extant, as at a later period he lost credit in the church. We still possess in Greek his commentary on the Minor Prophets, and in Latin translations commentaries on the minor Pauline epistles, besides very many fragments, especially of that on the epistle to the Romans. Theodore’s importance as an exegete lies in two char­acteristics:—(1) in opposition to the allegorical method he insists on getting at the literal meaning, and adheres to it when found ; (2) in his interpretation of the Scriptures he takes into account the historical circumstances in whieh they were produced, and substi­tutes the historical-typological for the pneumatico-christological interpretation of prophecy ; in other words, he interprets all Old Testament passages historically in the first instance, and sees the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in the history of Christ and His church only in so far as the entire Old Testament is a “ shadow of things to come.” Following his master Diodorus, who had already written a treatise T*íς* *διαφορά θeωpías κaí aλληyoρías,* Theodore also was the author of a special dissertation against the allegorists, *i.e.,* against Origen and his followers, which, however, has unfortunately perished. The comparative freedom of Theodore’s view of inspiration is also noteworthy. He discriminates between historical, prophetical, and didactic writings, and in accordance with this distinction assumes varying degrees of inspiration. Finally, he entertained very bold opinions about the canon and several of the books included in it. He esteemed very lightly the Solomonic writings and the book of Job ; Canticles he explained as a nuptial poem of Solomon’s; the book of Job appeared to him in many places hardly worthy of its subject, and he censures the writer sharply ; Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah he entirely rejected ; he denied the accuracy of the titles of the Psalms, and referred the so-called Messianic element almost invariably to the kings of Israel ; he even criticized the catholic epistles and rejected the epistle of James. His commentaries contain a great deal of learned matter, and his grammatico-historical observations are still to some extent useful. But, on the other hand, his learning must not be over­estimated. It falls behind that of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, notwithstanding the superiority of his method. It is specially noticeable that Theodore troubled himself little about textual criticism. He simply accepts the text of the LXX. as that of revelation, and never manifests the slightest effort to control it by the original or by the Syriac.

But in addition to his commentaries Theodore also wrote extensive dogmatico-polemical works, which were destined to operate long after his death disastrously for his fame. As a disciple of Diodorus, Theodore accepted the Nicene teaching on the doctrine of the Trinity, but at the same time in christology took up a position very closely approaching that of Paul of Samosata. The violence of his opposition to his fellow countryman, Apollinaris of Laodicea, perhaps the most acute and far-seeing theologian of the century, made it necessary for Theodore to formulate his christology with precision (in fifteen books on the Incarnation—all lost except a few fragments—and in special treatises against Apollinaris). He held the Logos to have assumed a complete manhood, which had to pass through the stages of ethical development just as in the case of any other human being. In this the Logos only supported the man Christ Jesus, but was not essentially connected with him ; the Logos dwelt in him (*έvoικeîv*)*,* but any such thing as έ*vωσιs φυσική* did not and could not exist, because the finite is not “ capax infiniti,” and because any έ*vωσιs* would have destroyed the reality of the human nature. The same sober and thoughtful way of looking at things, and the same tendency to give prominence to the moral element, which characterize the commentaries of Theodore appear also in his dogmatic. When, accordingly, the Nestorian controversy broke out, his works also were dragged into the discussion. At Ephesus, indeed, the memory of Theodore does not appear to have been attacked,@@1 but soon afterwards the assault began. Marius Mercator, Rabulas of Edessa, Cyril, and other monophysites brought the charge of heresy against his writings, and sought to counteract their influence. But it was not until more than a century after­wards that his fanatical adversaries succeeded—in spite of the strong opposition of the best theologians of the West—in obtaining from Justinian the condemnation of his works in the controversy of the Tria Capitula, as it is called ; this act of the emperor was con­firmed by the fifth œcumenical council, and Theodore’s name was accordingly deleted from the list of orthodox writers. From that day Theodore’s works ceased to be read within the Byzantine Church, and hence have been lost. The Syrians, on the other hand, have always held in high esteem the memory of the great teacher, and have even carried back their liturgy to his name. The Nestorians possess, or possessed, a very large number of writings by him in Syriac translations.@@2

Theodore took part also in the Pelagian controversy at the time when it raged in Palestine. In the treatise, only partially pre­served,@@3 *∏ρόs toύs λέγovτas φύσeι κaί ού γνώμη ιrτaίειv* toύs

*άvθρώπoυs,* he sharply controverts the doctrine of original sin and Jerome its advocate. In his view the theory of Augustine is “a new heresy,” “a malady”; he regarded it as a doctrine which necessarily led to dualism and Manichæism. The attitude thus taken by Theodore is not surprising ; he more nearly takes up the ground of the old church doctrine as set forth in the apologists and in the great Greek fathers of the 3d and 4th centuries. The Pelagians driven from the East were received by him in Cilicia.

A brother of Theodore, Polychronius by name, bishop of Apamea, also achieved fame as an exegete, and expounded the theology of the school of Antioch.@@4

*Literature.—*Migne, *Patrol.,* ser. Gr.. lxvi. The Greek fragments of Theodore's New Testament commentaries have been collected by Fritzsche (*Theod. Mops. in N*. *T. Comm.,* Turin, 1847). The commentaries on the Pauline epistles (Pitra, *Spic. Solesm.,* i. 49 *sq.*) have been recognized by Jacobi *(Ztschr. f. christl. Wissensch.,* 1854) and Hort *(Journ. Class. and Sacr. Philol.,* iv., 1859, p. 302 *sq.),* and edited by Jacobi (Halle University *Programm,* 1855-60). They have also been edited very admirably by Swete *(Theod. Mops. in Epp. B. Pauli Comm.,* i., ii., Cambridge, 1880-82), along with the Greek fragments and the fragments of the dogmatical writings on this edition, see Schürer, *Theol. Lit. Ztg.,* 1880-82. The commentary on the Minor Prophets will be found in Mai's *Nov. Patr. Biblioth.,* vii. 1854 (Wegnern, Berlin, 1834 ; Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.,* vi., 1832). See also Sachaα, *Theod. Mops. Fragm. Syriaca,* Leipsic, 1869, and Bäthgen, “Der Psalmen- commentar des Theod. v. Mops. in Syr. Bearbeitung,” in *Ztschr. f. ATliche Wissensch.,* v. 53 *sq.* Extracts from the writings of Theodore occur in the *Catenae* of Marius Mercator, in the *Acta* of the third and fifth œcumenical councils, in Facundus, Liberatus, and Theodore's chief adversary, Leontius Byzantinus.

The principal monograph on Theodore, apart from the excellent prolegomena of Swete, is that of Kilin *(Th. v. Mops. u. Junιlius Afric. als Exegeten,* Freiburg, 1880). On his importance for the history of dogma, see the great works of Baur and Dorner. Upon the Antioch school in general, compare Münscher, *Comment. de Schola Antioch.,* Copenhagen, 1811; Hergenrother, *Die antioch. Schule,* 1866; and Kihn, *Die Bedeutung der antioch. Schule,* Eichstädt, 1866. Literary and biographical details will be found in Dupin, Tillemont, Cave, Fabricius, Noris, Gamier, Schröckh, Alzog; see also Fritzsche, *De Theod. Mops. Vila et Scriptis,* 1836; Sieffert. *Theod. Mops. Vet. Test. Sobrie Interpr. Vind.,* Ratisbon, 1827; Klener, *Symbol. Lit. ad. Theod. Μ. pertin.,* Göttingen, 1836; Specht, *Theod. v. Mops. u. Theodoret,* Munich, 1871 ; Kihn in the *Tub. Quartalschr.,* 1879 ; Nestle in *Theol. Stud. aus Würtemb.,* ii. 210 *sq.* ; and Batiffol, “ Sur une Traduction Latine de Th. de Mops.,” in *Ann. de Philos. Chrét.,* 1885. (A. HA.)

THEODORE,' the name of two popes. Theodore I., pope from November 642 till May 649, succeeded John IV. He was the son of a bishop, and was born in Jeru­salem. A zealous opponent of monothelitism, in the course of the protracted controversy he in a Roman synod ex­communicated Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, and signed the document with ink mingled with consecrated wine. Theodore II. had a pontificate of only twenty days (Nov.-Dec. 897).

THEODORET, bishop of Cyrus, and an -important writer in the domains of exegesis, dogmatic theology, church history, and ascetic theology, was born in Antioch, Syria, about 390. At an early age he entered the cloister ; and in 423 he became bishop of Cyrus, or Cyrrhus, a small city between Antioch and the Euphrates, where, except for a short period of exile, he spent all the rest of his life. The date of his death is uncertain, but it must have been at least six or seven years later than the council of Chal­cedon (451). Although thoroughly devoted to the ideals of monasticism, he discharged his episcopal duties with remarkable zeal and fidelity. He was diligent in the cure of souls, labouring hard and successfully for the conversion of the numerous Gnostic communities and other heretical sects which still maintained a footing within the diocese. He himself claims to have brought more than a thousand Marcionites within the pale of the church, and to have destroyed many copies of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, which were still in ecclesiastical use ; and he also exerted himself to improve the diocese, which was at once large and poor, by building bridges and aqueducts, beautifying the town, and similar works.

As an exegete Theodoret belongs to the Antiochene school, of which Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia were the heads. He was not actually the personal disciple of either, but he adopted their methods, though without the consistency and boldness of the first-named. His extant commentaries (those on Canticles, on the Prophets, on the book of Psalms, and on the Pauline epistles—the last the most valuable) are among the best performances of the fathers of the church. They are brief, yet not wanting in that element of practical edification on which Chrysostom lays special weight as characteristic of the Antiochenes. In addition to these complete commentaries, we have fragments of some others (of that on Isaiah, for example), principally met with in catenæ. There are also special elucidations of some difficult Scripture texts.

@@@1 A confession, however, drawn up by him was spoken of; see Hahn, *Biblioth. der Symbole,* 2d ed., p. 229 *sq.*

@@@2 See the catalogue in Assemani, *Bibl. Or.,* iii. 1, p. 3 *sq.*

@@@3 See Photius, *Biblioth.,* c. 177; Mercator, p. 339 *sq.,* ed. Baltz.

@@4 See Bardenheuer, *Polychronius,* Freiburg, 1879.