previously been a constant defender of Nestorius it was impossible for him to concur in this sentence upon his unfortunate friend with a clear conscience, and in point of fact he did not change his own dogmatic position. It is painful, therefore, to find him in his subsequent *Epitome* classing Nestorius as a heretic, and speaking of him with the utmost hostility. Some of Theodoret’s dogmatic works are no longer extant : of his five books ∏ϵρί ϵ*vavθpωττ∣σeωs, for* example, directed against Cyril after the council of Ephesus, we now possess fragments merely. A good deal of what passes under his name has been wrongly attributed to him. Certainly genuine are the refutation *(Ανατροπή)* of Cyril's twelve *Αναθεματισμοί* of Nestorius, and the *,Epavlστηs,* or Πολύμορφο?, (written about 446), consisting of three dialogues, entitled respectively 'Aτpeιrτos, *Ασθyχvτos,* and ,Ar<rf‰ in which the monophysitism of Cyril is opposed, and its Apollinarian character insisted on. Among the apologctico-dogmatic works of Theodoret must be reckoned his ten discourses ∏tρi *πρovolas.*

Theodoret gives a valuable exposition of his own dogmatic in the fifth book of his Alpeτικ⅞5 κακoμυβlαs *επιτομή,* already re­ferred to.@@1 This, the latest of his works in the domain of church history (it was written after 451), is a source of great though not of primary importance for the history of the old heresies. In spite of the investigations of Volkmar and Hilgenfeld, we are still somewhat in the dark as to the authorities he used. The chief uncertainty is as to whether he knew Justin’s *Syntagma,* and also as to whether he had access to the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus in their complete form. Besides this work Theodoret has also left us a church history in five books,, from 324 to 429, which was published shortly before the council of Chalcedon. The style is better than that of Socrates and Sozomen, as Photius has remarked, but as a contribution to history the work is inferior in importance. Its author made use of Eusebius’s *Life of Constantine',* and of the histories of Rufinus, Socrates and Sozomen, and probably of Philo- storgius as well. He also used other sources, and made a thorough study of the writings of Athanasius, but apart from some docu­ments he has preserved, relating to the Arian controversy, he does not contribute much that is not to be met with in Socrates. As regards chronology he is not very trustworthy; on the other hand, his moderation towards opponents, not excepting Cyril, deserves recognition. The ,Eλλη>,urω>' t>epατreυτut⅛ *παθημάτων (De Curandis Graecorum Affectionibus)—*written before. 438—is of an historical and apologetic character, very largely indebted to Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius; it aims at showing the advantages of Christianity as compared with “ the moribund but still militant ” Hellenism of the day, and deals with, the assaults of pagan adver­saries. The superiority of the Christian faith both philosophically and ethically is set forth, the chief stress being laid on monachism, with which heathen philosophy has nothing to compare. Much prominence is also given to the cult of saints and martyrs.

On this side of his character, however, Theodoret can best be studied in the thirty ascetic biographies of his Φιλ<50eos *Ιστορία.* This collection, which has been widely read,, is a pendant to the *IIistoria Lausiaca* of Palladius and the monkish tales of Sozomen. For the East it has had the same importance as the similar writings of Jerome, Sulpicius Severus and Cassian for the West. It shows that the “ sobriety ” of the Antiochene scholars can be predicated only of their exegesis; their style of piety was as exaggerated in its devotion to the ideals of monasticism as was that of their mono- physite opponents. Indeed, one of the oldest leaders of the school, Diodorus of Tarsus, was himself among the strictest ascetics.

181 letters of Theodoret have come down to us. partly in a separate collection, partly in the *Acta* of the councils, and partly in the Latin of Manus Mercator; they are of great value not only for the biography of the. writer, but also for the history of his diocese and of the church in general.

The edition of Sirmond (Paris, .1642) was afterwards completed by Garnier (1684), who has also written dissertations on the author’s works. Schulze and Nösselt published a new edition (6 vols., Halle, 1769-74) based on that of their predecessors; a glossary was afterwards added by Bauer. The. reprint will be found in vols, lxxx.-lxxxiv. of Mιgne, and considerable portions occur in Mansi. The church history has been published frequently in con­nexion with the histories of Socrates, Sozomen and others, *e.g.* by Valesius (169^) and Reading (1720). There is an English transla­tion of the history by Bloomfield Jackson in the *Nicene and Post- Nicene Fathers,* series ii., vol. iii. ; the translation including also the dialogues and letters.

Besides the earlier labours of Tillemont, Ccillier, Oudin, Du Pin and Fabricius and Harless, see Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.,* vol. xviii.; Hefele, *Conc.-gesch.,* vol. ii. ; Richter, *De Theodoreto Epp. Paul. Interprète* (Leipzig, 1822); Binder, *Etudes sur Theodoret* (Geneva, 1844); Stäudlin, *Gesek, u. Lit. der Kirchengesch.* (Hanover, 1827); Kihn, *Die Bedeutung der antioch. Schule* (1866); Diestel, *Das A. T. in der chrisÜ. Kirche* (Jena, 1869); Specht, *Theodor v. Mopsvestia*

*u. Theodoret v. Cyrus* (Munich, 1871); Roos, *De Theodoreto Clementis et Eusebii Compilatore* (Halle, 1883); Nolte in the *Tübing. Quar- talschr.* (1859), p. 302 seq.; Möller, art. “Theodoret," in Herzog- Hauck’s *Realencykl.;* Venables’s article in Smith and Wace’s *Dict. of Christian Biography;* also Bardenhewer’s *Patrologie,* p. 345 ff. On the sources of Theodoret’s church history see Jeep, *Quellen­untersuchungen* z. *d. Griech. Kirchenhistorikern* (Leipzig, 1884); and especially Güldenpenning, *Die Kirchengesch. des Theodoret von Kyrrhos* (Halle, 1889). (A. Ha.; A. C. McG.)

THEODORIC, king of the Ostrogoths (c. 454-526). Referring to the article Goths for a general statement of the position of this, the greatest ruler that the Gothic nation produced, we add here some details of a more personal kind. Theodoric was horn about the year 454, and was the son of Theudemir, one of three brothers who reigned over the East Goths, at that time settled in Pannonia. The day of his birth coincided with the arrival of the news of a victory of his uncle Walamir over the sons of Attila. The name of Theodoric’s mother was Erelieva, and she is called the concubine of Theudemir. The Byzantine historians generally call him son of Walamir, apparently because the latter was the best known member of the royal fraternity. At the age of seven he was sent as a hostage to the court of Constantinople, and there spent ten years of his life, which doubtless exercised a most important influence on his subsequent career. Soon after his return to his father (about 471) he secretly, with a *comitatus* of 10,000 men, attacked the king of the Sarmatians, and wrested from him the important city of Singidunum (Belgrade). In 473 Theudemir, now chief king of the Ostrogoths, invaded Moesia and Macedonia, and obtained a permanent settlement for his people near Thessalonica. Theodoric took the chief part in this expedition, the result of which was to remove the Ostrogoths from the now barbarous Pannonia, and to settle them as *foederati* in the heart of the empire. About 474 Theudemir died, and for the fourteen follow­ing years Theodoric was chiefly engaged in a series of profitless wars, or rather plundering expeditions, partly against the emperor Zeno, but partly against a rival Gothic chieftain, another Theodoric, son of Triarius@@2 In 488 he set out at the head of his people to win Italy from Odoacer. There is no doubt that he had for this enterprise the sanction of the em­peror, only too anxious to he rid of so troublesome a guest. But the precise nature of the relation which was to unite the two powers in the event of Theodoric’s success was, perhaps purposely, left vague. Theodoric’s complete practical inde­pendence, combined with a great show of deference for the empire, reminds us somewhat of the relation of the old East India Company to the Mogul dynasty at Delhi, but the Ostrogoth was sometimes actually at war with his imperial friend. The invasion and conquest of Italy occupied more than four years (488-493). Theodoric, who marched round the head of the Venetian Gulf, had to fight a fierce battle with the Gepidae, prohably in the valley of the Save. At the Sontius (Isonzo) he found his passage barred by Odoacer, over whom he gained a complete victory (28th of August 489). A yet more decisive victory followed on the 30th September at Verona. Odoacer fled to Ravenna, and it seemed as if the conquest of Italy was complete. It was delayed, however, for three years by the treachery of Tufa, an officer who had deserted from the service of Odoacer, and of Frederic the Rugian, one of the companions of Theodoric, as well as by the intervention of the Burgundians on behalf of Odoacer. A sally was made from Ravenna by the besieged king, who was defeated in a bloody battle in the Pine Wood. At length (26th of February 493) the long and severe blockade of Ravenna was ended by a capitulation, the terms of which Theodoric disgracefully violated by slaying Odoacer with his own hand (15th of March 493). (See Odoacer.)

The thirty-three years’ reign of Theodoric was a time of unexampled happiness for Italy. Unbroken peace reigned within her borders (with the exception of a trifling raid made by Byzantine corsairs on the coast of Apulia in 508). The

@@@1 Roman Catholic writers vary greatly in their estimate of Theodoret’s christology and of his general orthodoxy. On Ber­tram’s essay on this subject *(Theodoreti, Episcopi Cyrensis, Doctrina Christologica,* Hildesheim, 1883), see *Theol. Lit.-Ztung.* (1883), 563 seq.

@@@2 In one of the intervals of friendship with the emperor in 483

Theodoric was made master of the household troops and in 484 consul.