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, anticipated the hypothesis that many of them belong to the Maccabean age, 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. Charac­teristics such as these bring Theodore, of all patristic writers, nearest to the modern spirit. 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 or revelation, and never manifests the slightest effort to control it by the original or even by the Syriac. He is a prosaic and often monotonous writer, and has other faults, *e.g* a lack of insight into the deeper movements of scriptural thought, and a want of spiritual and devotional fervour.

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 starts with a theory of man’s relation to the world. Man is the *vinculum* of the cosmos, uniting in his person the material and the spiritual. This bond, broken by sin, was restored by Christ. According to Theodore the Logos 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 (ϵνοικϵϊν), but any such thing as ϵνωσιs *φυσική* did not and could not exist, because the finite is not “ capax infiniti,” and because any ϵνωσιs 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, Rabbula 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 Three Chapters; this act of the emperor was confirmed by the fifth oecumenical 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, who called him “ the Inter­preter,” 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 Πpόs toùs *λlyovτas φbσeι κal ob yvωμ-∣ πτaleιv* tous du0pωτrovs, 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. Manichaeism. 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 3rd 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 in Syria (d. 430) also achieved high fame as an exegete, and expounded the theology of the school of Antioch.@@4
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**THEODORET,** bishop of Cyrrhus, an important writer in the domains of exegesis, dogmatic theology, church history and ascetic theology, was born in Antioch, Syria, about 386. At an early age he entered the cloister; and in 423 he became bishop of Cyrrhus, a small city in a wild district between Antioch and the Euphrates, where, except for a short period of exile, he spent the remainder 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 by similar works.

As an exegete Theodoret belongs to the Antiochene school, of which Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsucstia 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 catenae. There are also special elucidations of some difficult Scripture texts.

Theodoret's chief importance is as a dogmatic theologian, it having fallen to his lot to take part in the Nestorian controversy and to be the most considerable opponent of the views of Cynl and Dioscurus of Alexandria. For more than twenty years he maintained the struggle against the Alexandrian dogmatic and its formulae *(0ιoτ6κos, lvωrιs κaβ' (nr0στaσw, μία bτ0σraσιl, lι>ωσιs φυσική,* and the like), and taught that in the person of Christ we must strictly distinguish two natures *(hypostases),* which are united indeed in one person *(prosopon),* but are not amalgamated in essence. For these years his history coincides with that of the Eastern Church from 430 to 451, and for this very reason it is impossible to sketch it even briefly here (see Hcfeíe, *Conc.-gesch.,* vol. ii.). The issue was not unfavourable to Theodoret's cause, but melan­choly enough for Theodoret himself: the council of Chalcedon. condemned monophysitism, but he unhappily yielded to pressure so far as also to take part in pronouncing “ anathema upon Nestorius, and upon all who call not the Holy Virgin Mother of God, and who divide the one Son into two.” As Theodoret had
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@@@3 See Photius, *Biblioth.,* c. 177; Mercator, p. 339 seq., ed. Baluz.

@@@4 See O. Bardenhewer, *Polychronius* (Freiburg, 1879).