Condition. — In the first half of the 14th century, Tyre was visited by Sir John Maundeville, who says, speaking of Tyre, which is now called Sûr, here was once a great and goodly city of the Christians; but the Saracens have destroyed it in great part, and they guard that haven carefully "for fear of the Christians" (Wright, *Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 141). About 1610-11 it was visited by Sandys, who said of it, "But this once famous Tyre is now no other than a heap of ruins; yet have they a reverent aspect, and do instruct the pensive beholder with their exemplary frailty. It hath two harbors, that on the north side the fairest and best throughout all the Levant (which the cursors enter at their pleasure); the other choked with the decays of the city" (Purchas, *Pilgrims*, 2. 1393). Towards the close of the same century, in 1697, Maundrell says of it, "On the north side it has an old Turkish castle, besides which there is nothing here but a mere Babel of broken walls, pillars, vaults, etc., there being not so much as an entire house left. Its present inhabitants are only a few poor wretches that harbor in vaults and subsist upon fishing" (see Harris, *Voyages and Travels*, 2, 846). Lastly, without quoting at length Dr.

Richard Pococke, who in 1737-40 stated (see vol. 10 of Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, p. 470) that, except some janissaries, there were few other inhabitants in the city than two or three Christian families, the words of Hasselquist, the Swedish naturalist, may be recorded, as they mark the lowest point of depression which Tyre seems to have reached. He was there in May, 1751, and he thus speaks of his visit: "We followed the seashore... and came to Tyre, now called Zur, where we lay all night. None of these cities, which formerly were famous, are so totally ruined as this except Troy. Zur now scarcely can be called a miserable village, though it was formerly Tyre, the queen of the sea. *Here are about ten inhabitants, Turks and Christians, who live by fishing (Voyages and Travels in the Levant [Lond. 1766])*. A slight change for the better began soon after Volney states that in 1766 the Metawileh took possession of the place, and built a wall round it twenty feet high, which existed when he visited Tyre nearly twenty years afterwards. At that time Volney estimated the population at fifty or: sixty poor families. Since the beginning of the present century there has been a partial revival of prosperity. But it has been visited at different times during the last thirty years by Biblical scholars, such as Robinson, Stanley (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 270), and Renan (*Letter in the Moniteur*, July 11, 1861), who all concur in the account of its general aspect of desolation. Mr. Porter, who resided several years at Damascus, and had means of obtaining correct information, stated in 1858 that "the modern town, or rather village, contains from 3000 to 4000 inhabitants, about one half being Metawileh; and the other Christians" (*Handbook*, p. 391). They are living among the broken ruins of its former magnificence, eking out a scanty livelihood upon insignificant exports of tobacco, cotton, wool, and wood. The place as it now stands was founded under the old name Sur in 1766, and suffered very considerably during the earthquake in 1837. The remains of an ancient cathedral church probably enclose the bones of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa and of Origen. About one and a half mile distant from Tyre is the so-called Tomb of Hiram, an immense sarcophagus of limestone, popularly supposed to contain the corpse of that king. *SEE HIRAM.*

The present city lies only upon the eastern part of the island, on the junction of the island and isthmus. The houses are mostly mere hovels, one story high, with flat roofs; and the streets are narrow, crooked, and filthy. Yet the numerous palm-trees and pride of India trees interspersed among the houses and gardens throw over the plain an Oriental charm. One of the

best accounts of its present appearance is given by Dr. Robinson, who spent a Sabbath there in 1838 (*Bibl. Res.* 3, 395): “I continued my walk,” says he, “along the shore of the peninsula, part of which is now unoccupied except as ‘a place to spread nets upon,’ musing upon the pride and fall of ancient Tyre. Here was the little isle, once covered by her palaces and surrounded by her fleets; but, alas! thy riches and thy fame, thy merchandise, thy mariners and thy pilots, thy calkers, and the occupiers of thy merchandise that were in thee—where are they? Tyre has indeed become like ‘the top of a rock.’ The sole tokens of her more ancient splendor columns of red and gray granite, sometimes forty or fifty heaped together, or marble pillars—lie broken and strewed beneath the waves in the midst of the sea; and the hovels that now nestle upon a portion of her site present no contradiction of the dread decree, ‘Thou shalt be built no more.’”

The downfall and permanent desolation of Tyre is one of the most memorable accomplishments of prophecy which the annals of the world exhibit. The sins which sealed its ruin were, in the words of the sacred writers, these: “Because that Tyrus hath said against Jerusalem, Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people; she is turned unto me; I shall be replenished, now she is laid waste” (^{381D}Ezekiel 26:2). “Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a god, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas” (^{381D}Ezekiel 28:2). “The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians, that ye might remove them far from their border” (²⁰¹⁶Joel 3:6).

V. Literature. — See, in addition to the works cited above, Cellarii *Notit.* 2, 381 sq.; Hengstenberg, *De Rebus Syriorum* (Berol. 1832); Rhyner, *De Tyro* (Basil. 1715); Camem, *De Nave Tyria* (Viteb. 1714); Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.; Poulan de Bossay, *Recherches sur Tyre* (Paris, 1864); Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 260 sq.; Gesenius, *Comment. zu Jesa.* 1, 707 sq.; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, 2, 229; Badeker, *Palestine*, p. 426 sq.; Ridgeway, *The Lord's Land*, p. 604 sq.

Tyre, Council Of.

The Arians, through Eusebius of Nicomedia, obtained the convocation of this council from the emperor Constantine, A.D. 335, under pretext of thereby healing the divisions which existed among the bishops; but their real intention was to oppress Athanasius. The bishops who were summoned to attend were selected by the Eusebian party, and came from

Egypt, Libya, Asia; and most of the eastern provinces. The most noted were Marius of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicea, Ursaces of Singedunum, and Yalens of Mursia; in all about sixty Arian bishops attended. There were also a few bishops present who were not of the Eusebian faction, as Maximus of Jerusalem, Marcellus of Ancyra, Alexander of Thessalonica, etc. Constantine sent the count Dionysius to keep order, who, as the event showed, was completely devoted to the Eusebian cause, and by his violence destroyed all liberty of debate.

Athanasius, compelled by the order of the emperor, came to the council, attended by forty-nine Egyptian bishops, among whom were Potamon and Paphnutius. No accusation was brought against Athanasius on account of his faith; but he was arraigned for having killed a Meletian bishop named Arsenius, and for having forcibly broken into a church while Ischyryus, a pretended priest, was celebrating; and for having overturned the altar and broken the sacred chalice. He was made to stand as a criminal while Eusebius and the others sat as his judges, against which treatment Potamon of Heraclea made a vehement protest, heaping reproaches upon Eusebins. From the very first the Egyptian bishops protested against the proceedings; but their objections were not heeded. Sozomen says that Athanasius appeared frequently before the council, and defended himself admirably, listening quietly to all the calumnious accusations brought against him, and replying with patience and wonderful sagacity. However, his enemies, not contented with the charges which they had already brought against him, dared to impeach his purity, and introduced into the council a debauched woman, whom they had bribed to assert that she had been ravished-by him. The utter falsehood of the charge was, however, triumphantly proved; for Athanasius having deputed one of his priests, named Thimoteus, to reply for him, the woman, who was ignorant even of the person of the holy bishop, mistaking Thimoteus for him, declared that he was the man who had offered violence to her at such a time and place. Neither were his accusers more successful in their endeavor to fix upon him the murder of Arsenius, who, in the midst of their false statements, appeared before the council alive. Foiled in both these infamous attempts, the Arians were filled with fury, and endeavored to offer violence to him; in which, however, they were prevented by the officers of Constantine. Nothing now remained but the charge of having broken the chalice, and there being no proof ready, and the clergy of the country where the offence was said to have taken place having solemnly sworn to the falsehood of the charge, a

deputation was sent to make inquiry on: the spot (in the Mareotis), composed of the most decided of his enemies. In the meantime, Athanasius, seeing that his condemnation, by fair means or foul, was resolved, withdrew from Tyre. The deputies, upon their return, declared that they had found the charge correct; and upon this statement, sentence of deposition was pronounced, on the plea of his having been convicted of a part of the accusation brought against him. More than fifty bishops protested against the acts of this assembly. See Malmsi, *Concil.* 2, 435.
SEE ATHANASIUS.

Tyr'ian

(**Τύριος**), a native or inhabitant of the city of Tyre (Ecclesiastes 46:18). The corresponding Heb. word (**yræpTsori**) is rendered by the indirect phrase of Tyre in the A. V. (^{<1074>}1 Kings 7:14; ^{<1324>}1 Chronicles 22:4; ^{<424>}2 Chronicles 2:14; Ezra 3, 7; ^{<1336>}Nehemiah 13:16), and so likewise the Greek (1 Esdr. 5, 55; 2 Macc. 4:10; ^{<422>}Acts 12:20).

Tyrimmas

in Greek mythology, was a friend of Ulysses, with whom the latter lived while on his journey from Troy to Epirus to consult the oracle about the war. Tyrimmas had a beautiful daughter, Erippe, whom Ulysses loved, and by whom he begot a son, Euryalus.

Tyrius

(i.e. *the Tyrian*), in Greek mythology, was; an epithet of *Hercules*, as adored in Cyprus.

Tyrones Dei

(*new soldiers of God*), a name given in the early Church, to catechumens, by Tertullian (*De Panitent.* c. 6) and Augustine (*De Fide ad Catechumen.* 2, 1), because they were just entering upon that; state which made them soldiers of God and candidates of eternal life. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 11, ch 1, § 1.

Tyropceon

(**Τυροποιῶν**, *of the cheese-makers*), the name of a valley (**φάραξ**) in Jerusalem, mentioned only by Josephus, who says that the city “was built,

one quarter facing another, upon two hills, separated by an intervening valley, at which over against each other the houses terminated.” Again, “The valley of the Tyropoeon, which, I have said, divided the hill of the upper town from that of the lower, extended as far as Siloamar, a fountain whose waters are sweet and copious” (*War*, 5, 4, 1). He also tells us that the “other hill called Akra, which sustained the lower city,” lay opposite to Mount Moriah, from which it was separated by “another broad valley;” and, further, that the whole city, situated on these two hills, “lay over against the Temple in the manner of a theatre” (*Ant.* 15:11, 5).

Notwithstanding this repeated and seemingly definite notice, the position of the valley is still a matter of dispute. Dr. Robinson, in accordance with his theory of the site of Akra (q.v.), and of the topography of ancient Jerusalem in general, maintains that it is the small valley on the north of Zion; and the English engineers have determined that this chasm, although now inconsiderable, was formerly much deeper, being filled up with the rubbish of ages. Most archaeologists, however, have regarded the “Valley of the Cheese mongers” as identical with, the conspicuous and important one leading from the Damascus gate to the Pool of Siloam, which in all ages has been the principal drain of the internal waters of the city (Thomson, *Land handbook*, 2, 470; Pierotti). *Jerusalem Restored*, 1, 19).
SEE JERUSALEM.

Tyrrhenus

in Greek mythology, was a son of Hercules and Omphale, or a son of Telephus and Hiera, and a brother of Tarchon; or a son of Atys and Callithea, and brother of Lydus. He is said to have introduced the use of the great sea-shell as a trumpet. He colonized that part of Italy named after him at the time of his flight from Maeonia because of starvation.

Tyrrhus

in ancient Italian mythology, was a chief shepherd of Latinus, king of Italy. He was the owner of a beautiful tame deer which Silvia nursed, bathed, and ornamented with flowers. The Fury Alecto, sent from Tartarus chased this deer, so that it came within reach of Ascanius, who wounded it, whereupon it fled towards home. The angry shepherd and his sons, and invisibly the Furies also, assembled the neighboring inhabitants, and this was popularly assigned as the original cause of the war which Jeneas was obliged to carry on with the Latinians in Italy.

Ty'rus

(Τύρος), the Greek form of the name of two places in Palestine.

1. The well-known city of TYRE *SEE TYRE* (q.v.), as the name is usually Anglicized, but “Tyrus” in the A. V. in certain passages (~~3472~~Jeremiah 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; ~~3472~~Ezekiel 26:2, 3, 4, 7, 15; 27:2, 3, 8, 32; 28:2,12; 29:18; ~~3472~~Hosea 9:13; Amos 1:9, 10; ~~3472~~Zechariah 9:2, 3; 2 Esdr. 1, 11 Judith 2, 28; 1 Macc. 5, 15; 2 Macc. 4:18, 32, 44, 49). **2.** A place described by Josephus as lying “between Arabia and Judaea, beyond the Jordan, not far from the country of Heshbon,” where Hyrcanus built a strong castle, of a sumptuous character, as the center of his power in that region (*Anf.* 12:4, 11). It has been identified in modern times with the magnificent ruins *Airak el-Emir*, four hours from Hesban, which Tristram minutely describes as corresponding to the statements of the Jewish historian (*Land of Israel*, p. 529).

Tyrus, Ladder Of.

SEE LADDER OF TYRE.

Tyson, Michael

a learned English divine, was born in the, parish of All-Saints, Stamford, Nov. 19, 1740. He was educated at Benedict College, Cambridge, where he received his degrees; that of A.B. in 1764, A.M. in 1767, and B.A. in 1775. After taking his bachelor's degree, he was elected a fellow of his college. In 1766 he traveled with Mr. Gough (afterwards the celebrated antiquarian), and, after his return in the following year, was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and in 1769 a fellow of the Royal Society. In 1770 he was ordained deacon at Whitehall Chapel; and in 1773 received the official of the archdeaconry of Huntingdon from his father. He was, at the same time, bursar of the college, and succeeded, to the cure of St. Benedict's Church, Cambridge. In 1776 he became Whitehall preacher, and in the same year was presented by the college to the rectory of Lambourne, near Ongar, Essex. He died May 3, 1780. Mr. Tyson wrote an ode *On the Birth of the Prince of Wales*, and another, *An Ode to Peace*. He was also an excellent draughtsman and painter.

Tyssens, Peter

a Flemish painter, was born at Antwerp in 1625; and, after the death of Rubens and Vandyck, was considered one of the ablest painters of his time. He was made director of the Academy at Antwerp in 1661. "His compositions are copious and ingenious, his design more correct than is usual with painters of his country, his coloring strong, clear, and harmonious." He died, according to best authorities, in 1692. Among his works most worthy of notice are, *The Martyrdom of St. Benedict*, Church of the Capuchins, Brussels: — *The Crucifixion at the Church of the Barefooted Carmelites*: — *The Assumption of the Virgin*, Church of St. James, Antwerp. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts*, s.v.

Tzschirner, Heinrich Gottlieb

a German theologian and-orator, was born Nov. 14, 1778, at Mitweida, in Saxony. He graduated at Leipsic, and in February, 1800, became an adjunct to the philosophical faculty at Wittelberg. His lectures were principally concerned with empirical psychology, and yielded fruit in the works *Leben .u Ende merkw. Selbstmrders nebst Abhandl. lib. d. Selbstmord* (1805): — *Ueber d. moral. Indifferentismus*: and *Verwandschaft d. Tugenden und Laster*. He was also associated with Manchart in the publication of the *Neues Repert. f. empir. Psychologie*. In 1801 the sickness of his father called him away from the university, and he became first assistant, and, after the decease of his father, deacon at Mitweida. At that time he began a history of apologetics, but published only one volume (Leips. 1805). In the same year he was received into the theological faculty at Wittenberg, and in 1809 he removed to Leipsic, where he remained until his death, with a temporary interruption occasioned by the war of deliverance from French domination, in which he served as chaplain and gained the decoration of the green cross (1813). The literary fruitage of his campaign is contained in the volume *Ueber den Krieg*, etc. (Leips. 1815). He died Feb. 17, 1823, regretted by the whole community of Leipsic.

Tzschirner's theological tendency was that known in his day as aestheticism, whose aim was the reconciliation of rationalism and supernaturalism. He regarded Christianity as being in its nature a religion of reason, though introduced by a supernatural revelation. See *Briefe, veranl. durch Reinhardts Gestandnisse* (Leips. 1811), and *Briefe einzel*

Deutschen an Chateaubriand, etc., published by Krug. His *Dogmatik* (published by Hase, Leips. 1829) is non-committal, and contents itself with merely stating the differences of the two great opposing schools of thought in Protestant theology (see Rohr, *Krit. Prediger-Bibliothek*, 10:1). He was rather a historian than a systematic theologian, and-disposed to hide himself behind his work. He added the two final volumes to Schröckh's *Church History since the Reformation*; but his principal work, according to his own judgment, is his *Fall des Heidenthums*, published by Niedner (Leips. 1829).

The period following the Napoleonic wars and beginning with the jubilee of the great Reformation (1817), developed Tzschirner into a foremost defender of Protestantism and popular freedom. Enthusiastically inspired by the study of the great past of the Evangelical Church, he yet refused to confine himself to the letter of Luther's authority, but insisted upon the exercise of the Protestant principle of intellectual liberty. In view of the fact that timid statesmen endeavored to repress the enthusiasm of the nation consequent on the defeat of Napoleon, and that Romanists and would-be perverts to Romanism charged upon Protestantism the originating and development of every revolutionary tendency and excess, he devoted his brilliant diction and incisive thought to the demonstration that Protestantism tends to mature the intelligence and fix the principles of peoples; and that it therefore tends to peace and quietness, and is more favorable to any legitimate form of settled government than Romanism. Numerous works, some of which became famous and were translated into foreign languages, were the result of this effort—e.g., *Katholic us. Potesismu s . Prtes smus s dem Standpunkte der Politik* (1822). He also wrote in behalf of oppressed Protestants in France, Sardinia, and Hungary (1824), and of the liberties of Greece (1821). — His Protestant contemporaries, for their part, gave him many tokens of their appreciation of his labors in their behalf, among them the king of Denmark, who in 1826 conferred on him the Order of Danebrog.

Tzschirner had taken Reinhard for his model as a pulpit orator. His sermons are occasionally models of pulpit eloquence. They were carefully elaborated and strictly memorized, sometimes pervaded with a poetic spirit and great freshness, and characterized by the frequent use of matter drawn from Church history. His personality, voice, and manner in the pulpit gave him great power over his audiences, despite difficulties he experienced with his respiratory organs. Five volumes and several separately published

Sermons by Tzschirner are extant. His views respecting the effect of rationalistic principles upon the preacher are contained in the article *Dass die Verschiedenheit d. Dogmen Systeme kein Hi-zde-niss des Zweckes d. Kirche sei*, in *Magazin für christl. Prediger*, 1823. His theory of homiletics sets forth that homiletics “is the art of edifying by means of speech which harmonizes with the forms of beauty and excites into activity all the faculties of the soul, subject to the purpose of promoting piety and virtue, for which the Church exists” (see Rohl, *sup.* 2, 2, p. 243, art. Tzschirner als Homiletiker”).

Literature. — Krug, *Tzschirners Denkmal*, etc. (Leips. 1823); H. G. Tzschirner, etc. (2nd ed. *ibid.* 1828); Goldhorn, *Dr. H. G. Tzschirner*, etc. (1828); Rohr, *Krit. Prediger-Bibl.* 1, 1, 126; Tittman, *femoria Tzschirneri* (Lips. 1829), and many others. See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v., where an extended list of Tzschirner’s numerous works is given