

A

DICTIONARY

OF

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY.

LITERATURE, SECTS, AND DOCTRINES.

N

NAAMANES

NAAMANES, a chief of the Scenite Arabs, son of the chief Alamundarus. His life was spared by the emperor Maurice, and he eventually became a Christian. (Evang. *H. E.* vi. 2, 22.) [C. H.]

NAAMATUS, Nov. 17, twenty-fifth bishop of Vienne, who died A.D. 567 in his 73rd year. An ancient metrical account of him is quoted in the *Gallia Christiana*, xvi. 26. [C. H.]

NAASSENES. [See OPHITES.]

NABOR (1), a saint honoured with St. Felix at Milan (Ambros. *Ep.* 22). He is believed to have been martyred there in 304 (Boll. *Acta SS.* 12 Jul. iii. 291; Tillem. ii. 79, v. 267). See also for this and others of the same name, Alcuin, *Carm.* 104; *Gall. Chr.* xiii. 709; and *D. C. A. NABOR.* [C. H.]

NABOR (2), Donatist bishop of Centuriones, a place of unknown site in Numidia (Böcking, *Not. Dig. Occ.* p. 644), present at the council of Circa A.D. 305. (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 30.) [H. W. P.]

NACHLAN, saint. [NATHALAN.]

NAILTRIM, saint in Kidwelly, co. Carmarthen, in the time of St. David: in the Latin *Life of St. David* his name is Mairtrun (Rees, *Camb. Brit. SS.* 123, 406). [J. G.]

NAINNIDH (NENNIDIUS), son of Eochaidh of the race of Niall of the nine hostages by Ligach Bredmainech, was bishop of Kiltoom, co. Westmeath. His feast is Nov. 13 (*M. Don.*; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 172-3). There are also Nainnidh of Cruach, April 21, Nainnidh of Cluain h-Uinnseann, June 2, and Nainnidh of Inis Cais, Oct. 12 (*M. Don.* 107, 143, 275; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc.* Tr. 4 ser. iii. 47 sq.) [J. G.]

NAITAN, king of the Picts. [NECTAN (2).] CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

NAMMATIUS

NAMAEAE, a female correspondent of Chrysostom's, who wrote her a playful letter from Cucusus in 405. (Chrys. *Ep.* 47.) [E. V.]

NAMATIUS (1), Oct. 27, ninth bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, 446-462. He built the cathedral church, the dimensions and architectural details of which, rather fully given by Gregory of Tours, are of considerable interest. He was married, and his wife built another church in the suburbs in honour of St. Stephen, but in course of time it was called after St. Eutropius. (Greg. *Tur. H. F.* ii. 16, 17, 21; *Glor. Mart.* cap. 44; Savaron, *Orig. de Clairm.* pp. 48, 353, ed. 1662; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 230; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. xii. 254; Tillem. v. 316, xv. 36, 409.) [S. A. B.]

NAMATIUS (2) (NAMACIUS), addressed, along with his wife Ceraunia, in a consolatory letter by Ruricius bishop of Limoges, whose son was married to a daughter of Namatius. (Rur. *lib.* ii. epp. 2, 3, 4, 5, 61, in *Pat. Lat.* lviii.; Tillem. xvi. 270; Ceill. x. 608.) [NAMMATIUS.] [C. H.]

NAMATIUS (3), nineteenth bishop of Orleans, present at the first and second councils of Mâcon in 581 and 585 (Mansi, ix. 936, 957). He was sent by king Guntram on an embassy to the Bretons, and on his return journey died in 587 (Greg. *Tur. H. F.* ix. 18; *Gall. Chr.* viii. 1415). [C. H.]

NAMFASIUS, Nov. 21, a hermit of Marcillac, Aveyron, cir. 800 (Mabill. *AA. SS. O. S. B.* Saec. iii. 2, p. 405 ed. 1734). [C. H.]

NAMMASIUS, an advocate who pleaded the cause of the party of Primian against the Maximianists before the proconsul of Africa, A.D. 394 (vol. ii. 475; Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 4, 5). [H. W. P.]

NAMMATIUS (NAMATIUS), celebrated in Gaul for his eloquence, and addressed in 471 by

B

Sidonius Apollinaris, who sent him the works of Varro and the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. He may have been the Namatius addressed by Ruricius. (Sidon. lib. viii. ep. 6 and note, in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 593; Ceill. x. 393; Tillem. xvi. 269, 270.) [NAMATIUS (1).] [C. H.]

NAMPHAMO (or NAMPHANIO, *Mart. Rom.* Jul. 4). He with his companions, Lucitas, Mygdon or Miggin, and Samae or Saname, were apparently the first martyrs who suffered in Africa, and therefore, according to Aubé, suffered under the proconsul Saturninus, A.D. 180, who, as Tertullian states, first attacked the Christians. Namphamo enjoyed the local title of archimartyr. He is only known to us by the correspondence between Maximus of Madaura and St. Augustine (cf. August. *Opp. t. ii., Epp.* 16 and 17). From this correspondence we conclude that these martyrs were of Punic blood and not Roman colonists. Augustine expounds the name Namphamo as a Punic one. See SCILLITAN MARTYRS for other authorities. [G. T. S.]

NAMPULUS, Numidian bishop addressed by Cyp. *Ep.* 62, and in synodical letter (*Ep.* 70) of *Syn. Carth. de Bap.* i. The name is thoroughly African, as evinced by inscriptions. [E. W. B.]

NANNANUS, mentioned by Giraldus Cambrensis as an ancient saint in Connaught, who in a plague of fleas expelled the insects from the locality "per excommunicationem et imprecationem suam." (Girald. Camb. *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, distinct. i. cap. 53, *Topographia Hibernica*, dist. ii. cap. 31 in *Works*, ii. 160, v. 119, ed. Dimock, 1867.) [J. G.]

NANNIDIUS or NANNIUS. [NENNIUS.]

NANNYD LAMDERE, Irish saint, "vir sanctus et virtutibus plenus," A.D. 540. (Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 18, wks. vi. 473, 590.) [NINNIDH (1).] [J. G.]

NANTECHILDIS (NANDECHILDIS, NANTHILDIS, NANTILDIS), wife of Dagobert I. and mother of Clovis II., kings of the Franks. Notices of her occur in Fredegarius (*Pat. Lat.* lxxi.) and in the following authorities contained in Bouquet, t. iii., Aimoin, *Chron. S. Denys*, *Chron. Marcanense*, Hermannus Contractus, Hucbald's *Life of St. Rictrude*. She was married to Dagobert at Paris in 628, the year he became sole king of the Franks, Dagobert deserting queen Gomatrudis in the villa Romiliacum (Reully, now a suburb of Paris) where he had married her, and taking Nantechildis, "unam ex puellis de ministerio," as Fredegar (p. 635 where see note) describes her, or "quandam puellam a monasterio raptam," as Aimoin puts it after a corrupt reading (Bouq. 127 D and note). Aimoin here says Dagobert forsook Gomatrudis on account of her sterility. Fredegar (637) blames Dagobert's luxuriousness in having three queens, Nantechildis, Wlfegundis, Berchildis, besides numerous concubines. In 630 her brother Landegiselus died and was buried at St. Denys's (*Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 292 D). In 633, Dagobert's 12th year, she became the mother of Clovis II. (Fred. 648). She is mentioned in a diploma of

Dagobert I. in 633 (Breq. num. 261). In 637 she stood sponsor for Eusebia [EUSEBIA (7)] daughter of duke Adalbold and Rictrude (*Chron. Marcanense* and Hucbald's *Life of Rictrude*, Bouq. 523 B, 538 B). Early in 638 Nantechildis and her son Clovis were committed by Dagobert, shortly before his death, to the guardianship of his minister Aega or Aeganes (Fred. 651; Aimoin, Bou. 134 c; *Chr. S. Den.*, Bou. 298 E). At the accession of Clovis II. to the throne of Neustria and Burgundy the government was in the hands of Nantechildis in conjunction with Aega as mayor of the palace (Fred. 651; Aimoin, *Chr. S. Den.*, Herm., in Bouq. 135 D, 301 B, 328 C). The *Chr. S. Den.* makes Nantechildis then residing at Venete (Vannes). In 638 she and Clovis received at Compiègne the Austrasian nobility sent from Metz by king Sigebert, headed by Chunibert archbishop of Cologne and the Austrasian mayor Pippin, when by the advice of Aega the treasure of Dagobert there stored was divided equally between the two brothers Sigebert and Clovis, Nantechildis having reserved for her one-third of what was amassed by Dagobert after his marriage with her (Fred. 655; Aimoin and *Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 136 A B, 301 C). In 638 she subscribed a diploma of Clovis II. to the monastery of St. Maur-des-Fossés (Bouq. iv. 634 A; Brequigny, *Diplomata*, ed. Pardessus, vol. ii. num. 291). In 640, after Aega's death, she had his son-in-law Ermenfred [ERMENFREDUS (1)] heavily mulcted for the murder of count Aenulph (Fred. 654). The same year, according to Brequigny's date, she subscribed a praeceptum of Clovis II. to the monastery of St. Denys (Breq. num. 294; Bouq. iv. 638 A undated). Her name occurs in a spurious charter of Blidegisillus assigned to 640 (Breq. num. 293). In 641 she accompanied Clovis from Orleans to the capital of Burgundy (so the passage of Aimoin reads in Bouquet, "Aurelianus caput regni Burgundiae petiit," and Fredeg. 658 similarly), where she received the bishops and nobility of that kingdom, who came to make their submission to her son, with marked consideration, appointing Flaucatus, to whom she gave her niece Ragneberta in marriage, mayor of the palace for Burgundy (Aimoin and *Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 136 E, 301 E). The *Chr. S. Den.* here cited places the event at Orleans. She died in 641 (Fred. 659), after bequeathing many rich legacies to various churches, including that of St. Denys (*Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 302 A), where she was interred with Dagobert. (Aimoin and *Chr. S. Den.*, Bouq. 137 B, 302 A; *Diploma* of Landeric, Breq. num. 320; *Diploma* of Clovis II., Breq. num. 322, and *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 1198 A.) [C. H.]

NANTHARIUS (1) I., seventh abbat of St. Bertin, cir. 744-754. In this monastery during his rule, Childeric III., the last of the Merovingian kings, was immured, A.D. 752, and died the same year (Laplane, *Les Abbés de Saint-Bertin*, i. 29; *Gall. Chr.* iii. 487). For a deed of gift to the monastery during his abbacy and dated July 25, 745, see *Pat. Lat.* cxxxvi. 1187. [S. A. B.]

NANTHARIUS (2) II., eleventh abbat of St. Bertin, cir. 804-820. In 808 or 809 the

emperor Charles sent him and another abbat to Britain in company with the papal legate, with a view to procure the reinstatement of Eardulph the exiled king of the Northumbrians (Einard, *Annales*. ap. Pertz, *Script.* i. 195; Bouquet, v. 57, 255, 355). He was probably the abbat Nantharius present at the council of Noyon in 815. (Mansi, xiv. 142; Laplane, *Les Abbés de Saint-Bertin*, i. 43; *Gall. Chr.* iii. 488.)

[S. A. B.]

NANTINUS, count of Angoulême, cir. 578, who robbed the church, quarrelled with Heraclius the bishop, was excommunicated, and perished in an epidemic (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* v. 37).

[C. H.]

NARCISSUS (1), bishop of Jerusalem, at the close of the 2nd century. Clinton (*Pasti Romani*) accepts the date A.D. 190 for the commencement of his episcopate. He was the 15th of the Gentile bishops of Jerusalem, reckoning from Marcus A.D. 136, πεντεκαδικάτην ἄγων διαδοχὴν, and the 30th in succession from the Apostles, τριακοστήν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἐξῆς διαδοχὴν (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12). According to the *Synoticon*, Narcissus presided over a council of 14 bishops of Palestine held at Jerusalem A.D. 198, on the Paschal controversy, and took part in that held at Caesarea on the same subject under the presidency of Theophilus, bishop of the city (Labbe, *Concil.* i. 600). Eusebius speaks of the synodical letter of these bishops as still extant in his time (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23). Narcissus occupied a conspicuous position in the church of his day, standing forth "as one of the more prominent heroes of those early times" (Neale, *Patriarch of Antioch*, p. 34). δὲ παρὰ πολλοῖς εἰσέτι νῦν βεβημένος (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12). Eusebius records a miracle traditionally ascribed to him among many others (πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα παράδοξα), to the effect that one Easter Eve, the oil for the lamps required for the great illumination usual at that festival having failed, and the people being grievously disheartened at so unfavourable an omen, Narcissus commanded the deacons to draw water and bring it to him, and after he had prayed over it, to pour it, with hearty faith, into the lamps, on which it was converted into oil. A small portion of this miraculously produced oil, Eusebius tells us, was preserved among the treasures of the church in his own day (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 9). The rigid sanctity and holy consistency of Narcissus raised against him a band of slanderers among those who, conscious of their own evil life, dreaded conviction and punishment. He was accused of some heinous crime—probably a sin of impurity—and three witnesses came forward to substantiate the charge. Finding the people incredulous, they imprecated on themselves terrible curses if their accusation was not true—one, that he might be burnt alive; another, that he might become leprous; the third, that he might be struck with blindness. But not even so were they able to convince their hearers of the truth of their story. Narcissus, however, stung by the calumny, and fearing that his influence for good would be destroyed by a charge, which some would be certainly found to give credence to, abdicated his bishopric, and retired to the remotest part of the desert, where for several

years he lived the ascetic life, τὸν φιλόσοφον βίον, which he had long coveted, no one knowing the place of his concealment.

Having been sought for in vain, the neighbouring bishops declared the see vacant, and ordained Dius as his successor [DIUS]. Dius was succeeded by Germanicus, and he by Gordius. During the episcopate of the last named, Narcissus reappeared, as it were rising from the dead, ὡσπερ ἐξ ἀναβιώσεως ἀναφανείς. Shortly after his disappearance the falsity of the charges brought against him, Eusebius tells us, had been proved by the curses imprecated by the false accusers having been fearfully made good. This having eventually reached Narcissus's ears probably induced him to return to his see, the oversight of which he at once resumed at the earnest request of all. [GORDIUS.] (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 9, 10.) We are not told what became of Gordius. In the second year of Caracalla, A.D. 212 (Euseb. *Chronicon*), Alexander, a Cappadocian bishop, a confessor in the persecution of Severus, visiting the holy city in fulfilment of a vow, was selected by the aged prelate as his coadjutor and eventual successor. Eusebius records the tradition that this was done in obedience to a nocturnal vision vouchsafed first to Narcissus himself, and afterwards to the leading members of the church. Eusebius preserves a fragment of a letter written by Alexander to the people of Antinous, in which he associates Narcissus with himself in beseeching them to be of one mind. In this letter he speaks of Narcissus as being then in his hundred and sixteenth year, and as having virtually retired from his episcopal office. [ALEXANDER.] (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11.) Epiphanius states that he survived ten years after Alexander became his coadjutor, to the reign of Alexander Severus A.D. 222 (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxvi. 20). This, however, is very improbable. Nicephorus calls him a martyr (*H. E.* iv. 19), but the authority of the martyrologies, which commemorate him, October 29th, without any such designation, negatives this. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* iii. 177 ff.)

[E. V.]

NARCISSUS (2), Mar. 18, bishop and martyr. He was born in the East, preached the gospel in Rhaetia; converted S. Afra from a life of sin at Augsburg, and then departing to Spain, taught there with great success. He suffered with his deacon Felix, an African, in the Diocletian persecution. (*AA. SS. Boll.* Mar. ii. 621.) For other martyrs see NARCISSUS in *D. C. A.*

[G. T. S.]

NARCISSUS (3), bishop of Neronias (Irenopolis) in Cilicia (Le Quien, ii. 898). In and about 314 he attended the councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea (Mansi, ii. 534, 549). He was of the party of Arius before the council of Nicaea in 325 (Athan. *De Syn.* § 17). He attended the council of Nicaea (Mansi, ii. 694, 699, 818; Theod. *H. E.* i. 7) and professed the Catholic doctrine (Nicet. *Chon. Thes. Orth. Fid.* v. 7). In 332 he was one of the bishops at Antioch who put forward Eusebius of Caesarea for that see (Euseb. *V. C.* iii. 62). In 335 he must have been one of the eminent Cilician bishops at the Jerusalem dedication (Eus. *V. C.* iv. 43). In 341 he was at the dedication council of Antioch (Mansi, ii. 1308), and in 342 (Tillemont, vi. 326, 759) was deputed, with bishops Theo-

B 2

dore of Heraclea, Maris of Chalcedon, Marcus of Arethusa, from the emperor Constantius to his brother Constans (Ath. *De Syn.* § 25; Soc. ii. 18; Soz. iii. 10). About the same time he and Flacillus bishop of Antioch conducted Eusebius Emesenus [EUSEBIUS (35)] to Emesa (Soc. ii. 9). In 342 (al. 341) he was one of the Eusebians addressed by pope Julius (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 20). In 343 he formed one of the Eusebian party at Philippopolis (Mansi, iii. 140; Hilar. *Frag.* ii. § 7, § 8, § 14 here called of Jeropolis, iii. § 29 here of Anapolis, in *Pat. Lat.* x. 637, 638, 642), and was deposed by the council of Sardica (Ath. *Hist. Ar.* § 17, 28, *Ap. c. Ar.* § 36, *Ep. ad Episc.* § 7). Athanasius, writing cir. 350, calls him one of the then prominent Eusebians (*Ap. c. Ar.* § 48). In 351 he was one of the authors of the Sirmian creed (Hilar. *Frag.* vi. § 7 in *Pat. Lat.* x. 692; Tillem. vi. 351; Hefel. *Counc.* ii. 193). In 356 (Tillem. vi. 394) he was one of the synod of Antioch which ordained George bishop of Alexandria (Soz. iv. 8 and note of Vales.; Mansi, iii. 23). Athanasius, writing in 357 or 358, hears that Narcissus is charging him with cowardice for his flight (*Ap. de Fug.* § 1 init.), and declares (§ 28) that Narcissus has been accused of many offences, has been degraded three times by various synods, and is the wickedest of all the Eusebian party. In 358 Narcissus complains to Constantius of Basil of Ancyra. (Philostorg. iv. 10; Tillem. vi. 442.) [C. H.]

NARCISSUS, catholicos of Armenia. [NORSESES.]

NARDACIUS (Sulp. Sev. ii. 50), a bishop, and persecutor of the Priscillianists.

[M. B. C.]

NARIOUS, acolyte of Cyprian, sent by him from his retirement with a second relief for sufferers by Decian persecution. (Cyp. *Ep.* vii.) [E. W. B.]

NARSES (1), martyr. [LAZARUS (3).]

NARSES (2) (BARDA, BARSA), bishop of Edessa, occurs as Narses among the eastern bishops who addressed a letter to the Italians and Gauls, A.D. 372 (Basil. *Opp.* iii. 263, Par. 1839; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 446), but is better known as Barsa, friend and correspondent of St. Basil of Caesarea, who has left two letters written to Barsa in A.D. 377 (Basil. *Opp.* iii. 590, 599, *Epp.* nos. 264 or 326, 267 or 327). [J. G.]

NARSES (3), an adherent of Gratian, for whom St. Martin interceded with the successful Maximus at the same time that he pleaded for the condemned Priscillianists, A.D. 385 [MAXIMUS (2)]. (Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* iii. 11 in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* xx. 218 [MARTINUS (1)].) [G. T. S.]

NARSES (4), priest, syncellus of Eutyches, was called as witness against Eutyches in the 6th session of the council at Constantinople, Nov. 20, A.D. 448, but there is no account of his testimony: the minutes were read at the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon (Binus, *Conc. Gen.* ii. 86; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 672). [J. G.]

NARSES (5), twenty-fifth catholicos of the Chaldaeans (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 1116), succeeded Silas but was opposed by Elisaens. The schism continued twelve or fifteen

years till Narses's death, A.D. 535, when Elisaens also was deposed. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* ii. 82 in *Assem. B. O.* ii. 409, iii. 166, 614-5.) [J. G.]

NARSES (6), bishop of Ascalon, commended in a poem of Sophronius patriarch of Jerusalem (carm. xvii. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxxvii. 3801; Ceill. xi. 709). [C. H.]

NARSES (7), the eunuch, sent, in A.D. 551, to take the command against the Goths in Italy, where he had previously served under Belisarius. For a short account of his successes in Italy, see JUSTINIANUS I., Vol. III. 542, and for a detailed account of his career, see NARSES, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*. He took part in the ceremony at St. Peter's, when pope Pelagius cleared himself of the charge of being implicated in the death of his predecessor (Anastas. *Vita Pelagii*). Pelagius subsequently asked him to assist his legates in their proceedings against certain schismatic bishops, and more than once requested him to arrest and send the bishops of Milan and Aquileia [PAULINUS ()] in custody to the emperor, and to use force against the other bishops of Northern Italy and Istria, who refused to accept the fifth general Council. Apparently the only consequence of these exhortations was the excommunication of Narses himself, by the schismatics. (Pelagii *Epp.* 1-4, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxix. 393-397.) In A.D. 567 he was superseded by Longinus in consequence of the complaints of the oppressiveness of his administration, and he is accused of having, in revenge, invited the Lombards into Italy. According to the well-known story, the empress Sophia said she would charge him with parcelling out the wool for spinning to the women of the palace, to which Narses replied that he would spin her such a thread as would last her her lifetime (Paulus *Diac.* ii. 5). At any rate, he retired to Naples, from which he was induced in A.D. 568, by the entreaties of pope John III. to return with him to Rome, where he died soon afterwards (Anastas. *Vita Joannis III.*). [F. D.]

NARSES (8), patrician, sometimes confounded with the preceding, is addressed in several letters by Gregory the Great. The first (i. 6) is written immediately after his election, which he regrets; in the second (iv. 32), from which it appears that Narses was then in bad health, and the third (vi. 14) he refers to the case of the priest JOANNES (471); and in the last he also decides that Athanasius, a priest, had fallen into Manichaeism, and makes some remarks on the Pelagian heresy. Though a fourth letter (vii. 30) is addressed "Narsae religioso," he appears to be the same as the person to whom the other three are written, as a number of persons to whom Gregory sends salutations in the first letter are again mentioned. In this letter Gregory endeavours to console him under the misfortunes and calumnies from which he is suffering, and commends to him the deacon Anatolius, whom he is sending to Constantinople. He may perhaps be the same as the Narses, the famous general of the emperor Maurice (Theoph. Sim. v.), on whose fall, in A.D. 602, he rebelled against Phocas, occupied Edessa, and incited the Persians to declare war. Two years afterwards, he surrendered to one of the generals of Phocas, on condition that his life should be spared, but

Phocas, in violation of the promise, burnt him alive. (Theophanes, *Chron.* 245, 6, in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cviii. 616.) [F. D.]

NASAD (NASADH, NASSADIUS, NAZADIUS), a Briton at Lough Brieren, co. Down, companion of St. Bevan and St. Meldan; he was commemorated Oct. 26. (*Mart. Tull.*; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 113, 380; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 90, n. 19; Boll, *Acta SS.* 26 Oct. xi. 893, where is a sylloge on the three saints of Lough Brieren, but nothing decisive; *Ib.* 21 Oct. xii. 413, 414.)

[J. G.]

NASARAEI. Under this title Epiphanius classes two distinct sects; one Jewish, the other Christian. The Jewish sect is numbered by him with the Pharisees, Essenes, and Herodians. He calls it the fifth heresy of Judaism. The Christian sect is placed by him next after the Cerinthians and before the Ebionites, and is numbered the ninth heresy of Christianity.

Epiphanius spells the names of these sects differently. The Jewish he names *Nasapaioi*, the Christian *Naζapaioi*. (1) Nasaraei (*Nasapaioi*) then was, according to Epiphanius, a purely Jewish heresy. They dwelt in the region across the Jordan. They practised circumcision, and revered the feasts and sabbaths of the Jews. They rejected, however, animal food and sacrifices, and regarded the Pentateuch as a forgery. Epiphanius vindicates the historical accuracy of the Pentateuch by pointing to the localities where the events there recorded took place; Mount Sion, for instance, where Abraham had sacrificed the ram; and the oak of Mamre, where he had entertained the angels. Mamre, indeed, down to the 4th century, continued to be a place of pilgrimage at certain times, whither Jews, Pagans, and Christians resorted, and had a kind of fair, like the great Tara or Telltown assemblies among the ancient Irish, or the great autumnal meetings at Lyons of the ancient Gauls. The abuses of it became so great that Constantine abolished it by an edict (*Sozom. H. E.* ii. 4). Epiphanius points out also other corroborations of the Pentateuch. The Egyptians retained traces and memories of the passover in the red paint which they marked in spring on trees and cattle. In the region of the Cardyaei relics of the ark were still shown, and he was sure the remains of the altar built by Noah could be discovered by the diligent enquirer in the same region. Philaster, on the contrary, represents the Nasaraei as quite orthodox about the scriptures, but as trusting in the luxuriance of their hair for salvation (*lib. de Haeres.* cap. viii.).

(2) Nazaraei (*Naζapaioi*). Epiphanius occupies a large part of his notice of the Christian sect with a discussion concerning the descent of our Lord from David, and the fulfilment of the prophecies involved in Ps. cx. 4 and cxxxii. 11. His theory is that the Christians were at first called Jessaei, from Jesse, the father of David, or from the name Jesus, under which name Jessaei, he thinks, he discovers mention of them in the writings of Philo on the Egyptian Therapeutae. Epiph. accepts these writings as authentic, a view which some modern critics reject (cf. *Rev. Archeol.* t. xxii. p. 268, t. xxvi. p. 12), regarding them as a Montanist or Gnostic production of the 2nd century. The Christian Nazaraei were the followers of those earliest Christian Jews who

observed the law and believed in Christ. Epiphanius seems not to have been very well acquainted with them. They were scattered throughout Coele-Syria, Decapolis, Pella, whither they fled to avoid the destruction of Jerusalem, the region beyond the Jordan, and as far east as Mesopotamia. He was uncertain as to the view they took of Christ's person, whether they regarded him as a mere man or believed in his supernatural conception. They were well skilled in Hebrew, read the Old Testament in that language, and possessed a Hebrew version of St. Matthew; but Epiphanius knew not whether it contained the genealogies. They carefully observed circumcision and the Sabbath. They were known to other writers of that age. Augustine (*lib. i. Cont. Cresconium*, cap. xxxi.) mentions a Nazarene sect, by some called Symmachiani, who used both Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism. Jerome seems to have been better acquainted with them than anyone else. Writing to Augustine, he tells him that they were universally execrated by the Jews under the name MINEL. When commenting on Matt. xii. he gives the renderings of the Gospel which the Nazarenes use, which he had lately translated out of Hebrew into Greek; and tells us when treating of St. Matthew in his *Scriptt. Eccles.* that this Hebrew version of St. Matthew was preserved in the library at Caesarea. (On this point see more in *GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL*, Vol. II. p. 709, and Dr. Salmon's *Introd. to the New Test.* p. 215.) There were many points of contact between this sect and other branches of the Ebionite and Gnostic heresies. Epiphanius, indeed, expressly asserts that the Cerinthians, Nazarenes, Ebionites, Sampsaeans and Elcesaeans agreed on many points. They seem all to have delighted in the same localities—Syria, the Hauran, and Mesopotamia. Traces of them have been discovered in the Hauran. Waddington discovered at Zorava in Trachonitis, a monument commemorating a saint, *Mapθlvη*, whom the Sampsaeans worshipped. (*Voy. Archéolog.* t. iii. Ins. 2502.) The Nazaraei still exist, and under the same name, though they prefer in public the name Sabians. They now live in the marshes of Southern Babylonia, in the neighbourhood of Bussorah, where they have been visited by several modern travellers. The latest accounts of them and their doctrines will be found in Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, t. ii. p. 447; Kessler's article in Herzog *s.v.* Mandaer; an article by the same writer in the new *Encyclop. Britann.* t. xv. p. 467, on the Mandaeans; and in Liouffi, *Études sur la religion des Soubbus*, Paris, 1880; cf. also Chwolson's *Die Sabier*. Their doctrines are now practically identical with those of the ancient Manicheans [MANES]. They retain, however, traces of the sacraments in the religious use of bread and wine and of baptism. Their sacred books are interesting relics of Gnosticism. They were published by Norbey in the early part of this century, under the title of *Codex Nasaraeus*. A critical edition is much required. See also Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 22, for his theory about the Ebionite communities which were identical with the Nazarenes of whom Epiphanius speaks; cf. also Bishop Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 306. [NASARAEI.]

[G. T. S.]

NASAS, a Sicilian Jew, who in 593 had erected an altar in the name of the prophet Elijah, and seduced many Christians to worship at it. He had also purchased several Christian slaves. (Greg. Mag. lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 38 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii.; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 878.) [C. H.]

NATALIA, Dec. 1, wife of the martyr Hadrianus, who suffered at Nicomedia in the Diocletian persecution (Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Sept. iii. 209; Adon. *Mart.* Sep. 8). She ministered to the martyrs in prison clad in male attire, and after their passion departed to Byzantium, where she died in peace. [G. T. S.]

NATALIS (1), CAECILIUS. [MINUCIUS FELIX, p. 924.]

NATALIS (2), of Oëa (Oea; Oeensis civitas Offenses Tac. *Hist.* 4, 50, corrected by Lipsius, *hod. Trablus, Tripoli*), the famous colonia on coast near Leptis in Prov. Tripol. (*suffr.* 83. in *Syn. Carth.* sub Cyp. vii.) [E. W. B.]

NATALIS (3) (NATTAL), abbat of Kilmanagh, co. Kilkenny; commemorated July 31. He is chiefly known in connection with his pupil St. Senan, in whose metrical Life he is called Natalus celebris (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 170). He belongs to the 6th century, but his tradition is undecided as to exact date or identity (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. c. 9, § 4; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 450 sq. iii. 222; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 139-40, 3rd ed.). Giraldus Camb. (*Top. Hib.* dist. ii. c. 19) tells a curious story of the transformation of a man and woman in Ossory into wolves, "per imprecationem sancti cujusdam Natalis scilicet abbatis," that is, of Kilmanagh. (Conf. *Irish Nennius*, by Todd and Herbert, 204-5.) [J. G.]

NATALIS (4), bishop of Cesena, 590-614, mentioned in 603 by Gregory the Great (lib. xiv. ep. 6, in *P. L.* lxxvii.; Ughelli, ii. 445; Cappelletti, ii. 530, 554; Jaffé, 1538). [C. H.]

NATALIS (5), bishop of Salona, addressed in four letters of Gregory the Great (i. 19, 21; ii. 18, 52), and mentioned in others (i. 20; ii. 19, 20), which chiefly relate to his quarrel with **HONORATUS** (28). He was also charged with having uncanonically deposed and banished his suffragan **FLORENTIUS** (30), bishop of Epidaurus (*Epp.* iii. 8, 9; viii. 10). Natalis died about the end of A.D. 592 (*Epp.* iii. 22). [F. D.]

NATALIS (6), ST., bishop of Milan, c. 740. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 13 Mai. iii. 241; Ugh. iv. 70; Cappelletti, xi. 133, 302.) [C. H.]

NATALIUS, confessor at Rome, at the beginning of the third century. Our knowledge of him is derived from an extract given by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28) from an anonymous 3rd-century work, which we have ascribed to Caius (vol. iii. p. 98, b). The story told is that Natalius allowed himself to be persuaded to undertake the office of bishop in the heretical sect of which **THEODOTUS** the banker was a leader, receiving in that capacity a 'salary' of 150 denarii, monthly; that our Lord did not wish one who had braved martyrdom for His sake to perish out of the church, and warned him in visions to return; but

that when Natalius, blinded by ambition and by covetousness, gave no heed to the visions, angels were sent who scourged him severely for a whole night. Thereupon he rose early, put on sackcloth and ashes, and with strong supplications and tears besought Zephyrinus, the bishop, for restoration to communion; rolling at the feet not only of the clergy, but of the laity, and showing the weals of the stripes he had received. Thus, with great difficulty, he obtained his pardon. [G. S.]

NATERAS. [NATHYRAS.]

NATHALAN (NACHLAN, NAUHLAN, NETHALENUS, NETHELMUS, NOTHLAN), bp. and conf., Scotch saint, whose legend is given at Jan. 8 in *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. f. 25), from which it is translated by Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 417. See O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 128; Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 504, ascribing to him certain writings now lost. He is said to have been born in the parish of Tullicht on Deeside, devoted himself early and entirely to religion, been made bishop in Rome by the pope, and returned to the north of Scotland, where he built churches, of which he was afterwards the patron. He died at Tullicht, A.D. 452, according to King (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 141). But it is supposed by Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 170) and Bp. Forbes that Nathalan is the same as Nechtan abbat of Dun-Geimhin or Dungiven, co. Londonderry, who died A.D. 679 (*Ann. Tig.*) [J. G.]

NATHALIA, Aug. 27 (Us.) Jul. 27 (Baron). Martyr under the Arabs at Cordova in Spain. His relics were found in that country by Usuard when he was collecting materials for his martyrology. (Ceill. xii. 611.) [G. T. S.]

NATHANAEL, a solitary of Nitria, whose history is told us by Palladius in his *Historia Lausiaca*, cap. 18 (cf. Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. col. 1107). He entered the desert as a monk about the year 338, and continued there till his death about A.D. 376, some fifteen years before Palladius came to Nitria. Nathanael adopted the anchorite life, but, like the rest of the monks, fancied that he was specially pursued by a demon. His enemy wished to drive him from cell to cell. At the beginning of his monastic career, the demon rendered him so uncomfortable in his first cell that he moved to another. In his second cell the devil appeared again to him, mocking him, and saying that he would drive him from this cell too. Nathanael at once perceived that he had made a capital mistake in yielding a step to his opponent; so he at once returned to his original abode, which he never again left for the space of thirty-seven years. In fact some of these solitaries never left their cells even to receive the Holy Communion. Thus Sophronius tells us of St. Mary, an Egyptian recluse, who never received the Holy Communion for forty-seven years, during which period she had lived in the Egyptian desert (cf. Bingham's *Antiquities*, lib. xv. cap. v.; Card. Bon. *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. cap. xviii. n. ii.). Nathanael's demon ceased to trouble him for the last nine months of his life after he failed in the following attempt. He assumed the appearance of a young boy of twelve driving an ass laden with bread. He caused the ass to

fall, towards eventide, just outside Nathanael's cell, whose ears he at once assailed with the most lamentable cries for assistance, saying, "Father Nathanael, have pity on me, and stretch forth a hand to help." The monk opened his door, and surveyed the scene; asked who the suppliant was, and was told that he was servant to another monk. He urged too that his master was celebrating an agape or love feast, and that the next day being the Sabbath, oblations would be required, wherefore he asked help to raise the fallen load of bread. The boy appealed to his compassion also; wild beasts were about, and if he left him unassisted, the hyenas would devour him. The poor recluse was in a difficulty. He pondered for a while, reflecting upon the various tricks the demon had played upon him. Then he said, "Listen, boy, I worship God, whose rule is over all. If you really want help He will send it without causing me to break my vow; and He will not permit hyenas or anything else to hurt you. But if you are a tempter God will reveal you," and he shut his door. Whereupon the demon with a howl was resolved into a whirlwind, and Nathanael was left to die in peace. [G. T. S.]

NATHANIEL () (**NATHANAEL**), the sixth reputed abbat of St. Augustine's, Canterbury (*Mon. Angl.* i. 120; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 4, 184, 199-201; Thorn, ap. Twysden, cc. 1768, 1769, 2232). According to the history of St. Augustine's, whether legendary or fictitious, Nathaniel was one of the Roman missionaries who accompanied Justus and Mellitus to England; was elected abbat by the brethren on the death of Petronius in 654, after obtaining a licence of election from Ercombert, king of Kent; he was then blessed by archbishop Deusdedit, and held his office until the year 667, when he died. The exact place of his burial was unknown. Nathaniel is not mentioned by Bede, as he probably would have been, if he had known of his existence, in connexion with the history of Benedict Biscop and abbat Adrian. The detailed circumstances of the licence and election, probably drawn by Elmham from the usage of his own time, are not mentioned by the earlier writer. [S.]

NATHCHAEIMHE (**NATHCHAOIMHE**, **NATHCAEIMHE**, **NACOEIMUS**, **NAITCHAINN**, **NATHCHEIMHE**, **NATHCOEUS**, **MOCHOEMA**, **MOCHOEIMUS**), abbat of Terryglass, co. Tipperary, was son of Coemloga of the Dal Messincorb, and Caemell of the Hy Lugair. His feast is May 1, and he died A.D. 588. (*Ann. Tig.*; *M. Doneg.* 117 et al.; *Four Mast.* by O'Don. A.D. 584.) [J. G.]

NATHI (**NATHIAS**, **NATHINEUS**, **NATHYUS**, **DATHI**, **DATHYUS**, **DAVID**), surnamed Conrach and Cruimther, one of the most famous saints of Connaught, yet the details of his life are obscure. He is said to have received Achorry, co. Sligo, from St. Finian of Clonard about A.D. 530, to have been a contemporary of St. Attracta, and to have educated, and perhaps instituted, St. Fechin at Fore, but this is doubtful. In the Kalendars and old Lives he is always called cruimther or priest; but Ware and later writers call him first bishop of Achorry, Luigny, or Leyney (Cotton, *Fast.* iv. 97-8; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 204), a see joined to Killala in the 17th century. His feast is Aug. 9, and he flourished in the

second half of the 6th century. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 140, 396; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 190; iii. 39; Ussher, wks. vi. 538, 600.) [J. G.]

NATHYRAS (**NATORAS**, **NETRAS**), bishop of Pharan. He was previously a monk of Sinai and a disciple of Silvanus, the superior of the Anchorites of Sinai. He exercised greater austerities as a bishop than as a monk, on the ground of the greater danger of his position. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Patt.* v. 10; Coteler, *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* i. 579; Tillem, *Mém.* x. 453, xiv. 191; Le Quien, iii. 748.) [G. T. S.]

NAUCELION, a person to whom Alypius and Augustine wrote A.D. 402 in reply to a statement made by Clarentius, probably the Donatist bishop of Tabraca (*Carth. Coll.* i. 187), to the effect that Felicianus of Musti was condemned in his absence by the original Donatist party, but, having cleared himself from blame, was afterwards received by them. To which they replied that if he was innocent he ought not to have been condemned, but if guilty, he ought not to have been received afterwards. Maximian had been condemned at the same time by the Donatists, yet they did not re-baptize Maximianists who came over to them. (Aug. *Ep.* 70.) [FELICIANUS (4).] [H. W. P.]

NAUCHLAN, saint. [NATHALAN.]

NAUCRATIUS (1), the brother, next in age, of Basil the Great. He was born c. 330 A.D., and was the only one of the four sons who did not take holy orders. According to his brother Gregory's account he was equally remarkable for mental and physical endowments. His beauty of person, strength and agility of body, were thrown into the shade by his intellectual gifts and eloquence (Greg. Nyss. *de Vit. S. Macr.* ii. 182). At the age of two-and-twenty, after having given a public proof of his rhetorical powers, which had called forth the applause of a crowded theatre, under a strong conviction of the vanity of all earthly honours and pleasures, he retired from the world (*θελα τιλι προμηθεια*), accompanied by a single servant, Chrysaphius, leaving all his property behind him, and settled on the wooded slope of a hill above the river Iris, three days' journey from the monastery of his sister Macrina, which was also his mother's abode. Here he gathered about him a little handful of sick and destitute old men, whom he tended lovingly in their sickness, and supported by the produce of the chase, of which he was passionately fond. He proved himself at the same time a dutiful son, fulfilling his mother's desires with a glad and ready will. After about five years spent in this manner, he and his servant Chrysaphius lost their lives by an accident in hunting, c. 357. (Greg. Nyssen, *Vit. S. Macrinae*, ii. 182-183.) [E. V.]

NAUCRATIUS (2), addressed by Nilus (lib. i. epp. 259-263, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.) [C. H.]

NAUSTIANUS, bishop of Dumium and Braga, and a writer under the Moorish domination in Spain, A.D. 790-830. (H. Florez, *España Sagrada*, xv. 170.) [G. T. S.]

NAVATUS (**NOVATUS**), bishop of Sitifa or Sitiis, an important town and colony of Maure-

ania (*Setif*), *Ant. Itin.* 24. 7; *Ptol.* iv. 2. 24. *Shaw, Trav.* p. 52. He was present at the Conference, A.D. 411, about which time St. Augustine wrote to him, asking his forgiveness for not sending to him at his request his brother, a deacon named Lucillus, to serve in the diocese of Sitifi, as he was the only one that he had who could speak Latin. Navatus appears to have attended the council of Carthage, A.D. 419, and he may have been the same man as one of whom we hear in a letter from Augustine to Darius, A.D. 429, though Ruinart thinks that there were two bishops of Sitifi of the same name (*Carth. Coll.* i. 2. 143; *Hardouin, Conc.* i. 1249; *Aug. Ep.* 84, 229; *Morcelli, Afr. Chr.* i. 283). [H. W. P.]

NAVIGIUS, brother of St. Augustine. He was one of the party assembled at the country-house of Verecundus in 386, and an interlocutor in the dialogues held there, *Contra Academicos, De Ordine, De Beata Vita*. He was present at Monnica's death at Ostia in 387, on which occasion his affectionate wish that his mother could have died in her own country met with her silent reproof. (*Aug. Conf.* ix. 11; *c. Acad. lib.* i. c. 2, § 5; *Beat. Vit.* cap. i. § 6, ii. §§ 7, 12, iii. §§ 19, 20; *Ord. lib.* i. cap. 3, § 7.) [H. W. P.]

NAVVIAS, a Saracen king at Damascus, who dedicated a basilica for his own people there, leaving the Christians the church of St. John Baptist, according to a work attributed to St. Jerome, but belonging to a period not earlier than the seventh century. (*Hieron. Loc. in Act. Apost.* in *Pat. Lat.* xxiii. 1298, 1300; *Tillem.* xii. 634.) [C. H.]

NAZARAEL. [NASARAEI.]

NAZARAEL, a name given by St. Gregory Nazianzen to the monks in allusion to the Nazarites of the old dispensation. (*Greg. Naz. Carm. lib.* I. sec. 2, in *Migne's Pat. Graec.* t. 37, col. 745.) [G. T. S.]

NAZARIUS (1), June 12, a soldier and martyr at Rome in the persecution of Diocletian with three others (*Mart. Rom., Adon.; Ceill.* x. 527). [G. T. S.]

NAZARIUS (2), July 28, a martyr, whose body was found by St. Ambrose in a garden outside the city after the death of the emperor Theodosius in 395. He transported the body to the Basilica of the Apostles, which was near the Roman gate of Milan, and treated it after the manner of the bodies of Gervasius and Protasius [GERVASIUS (1)]. Paulinus tells us in his *Vita Ambrosii*, num. 32, which is the primary authority for this martyr's history, that he had there seen the body uncorrupted, and with hair fresh as if buried but a day or two. In the works of St. Ambrose (*Migne, P. L.* xvii. 715) there is a sermon, *Serm.* lv., falsely ascribed to him, on the natal day of Nazarius and Celsus. It is evidently of a later date, as it speaks of his martyrdom under Nero, whereas Paulinus tells us that no one knew when he suffered. The Bollandists have, however, devoted more than thirty pages to a recital of his perfectly fabulous acts (*A.A. SS. Boll. Jul.* vi. 503-534.) Paulinus Nol. mentions him, *Poem.* xxvii., cf.

Migne, P. L. lxi. 658. Ado, Usuard and *Mart. Vet. Rom.* confound him with another Nazarius, and celebrate his memory on June 12. (See also *Tillem.* ii. 75, 86, iv. 255, 586). [G. T. S.]

NAZARIUS (3), an abbat of Lérins in the 5th century. He is said to have been a disciple of St. Honoratus, afterwards bishop of Arles, and may have succeeded Faustus as abbat when the latter became bishop of Riez (circ. A.D. 462). According to old MSS. of the monastery he destroyed a shrine of Venus Impudica, situated on a little hill on the mainland called Arlucus (Arluc), and there founded the nunnery which is believed to have flourished till the invasion of the Saracens, who destroyed Lérins, in the time of St. Porcarius (circ. A.D. 730). He was succeeded by a Eucherius, and was commemorated at Lérins, Nov. 18 (*Barralis Salerna, Chronologia Lerinensis*, ii. 79-80). [S. A. B.]

NEACHTAIN (NECTANUS), of Cill-Uinche and Fennor on the Boyne, nephew of St. Patrick by Liemania, from whom he bore the name Mac-Leamhna. By Usher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 382) he is called "Nechtains Episcopus," and Colgan follows him (*Acta SS.* 717-18). His feast is May 2. (*M. Doneg.; Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 414, n. *.) [J. A.]

NEADIUS (*Nēdiōs*), a monk, addressed with others by Nilus (*lib.* ii. ep. 77 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.). [C. H.]

NEAMUS (*Νεαμῶς*) (Nieceph. Call. *H.E.* xviii. 56 *fin.*), bishop of Jerusalem. [AMOS.] [C. H.]

NEARCHUS, a soldier in Armenia, by whom St. Polyeuctus was converted c. 251; martyred c. 260 (*Boll. Acta SS.* 13 Feb. ii. 652, 22 Apr. iii. 12; *Tillem.* iii. 425, 427). [C. H.]

NEBRIDIUS (1), husband of Olympias, the celebrated deaconess of Constantinople. At the time of his marriage, which Tillemont places towards the close of 384 A.D. (*Mémoires*, tom. xi. p. 419), he was young, but already high in official rank. In 382 and 383 A.D. he was count, or intendant of the imperial domain, and in 386 A.D. prefect of Constantinople (see for references *Cod. Theod.* tom. vi. p. 874, ed. Gothofred). He died within twenty months of his marriage (*Pallad.* p. 163), soon after June 29, A.D. 386. [E. V.]

NEBRIDIUS (2), a Roman statesman and prefect of Gaul, then of the East, in the later part of the 4th century. He married the sister of Aelia Flacilla the wife of Theodosius, and was well known to Jerome. (*Jerome, Ep.* lxxix. 1, ed. Vall.; *Ammianus Marc.* xxi. 5, xxvi. 7, xxix. 5.) [W. H. F.]

NEBRIDIUS (3), son of the foregoing, by a sister of the empress Flacilla, first wife of Theodosius the Great. His father had been an intimate friend of St. Jerome—"intima necessitudine copulatus"—(*Hieron. Ep.* 9). He was brought up by his aunt the empress—"materterae nutritus sinu"—in his uncle's palace—"nutritus in palatio"—as the companion and fellow pupil of his young cousins, the future emperors Honorius and Arcadius—"contubernalis et condiscipulus Augustorum"—

"iisdem studiis eruditus" (*ib.*)—by whom he was much beloved. Jerome draws a charming picture of the young man's modesty, humility, and virginal purity, which never gave the smallest ground for scandal, as well as the kind consideration by which he bound his inferiors to him. Nebridius was married at an early age, somewhere about 390 A.D., by his uncle Theodosius, to Salvina, the daughter of the Moorish chieftain, Gildo, count of Africa, who had been brought up at the court of Constantinople, as a pledge for the loyalty of her father and of the province of which he was governor. High official dignities were lavished on the young man—"honores quae aetatem anteibant"—which Jerome says he bore with a humility and moderation which seemed to shew that he foresaw that he should soon leave them all to depart and be with Christ (*ib.*). He was (probably) proconsul of Asia, 396 A.D., and died soon afterwards, leaving two children, a boy bearing his name—"Nebridius pusio"—and a daughter, the darling of her imperial relatives. His loss was severely felt, not only in Constantinople, where he had been the friend and reliever of the destitute and afflicted, but throughout the churches of the East, the bishops of which had been in the habit of addressing to him their petitions for cases of suffering in their dioceses, relying upon his influence with the emperor and those in chief authority. Jerome elaborately applies to him the character given of Cornelius the centurion in Acts x. (Hieron. *Ep.* 9.)

[E. V.]

NEBRIDIUS (4), an intimate friend of St. Augustine, and probably of about the same age as he was, described by him as very good and of a very cautious disposition. While Augustine was at Carthage, and still under the influence of Manichean doctrine, it was partly through his influence and that of Vindicianus that he was induced, though with some difficulty, to give up his belief in astrology, or, as this science was then called, mathematics. Nebridius had already abandoned Manicheism and delivered lectures against the system A.D. 379. (*Aug. Conf.* iv. 3, vii. 2, 6.) When Augustine removed from Rome to Milan, and undertook there the office of a lecturer in rhetoric, A.D. 384, Nebridius, in the fulness of his love for his friend, determined to leave his home and his mother, who declined to accompany him, and to take up his abode with Augustine and Alypius at Milan, "for no other reason," says Augustine, "than that he might live with me in most ardent pursuit of truth and wisdom. With me he sighed, with me he wavered, an eager enquirer after the life of happiness, and a most keen examiner of perplexing questions. There we were, three hungry mouths, each of us in turn sobbing out to himself his tale of destitution, and waiting till Thou, O God, shouldst give him meat in due season. And in all the bitterness which, in Thy mercy, followed us in our secular pursuits, while we were striving to discern the purpose for which we were made subject to these trials, a cloud of darkness would rise up against us, and groaning we would turn away and in agony exclaim, 'How long is this to last?' And as we said this we determined not to abandon our search, because if we were to let this go, nothing

certain appeared of which we might take hold. (*Conf.* vi. 7, 10.)

By and by Nebridius undertook to assist Verecundus, who was a teacher of grammar, in his lectures, not for the sake of gain, but at the earnest request both of himself and of Augustine. This duty he performed with great care and discretion, avoiding opportunities of acquaintance with persons of superior rank in the world, in order to secure for himself more complete freedom in his inquiries after true wisdom (*ib.* viii. 6). Soon after this Verecundus offered his country-house, *Cassisiacum agrum*, to Augustine for himself and his friends to occupy, an offer which they accepted with great pleasure and advantage to themselves, and for which Augustine was deeply grateful [LICENTIUS]. Nebridius, however, did not join the party, and it was probably during the time of his friend's sojourn there that most of the letters passed between them which are preserved in the general collection. During this time also he appears to have taken up the notion of the Docetae, that our Lord took human nature not in reality but only in outward appearance, an error of which in course of time, though we cannot fix the date, he was convinced, and soon after the conversion of Augustine he died, but not until he had become a true Catholic, and had induced his household to join him in the change. "He is now," says Augustine with confidence, "in the bosom of Abraham" (*ib.* ix. 3, 4).

Though a much loved and highly valued friend, Nebridius was a troublesome correspondent, for, as Augustine says, being most intelligent and persevering in his enquiries, which were sometimes very difficult to answer, he was not satisfied with brief replies, and did not always make sufficient allowance for his friend's occupations and want of leisure (*Aug. Ep.* 98, 8). Of the letters which passed between the two friends many are lost, and some never reached their destination. Of the twelve which remain, two only are addressed by Nebridius to Augustine. The rest are by Augustine, who mentions several by Nebridius which he had not received. These replies are very long, and chiefly on metaphysical subjects of extreme subtlety, and in some cases Nebridius seems to have been more anxious to provoke his friend to discourse than the latter was to reply, for Augustine sometimes manifests a friendly impatience of the speculative nature of his questions. Among the subjects thus treated are the nature of happiness, the difference between memory and imagination, and the different provinces of these two faculties (*Epp.* 3, 4, 6, 7, 13), the nature of dreams (*Epp.* 8, 9). Some are concerning the Incarnation (*Epp.* 11, 12, 14). One (14) contains an answer by Augustine to a question from Nebridius, in which he shews the fallacy committed by him in confounding sameness in the case of different objects with similarity. At the end of this letter he endeavours to reply to another question of Nebridius respecting the position held by the intellect of the Son of God towards those of men, whether it contains in itself the elements of human intellect in general, or those which belong to each man one by one. By way of reply Augustine says, when we think of an angle we think of one only, but when we think of a quadrangle we think of four angles at

once. Each man is created with one intellect, but if a nation is created, the intellect is not that of one, but of many. Each man is a part of the universe; God, the Creator of each part, contains in Himself the intellect belonging to each part. The first letter from Augustine to Nebridius is curious in a literary point of view, for in the course of it he asks his friend whether the verb *fugio* makes *fugi* or *fugiri* in the pass. inf., *cupio*, *cupi* or *cupiri*, and whether the *i* in *fugitum*, *cupitum*, and *cupitum* is long or short; a question which, coming from a professor of rhetoric, seems to argue either an unsettled state of the Latin language at the time, or an imperfect degree of grammatical knowledge on the part of the provincial professor; of which alternative suppositions, the latter is perhaps the true one. [H. W. P.]

NEBRIDIUS (5), bishop, but his see in Spain and his writings are unknown; he was brother of JUSTINIAN (4), bishop of Valentia, ELPIDIUS (17), and JUSTUS (19) in the 6th century: he may have been Nebridius bishop of Egara, at the 2nd council of Toledo, A.D. 527 (Hefele, *Conc.* ii. 701; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 265), and Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 13) suggests that he may have been translated to Barcelona before A.D. 540. On Nebridius of Egara see Henschen in *Boll. Acta SS.* 9 Feb. ii. 301. [J. G.]

NEBRIDIUS (6) (NEFRIDIUS, NIFRIDIUS, NIMFRIDIUS, NIMBRISIUS), abbat of Crassa (La Grasse) and afterwards the sixteenth bishop of Narbonne, a prominent opponent of Felix of Urgel and the Adoptionists [FELIX (176)]. In 799 he was at the council of Urgel (Mansi, xiii. 1033). In 813 he was the emperor Charles's missus dominicus at the sixth council of Arles (Mansi, xiv. 57 E), and he can be further traced down to 822. (*Gall. Chr.* vi. 15; Alcuin, *Opp.* i. 148, 267, 268 ed. Froben.) [C. H.]

NECTAN (1) (NACTAN, NEACHTAN, NECTU, NETHAD), surnamed Morbet, Morbrec, and Morbreac, son of Erip, Irb, &c., and king of the Picts, A.D. 455-480 (Innes, *Crit. Ess.* i. 101 sq.), or A.D. 458-482 (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 32). He touches ecclesiastical ground in the legends of St. BRIGIDA at Abernethy in Scotland, and of St. BOETHIUS of Monasterboice, who is also brought to Scotland. In honour of the former he is said to have dedicated Abernethy and given it to her pupil St. DARLUGDACHA; and St. BOETHIUS is represented as restoring him to life. (Skene, *Chron.* 6, et al. and *Celt. Scot.* i. 134-5; Innes, *Crit. Ess.* ii. 778-9; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 115-6.) [J. G.]

NECTAN (2), son of Derelei, king of the Picts, succeeded his brother Bridei or Brude, who died A.D. 706 (*Ann. Tig.*), but seems to have been driven from the throne and made prisoner by Drust about A.D. 725, and again restored for a short time on a defeat of Angus, son of Fergus, who afterwards reigned, however, for about thirty years. He is believed to be the Eactain or Ectain, king of the Picts, who was clericated A.D. 724 (*Ann. Tig.*), and the Nectan mac Derile who died A.D. 732 (*Ann. Tig.* See Skene, *Chron.* pass.). Though the general events and dates of his reign are uncertain, he was the

centre of a most important movement in the Pictish church, which had commenced to feel the Roman influence through Northumbria. The paschal controversy was at its height, and St. Wilfrid had already for half a century secured the observance of the Roman Easter to the south of the Firth. St. Adamnan had striven in vain to procure the like observance in Iona among the Dalriadic Scots; but St. Egbert the monk (A.D. 716-729) was about to succeed where the abbat had failed. Enquiry and discussion must thus have been rife among the Picts and Scots when Nectan ascended the throne, and was disposed to adopt the Roman usages. Bede (*E. H.* v. c. 21) has preserved an account of his application to Ceolfrid abbat of Jarrow [CEOLFRID], for instruction as to the arguments necessary for explaining and upholding the new rules for the observance of Easter among his people, and for the shape of the Roman clerical tonsure; he also wanted architects for the building of a church after the manner of the Romans, promising at the same time to dedicate it to the honour of St. Peter the prince of the apostles, and to have himself and his people always following the custom of the holy Roman and apostolic church "in quantum duntaxat tam longe a Romanorum loquela et natione segregati hunc ediscere potuissent" (*M. H. B.* 275). This and Ceolfrid's reply appear to have been written A.D. 710; and Bede's account of the action of Nectan is peculiarly striking, when, on receipt of Ceolfrid's letter, he had it read and interpreted in the assembly of his nobles, and on bended knee gave thanks to God for the gift, formally adopted the new Easter and tonsure, and took measures for the universal reception of the new cycle and suppression of the old among his clergy. But Bede's account of the harmonious settlement under the royal influence must be qualified by the statements of the Irish annals, which reveal a determined opposition between the Roman and the national parties to be put down only by the force of royal authority — "expulsio familiae Iae trans Dorsum Britannie a Nectano rege" (*Ann. Tig.* A.D. 717). Nectan drove the Columban clergy, and those who favoured their views, from Pictavia into Scotia, where there was still a strong leaning to the old traditions [DUNCHADH, FAELCHU (1)], and thus left the Roman party in undisturbed possession (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 158 sq.; Skene, *Chron.* pp. clviii. 74, 354, and *Celt. Scot.* i. 134 sq. et al.; ii. 176 sq. et al. and *Fordun*, ii. pp. xlviii. sq.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. 114 sq.; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 114 sq.). It is in connection with this change that the legend of St. Bonifacius Kiritinus, or Queretinus, is interpreted as belonging to the introduction of a Roman mission into Pictavia in the time of king Nectan, who is said to have been baptized by St. Bonifacius at Restennet. (Skene, *Chron.* 423, and *Celt. Scot.* ii. 230.) [BONIFACIUS QUERETINUS.] [J. G.]

NECTAN (3), ST., the eldest of the children of Brechan, king of Brecknock in Wales, i.e. one of the Welsh devotees who settled on the opposite coast of the Bristol Channel, where his relics were preserved at a sanctuary on the promontory of Hartland. Githa, Harold's mother, founded a college of secular canons here in honour of the saint by whose intercession

she believed her husband Godwin had been preserved from shipwreck (Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, ii. 358; Kerslake's *Damnonia*, 415); Hertiene' is called her property in Domesday. A notice of his legend is given in Leland's *Collectanea*, iv. 153, and in William of Worcester (104, 106, 125, 130, 131, 134). He had a sacred spring, and the marks of his blood were to be seen on the stones. (Whitaker's *Cathedral of Cornwall*, ii. 94, 99.) His day was the 17th June (Hampson's *Kalendarium*, i. 454, but Nicolas's *Chronology* gives 14th Feb.). The name was common among the Picts (Skene's *Chron. of Picts*, p. cii.) and possibly occurs in the Natanleod, or king Nectan, who fell in battle against Cerdic, A.D. 508, and whose name survives at Netley (Earle's *Saxon Chronicle*, p. 281); Forbes (*Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, xvii. 417) mentions an Irish saint of the name, whose day was 8 Jan. The Welsh saint was commemorated at other places in Devon as far as the ancient Celtic kingdom of Damnonia extended (Oliver's *Monasticon*, Exon. 204, 207, 444, 445, 455; Kerslake's *Damnonia*, 415), and at a chapel in St. Winnow near Lostwithiel ('Withiel's palace') in Cornwall. All visitors to Tintagel will remember the romantic chasm whence the water falls into the circular basin called St. Nighton's Keive (Saxon cyf, a vat; keeve is a western word still for a brewing tub). [C. W. B.]

NECTARIA, a deaconess (Soz. iv. 24 *fm.*; Tillem. vi. 494.) [ELPIDIUS (5).] [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (1), martyr in Auvergne c. 265 (Savaron, *Orig. de Clermont*, 46; Till. iv. 474). [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (2), May 5, bishop of Vienne cir. 337-364. (Ado, *Chron. in Pat. Lat.* cxxiii. 92 D, 95 B; *Mart. Hieron.*; Boll. *Acta SS.* 5 Mai. ii. 9, 1 Aug. i. 51; *Gall. Chr.* xvi. 13; Tillem. iii. 624, xv. 69.) [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (3), a layman of noble birth and high official position, to whom Basil addressed a consolatory letter on the death of his only son, a young man of great promise (*Ep.* 5 [188]). Basil also addressed a letter on the same occasion, in a somewhat turgid rhetorical style, to Nectarius's wife, in which he speaks of the death of their son as a common blow to the provinces of Cappadocia and Cilicia (*Ep.* 6 [189]). There is another letter of Basil's (*Ep.* 290 [323]), addressed to a man of high official rank bearing the same name, and perhaps the same person. There was an election of chor-episcopi at hand, and Nectarius had evidently been writing to urge the claims of a friend of his own. Basil courteously tells him that he is glad to receive testimony regarding the candidates from trustworthy sources, but that he alone was to be the judge after prayer for divine direction, and that no one should urge the cause of his friend with unseemly vehemence, remembering that the office was a very responsible one, and that one ought to wish and pray not for the success of a friend, but that the fittest man might be chosen. Tillemont is inclined to identify Basil's correspondent with the future bishop of Constantinople, but without sufficient grounds. [E. V.]

NECTARIUS (4), archbishop of Constan-

tinople, 9th from the foundation of the see, A.D. 381-397 or 398, successor to St. Gregory of Nazianzus. During the Second General Council (Constantinople, A.D. 381) died St. Meletius, bishop of Antioch. Gregory of Nazianzus had been persuaded to accept the see of Constantinople, partly in hope to heal the schism at Antioch through the agreement that Paulus, its other orthodox bishop, should be universally acknowledged on the death of Meletius, or Meletius on the death of Paulus. These hopes were now dashed to the ground by the election of the presbyter Flavianus in succession to Meletius, on the ground that the recognition of Paulus would be too great a concession to the Latins. Archbishop Gregory was so much grieved that he quitted the council and the episcopal palace. Many of the most influential men urged him not to resign; but his resolution was confirmed on the arrival of the Egyptian bishops, who professed themselves unsatisfied with his election, probably because he had been preferred to their countryman, Maximus. The archbishop appeared one day in the council and announced his resignation, on which he had finally determined for the sake of peace. The majority of the synod accepted this step, many even gladly. Besides the Egyptians there would be amongst his opponents those who refused to carry out the agreement about the succession at Antioch. The Emperor was most unwilling to lose the archbishop; but nothing remained except to choose a successor. The bishops were quite at a loss. Each had a candidate amongst his own friends. Who could have thought it was to be an unbaptized layman?

The praetor of Constantinople was a senator named Nectarius, of noble family, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, an elderly man, widely known for his admirable character in every temper of life, especially for his perfect good temper, the excellence of his heart, and his strict integrity. It was not generally known that he was still a catechumen, and had never been baptized.

The praetor was at this moment preparing for a journey to Tarsus, his own town. Before starting he called on the bishop of Tarsus, Diodorus, who was attending the council, to ask if he could serve him by taking letters home. Like others, the bishop's mind was full of the election. The reverend appearance and gentle manners of his visitor struck him so forcibly, that he at once determined that he should be his candidate. He said nothing, and alleging some other business took the praetor to call on the bishop of Antioch. The bishop of Antioch laughed at the idea of such a competition with the many famous names which had been suggested. However he asked Nectarius to put off his journey a short time. The day came when the emperor Theodosius asked the bishops at the council to hand him in their lists of candidates, reserving to himself the right of choosing one from the whole number of names. The bishop of Antioch with the rest gave in his list, at the bottom of which he had in compliment to the bishop of Tarsus written the name of the praetor. The emperor, reading over the lists, came to the bishop of Antioch's paper. He stopped at the name of Nectarius. Fixing his eyes on the paper and his finger on

the name, he paused awhile in deep thought. He began again, and read the list through; then he declared his choice. It was Nectarius. The fathers were amazed. Who was this Nectarius? Whence did he come? What was his character? It began to be said that he was not even baptized. Astonishment at the emperor's unexpected choice was redoubled. Even the bishop of Tarsus seems not to have known this disqualification. The startling information did not move Theodosius. The grumbles gradually ceased. The people of Constantinople were delighted at the news. The whole council agreed. Nectarius was baptized. The dress of a neophyte was changed for the robes of the bishop of the imperial city. The praetor, a few days ago a catechumen, stepped at once to the presidency of the Second General Council. He ruled the church upwards of sixteen years, and made an admirable prelate.

The name of Nectarius accordingly heads the list of the 150 signatures to the canons of the Second General Council. The 3rd Canon declares that "the bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."

The bishops of the west were not disposed to accept the election. Synods had been held the year of the great Council of Constantinople at Aquileia, at Rome, and at other places, and letters had been exchanged with the emperors. At a synod held in the autumn of A.D. 381 either at Milan or Aquileia, a letter was written to Theodosius which upheld Maximus the cynic in his claims to the see of Constantinople, repudiating alike Gregory and Nectarius. They asked for a common synod of east and west to settle the question of the succession.

In accordance with this request, the emperor Theodosius, soon after the close of the Second General Council, summoned the bishops of his empire to a fresh synod—not, however, as the Latins had wished, at Alexandria, but at Constantinople. He also twice invited St. Gregory, the retired archbishop, but he excused himself on account of weak health, and said that in his opinion such assemblies promised very little good. There were assembled here, in the beginning of the summer of 382, very nearly the same bishops who had been present at the Second General Council. On their arrival they received a letter from the Synod of Milan, inviting them to a great General Council at Rome. They replied that they must remain where they were, because they had not made preparations for so long a journey, and were only authorized by their colleagues to act at Constantinople. They sent three of their number—Syracus, Eusebius, and Priscian—with a Synodal Letter to pope Damasus, archbishop Ambrose, and the other bishops assembled in council at Rome. The letter, which is long and interesting, is preserved by Theodoret. It is sometimes printed in the Acts of the Second General Council. At the end of it, the Greek Fathers defend, by appealing to a canon of Nicaea, the elevation of Nectarius to Constantinople and of Flavian to Antioch. It has been disputed whether this appeal is to the seventh canon of Nicaea or to the fourth of Sardica; probability inclines to the former.

The Roman synod to which this letter was

addressed was the fifth under Damasus. No certain account of its proceedings remains, nor does it appear how its members treated the question of Nectarius. Theodosius, however, sent commissaries to Rome in support of the statements of his synod, a fact which we learn from the letters of pope Boniface. In his fifteenth letter (to the bishops of Illyria) he shews that the church in Rome had finally agreed to recognise both Nectarius and Flavian. And St. Ambrose, in his sixty-third letter, adduces the election of Nectarius as an approval of his own by the east.

The good terms which subsisted between Nectarius and his illustrious predecessor are clear from six graceful letters which remain in the collection of the correspondence of Gregory. In the first he expresses his hearty good wishes for his episcopate. In the second he commends to him a certain friend of his named Pancratius, whom Nectarius can serve. In the third he asks him to obtain the interest of the Count of the Household for one Georgius who has suffered great losses and misfortunes. The fourth is about the case of bishop Bosporius, by which Gregory obtained from Theodosius a law that bishops should only be tried by bishops. The fifth commends to Nectarius a young niece or cousin who is visiting the capital on business, and is unskilled in affairs. The last is of great importance, urging him not to be too liberal in tolerating the Apollinarians.

In the first year of the episcopate of Nectarius (or 388?), Theodosius was away fighting Maximus in the west. A false rumour coming to Constantinople of the victory of Maximus, the Arians burnt the episcopal palace.

In 383 the capacity of Nectarius was to be tried by a third synod at Constantinople. In spite of the decrees of bishops and emperor, the Arians and Pneumatomachians continued their efforts to spread their doctrines. Theodosius summoned all parties to the imperial city for a great discussion in June, hoping to reconcile all differences. Before the proceedings began, he sent for the archbishop and told him of his intention that all questions should be fully debated. Nectarius returned home, full of profound anxiety at this communication, and consulted the Novatian bishop Agelius, who agreed with him in doctrine, and was held in high esteem on account of his personal piety. Agelius felt himself unsuited and unskilled for so grave a controversy; but he had a very clever reader, Sisinnius, remarkably eloquent, a brilliant scholar alike in philosophy and theology, and to him he proposed to entrust the argument with the Arians. Sisinnius, however, thought that the suggested disputation might only increase the divisions. He stated his opinion before the archbishop, adding that it would be better to produce the testimonies of the old fathers of the church on the doctrine of the Son, and first to ask the heads of the several parties whether they accepted these authorities or desired to anathematize them. So bold an innovation would of course be rejected by the people; but if the sectaries should admit the testimonies, it would then be for the orthodox to produce their proofs.

The archbishop unfolded the scheme to the emperor, who gladly agreed to it. When the

bishops met, the emperor put this question: Did they respect the teachers who lived before the Arian division? They said yes. He then asked: Did they acknowledge them sound and trustworthy witnesses of the true Christian doctrine? The divisions which this question produced shewed that the sectaries were bent on disputation. The emperor was extremely displeased, and he now ordered each party to draw up a written confession of its doctrine. When this was done, the bishops were summoned to the imperial palace, Nectarius and Agelius for the orthodox, Demophilus (formerly bishop of Constantinople) for the Arians, Eleusius of Cyzicus for the Pneumatomachians, and Eunomius for the Anomoeans. The emperor received them with kindness, took from them their written confessions, and retired into a room alone with these documents. After praying God for enlightenment, he rejected and destroyed all except that of the orthodox, because they introduced a division into the Holy Trinity.

Of these creeds only that of Eunomius has come down. He called only the Father God, and placed the Son among creatures as the First-born of all creation, denying Him all share in Divine Being and Glory. The Holy Ghost he placed still lower, as created through the Son and subject to the Son in everything: the greatest, best, and most beautiful creation of the Only-begotten. Eunomius threatened his opponents with the judgment of God.

At this resolute conduct of the emperor, the sectaries sorrowfully returned home, and tried by letters to their adherents to comfort them, chiefly as to the fact that so many now went over to the Nicene faith. Many were called, they said, but few chosen. The emperor now forbade all sectaries, except the Novatians, to hold divine service anywhere for the future, to publish their doctrines or to ordain clergy, under threat of severe civil penalties. Gregory of Nazianzus wrote two letters about this council, one addressed to the praetorian prefect Posthumianus, the other to the consul Saturninus.

In 385 died Pulcheria, the emperor's daughter. The archbishop, diffident of his own rhetorical powers, asked Gregory of Nyssa to preach the funeral sermon. In the same year Theodosius lost his wife Placilla. Nectarius again asked the same celebrated preacher to undertake the sad duty. Both orations remain. In the latter, Gregory speaks with great respect of the primate.

In 394 a number of bishops were invited to Constantinople to the consecration of a magnificent church built across the water at a place called "The Oaks" by a praetorian prefect Rufinus in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul. Advantage was taken of their presence to hold a synod for settling the affair of Agapius and Gebadius, who both had claimed the bishopric of Bostra. Gebadius had been deposed in his absence by only two bishops. Arabianus of Ancyra asked if this was right? Nectarius supported the view of Arabianus. Another bishop, Theophilus, reminded his reverend brothers that both the disputing bishops were now dead. For the future, if any bishop must be tried, let all the bishops of the

province be present, and nothing be done in the absence of the accused. To this Nectarius, Flavianus, and all the others present agreed.

Towards the close of his episcopate, Nectarius abolished the office of presbyter penitentiary, whose duty appears to have been to receive confessions before communion. His example was followed by nearly all other bishops. The presbyter penitentiary was added to the ecclesiastical roll about the time of the Novatian schism, when that party declined to communicate with those who had lapsed in the Decian persecution. The presbyter penitentiary was a public official in each diocese to reconcile penitents to the church with greater comfort than could be secured by confession before the whole multitude of the church. Gradually he had fewer of the lapsed to reconcile, and his duties became more closely connected with preparation for communion. An interesting account is given by Sozomenus of the penitential ceremonies of the church in Rome, which were conducted by the bishop himself. At Constantinople a matron of rank had been confessing to the presbyter penitentiary and had been ordered by him to fast and to entreat God for forgiveness. She afterwards declared that while she was staying in church for this purpose she was violated by one of the deacons. Socrates says that she confessed to habitual sin on these occasions. The whole city was roused to angry indignation by the story; the disgrace of an individual was cast upon the whole order. Nectarius would do nothing in a hurry. He long deliberated, but at any rate expelled the offender from the diaconate. A presbyter named Eudaemon, a native of Alexandria, and others, advised him to leave the participation in holy communion entirely to individual consciences. The archbishop agreed with them, and abolished the office of presbyter penitentiary.

In collections of the Greek fathers a sermon is attributed to Nectarius on the subject, "Why the memory of the great saint and martyr Theodorus is celebrated on the first Sunday in Lent; and on fasting and almsgiving." The death of Theodorus happened in the Julian persecution, perhaps as much as thirty-five years before Nectarius might be preaching about it. The preacher mentions that some of his hearers had been eye-witnesses of the scene. The sermon is given in Latin in the works of Chrysostom, by Surius and Lipomann. In Greek it occurs in several manuscript collections.

There are two letters of St. Basil belonging to 358 or 359, addressed to Nectarius and his wife on the death of their only son. This Nectarius is thought by some to have been the archbishop before his consecration. [NECTARIUS (3).]

Nectarius died in 397 or 398, and was succeeded by St. John Chrysostom. (Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* v. viii. &c.; Soer. *Hist. Eccl.* v. viii. &c.; Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* vii. viii. &c.; Theoph. *Chronogr.* 59, &c.; Nectarii Arch. CP. *Enarratio in Patrol. Graec.* xxxix. p. 1821; Mansi, *Concil. tom. iii.* p. 521, 599, 633, 643, 694, &c.; Hefele, *Hist. Christ. Councils*, tr. Oxenham, Edinb. 1876, vol. ii. p. 344, 347, 378, 380, 382, &c.; Bonif. Pap. *Epist.* xv. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xx., p. 779; Ambros. *Epist.* lxiii.; Greg. Nyss. *Oratio in funere Pulch., Oratio Funeb. de Placill.*; Greg.

Naz. *Epist.* lxxxviii., xci., cli., clxxxv., clxxxvi., ccii.; Basil. *Epist.* v. vi.) [W. M. S.]

NECTARIUS (5), decurion of Calama, a pagan though the son of a Christian. (*Aug. Ep.* 91. 2.) Notwithstanding the edict of Honorius, forbidding both pagan and other celebrations, contrary to the Catholic faith (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. tit. v. 40, 41, A.D. 407), the people of Calama celebrated a pagan festival on June 1, A.D. 408, and when the procession passed ostentatiously in front of the door of the church, and the clergy endeavoured to prevent this insult, the mob broke out into riot and pelted the church with stones. This outrage was repeated a week later, and again a third time, notwithstanding the divine punishment, in Augustine's view, of a violent hail-storm. Churches and houses were set on fire; one Christian lost his life, and others suffered injuries, being maltreated by the mob in their endeavours to discover the hiding-place of the bishop, Possidius. The disturbance lasted until late at night. The whole, says Augustine, might have been prevented if the magistrates had only done their duty. Hearing of what had taken place, Augustine went to Calama to enquire, and some of the people, alarmed for the consequences of their misconduct, came to him and entreated him to pardon them. In this petition Nectarius, who was absent at the time of Augustine's visit, joined, and in a letter to him acknowledged the fault of the Calamese, but expressing his own love for his native place and his anxiety to leave it in a flourishing condition, requested him as a Christian bishop of distinguished eminence, to intercede for the people, and prevent severe punishment, asserting that the pecuniary loss was not great. (*Aug. Ep.* 90.) Augustine in reply speaks in dignified language of the real enormity of the outrage, and disclaims any wish for severity, but puts the question to Nectarius whether for example's sake it ought to remain entirely unpunished. In an earlier part of his letter he had taken the opportunity of shewing how the practice of pagan worship led almost necessarily to excess and immorality, and was therefore justly suppressed by civil authority, that in order for the country to be really prosperous the people ought to adopt the true religion, which he hoped that Nectarius himself might be led to do. (*Ep.* 91.) To this letter, after eight months' delay, Nectarius replied. He offers to his friend some high-flown compliments, thanks him for his wish to lead him to the heavenly country, but must ask him to be forgiven for taking a primary interest in his own earthly one, for, he says, philosophers believe that those who do so will deserve places hereafter in the other. He proceeds to endeavour to bespeak the favour of Augustine for the Calamese offenders without distinction, and to shew that a punishment by fine was really worse than death itself, and that if faults, as some philosophers think, are all alike, so also remission of punishment ought to be extended to all alike. He asks him to imagine the probable misery of the people, and his own anxiety on their behalf, if punishment should be enforced; and entreats him in the name of God and of his own high character to shew favour towards them. (*Ep.* 103.) To this letter of ostentatious, though

long-delayed, intercession, Augustine replied at once, expressing in highly polished and courteous sarcasm his own opinion concerning the delay asking whether Possidius the bishop of Calama, who in his opinion shewed much more real concern for the people than Nectarius, could in the interval make any demand for greater severity than at first had been intended, and called on him to state publicly whether he had heard any report of this being the case. As to the hardship of inflicting some pecuniary loss on people who have still the means of living luxuriously and spending money on embellishments of their public worship, those who were parties to the injuries inflicted on Christians in the riot ought not to complain of being made to pay for the damage done, and Nectarius, who has the welfare of his native place so strongly at heart, ought rather to rejoice at some curtailment of the superfluous means which the citizens possess for displaying their contempt for the law. With a sort of parody Nectarius had spoken of the value of repentance in removing guilt, but Augustine endeavours to set before him and the people of Calama the true nature of Christian repentance, with the earnest hope that they may be led to see its necessity, and to aim at reaching the heavenly country which Nectarius says is the aim of all religious systems, but to which there is only one true way. The Stoic doctrine that all offences are equal, a doctrine which leads to the conclusion not only that all are equally pardonable, but that all are equally punishable, is plainly absurd, and inconsistent both with the other Stoic doctrine which excluded mercy from the list of virtues, with the more amiable opinion of Cicero (*pro Ligario*, 37, 38), and still more with the doctrine of the church, which is really more merciful than Nectarius himself. He begs him to desist from the line of patronage which he has adopted, and to be content with the course which the church is pursuing, in the hope of ultimately bringing the people to Christ. (*Aug. Ep.* 104; Tillemont, xiii. 172; Fleury, *H. E.* v. 22, 17.) We are not informed distinctly as to the result of this controversy, but it is certain that in 409 and subsequent years stringent edicts were issued against opponents of the Catholic faith, especially Jews and pagans. (*Cod. Theod.* u. s. 46, 51.) [H. W. P.]

NECTARIUS (6), perhaps a bishop, to whom the *Commentary on the Book of Job*, attributed to Philippus, is addressed [PHILIPPUS]. (Tillem. xii. 351; Ceill. vii. 565.) [J. G.]

NECTARIUS (7), believed to be the third bishop of Digne (Gassend. *Notit. Eccl. Diniens.* 129; *Gall. Chr.* iii. 112; Tillem. xv. 65, 68, 84, 93, 94, 407), whose name appears in various Gallic synods and in the letters of pope Leo the Great. He was at the councils of Riez in 439, and Orange in 441 (Mansi, v. 1196, vi. 441); at Arles under Ravennius in 451 (vi. 162, 181; Leo, *Epp.* 99 al. 76, 102 al. 77); at Arles in 455 (Mansi, vii. 907). In 445 he was deputed by Hilary bishop of Arles to Leo (*Vit. Hil.* § 17 in *Pat. Lat.* l. 1258). In 449 he was one of the bishops of the province of Arles who addressed Leo on the election of Ravennius (Leo, *Ep.* 40 al. 36), and in 450 one of those addressed by Leo (*Ep.* 66 al. 50.) [C. H.]

NECTARIUS (8), Sept. 13, sixteenth bishop of Autun, mentioned by Venantius Fortunatus in his *Life of Germanus of Paris* (§ 3 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 436), and present at the council of Orleans in 547 or 549. (Mansi, ix. 136; *Gall. Chr.* iv. 343; *Boll. Acta SS.* 13 Sept. iv. 59.) [C. H.]

NEBRIDIUS, of Narbonne [NEBRIDIUS (6)].

NEFYDD (NEVYDD) ap Rhun Dremrudd ap Brychan, Welsh saint in the end of the 5th century, was bishop in North Britain, and slain by the Picts and Saxons (Rees, *W. SS.* 145 sq.; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 519 sq.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* i. 160, ii. 36). Perhaps has given his name to Neveth or Nevay, co. Perth (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 420). [J. G.]

NEMERTIUS (1) (*Νημέριος*), a public advocate (*ἐκδικος*) addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 210 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.), in reply to an enquiry as to whether the Holy Ghost were to be considered as of the same nature as the Father and the Son. [C. H.]

NEMERTIUS (2), a monk who being in much fear and despondency is addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 129-132; *Tillem.* xiv. 197). [C. H.]

NEMERTIUS (3), a silentarius, exhorted by Nilus (lib. ii. epp. 12, 13) to diligence in religious duties. [C. H.]

NEMESIANUS (1), bp. of Thubunae (*Tobna*). Numidian bp. addressed in *Cyp. Ep.* 62 (see JANUARIUS) A.D. 253, addressed in *Cyp. Ep.* 70 (*Syn. Carth.* sub *Cyp. de Bapt. Haer.* 1) Suffr. v. in *Sentt. Epp. Conc. Carth.* sub *Cyp. de Bapt.* 3. One of the nine sent to Sigua into the mines soon after the council (addressed by *Cyp.* in *Ep.* 76, and with three others replying in *Ep.* 77). These nine commemorated as martyrs in the African Calendar on 10th Sept. (Morcelli, vol. i. p. 226, vol. ii. 372; *Boll. Acta SS.* 10 Sept. iii. 483). [E. W. B.]

NEMESIANUS (2), boy martyr in Africa, mentioned by Augustine (*Serm.* 286, § 2 and note, in *Patr. Lat.* xxxviii. 1297; *Tillem.* iv. 174). [C. H.]

NEMESINUS (1), (*Νημεσίωος*), an official at court of Jovian at Antioch in 363, when the Arians of Alexandria came to secure his favour and the emperor recommended them to subscribe the orthodox faith; "Here are bishops," he said, "and here also is Nemesinus" (*Athan. Ep. ad Jov.* § 4 in *Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 821 B). *Tillemont* (viii. 223) supposes him a registrar ("un greffier"), as though to receive and record their subscriptions. [C. H.]

NEMESINUS (2), a friend for whom Cyril of Alexandria wrote his *Dialogues* and *Thesaurus*. (*Pat. Gr.* lxxv. 1, 657; *Ceillier*, viii. 268, 273; *Tillem.* xiv. 665, 670.) [C. H.]

NEMESION (1) (*Νημεσίων*), an Egyptian, martyred at Alexandria in the reign of Decius, by being burnt between two thieves. (*Euseb.* vi. 41; *Tillem.* iv. 252.) [C. H.]

NEMESION (2), elected bishop of Dioclea

in the province of Scodra in the room of Paulus, who had been deposed, but who kept him out by force. He appealed in person to Gregory the Great, who gave him two letters, A.D. 602, in support of his claims, addressed to Constantine the metropolitan of Scodra, and to John bishop of Prima Justiniana, the representative of the Roman see in the East. (*Greg. lib. xii. ind. iv. epp.* 30, 31; *Jaffé, E.P.* num. 1463, 1464.) [C. H.]

NEMESIUS (1), governor of Cappadocia, a friend and correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. He shewed the aged bishop much kindness towards the close of his life, which he gratefully records in a long poem of between 300 and 400 hexameters (*Carm.* 62, tom. ii. pp. 140-146). Nemesius was still a pagan, and Gregory devotes the greater part of his poem to an exposure of the folly of idolatry and exhortations to embrace the elevating and purifying doctrines of Christianity. Nemesius is described by the grateful Gregory as a man of considerable literary eminence, whose eloquence as a pleader had gained him distinction in the law courts. Cappadocia was his first province, and he does not seem to have held it very long, as he was once more his own master and was setting out on a journey when Gregory wrote to him his 184th letter. In a short subsequent letter (*Ep.* 185) Gregory upbraids him for having passed by his place of residence without apprising him or visiting him. Gregory wrote to Nemesius in favour of a certain Theodosius, who was extremely anxious to be relieved from a commission involving a long journey and protracted absence from his family (*Ep.* 79); and of a kinsman of his own named Valentinian, who (though the letter is obscure) appears to have had an accident by no fault of his own with a public vehicle and to have killed the horses, himself being thrown out and injured. Gregory begs that Nemesius will be content with reprimanding him, and not make him pay the price of the horses (*Ep.* 183). Nemesius was favourably inclined to Christianity. After quitting office he visited Gregory for the purpose of discussing the subject of religion. His arguments appear to have had some influence with Nemesius, and to have inspired the hope that the future interview which he promised would result in the conversion of one to whom he owed so much for the considerate kindness manifested towards him (*Ep.* 184): whether these hopes were verified is not known. We may safely reject the suggestion favoured by *Tillemont* (*Mem. Eccl.* ix. pp. 541, 607) that the governor of Cappadocia is the same with the bishop of Emesa, the author of a work *De natura hominis*, the second and third chapters of which appear by mistake among the works of Gregory Nyssen, under the title *De anima* (tom. ii. pp. 157-201 ed. Migne). (*Cf. Fabric. Bibl. Graec. lib. v. c. 14, § vi.*) [E. V.]

NEMESIUS (2) (*Νημεσίος*), various persons addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (*Patr. Gr.* lxxviii.); one on Ps. xlix. 20, and Prov. xiii. 16 (lib. ii. ep. 135, iv. 39); another on the love of riches (v. 36); a magistrianus on Deut. v. 27; Matt. vii. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 14 (iv. 81); a praetor warned against arrogance and severity (i. 47). [C. H.]

NEMESIUS (3), Aug. 1, confessor in the Pagus Lisuinus (Usuard. *Mart.*), thought to be Lisieux. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Aug. i. 46.)

[C. H.]

NEMESIUS (4), bishop of Emesa in the latter half of the 4th century, of whom nothing is certainly known but that he was the author of a rather remarkable treatise, *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*, *De Natura Hominis*, of which chapters ii. and iii. appear as a separate work, entitled *περὶ ψυχῆς*, *de Anima*, among the writings of Gregory Nyssen, being erroneously ascribed to that father. Tillemont and Galland are inclined to identify him with the governor of Cappadocia, friend of Gregory Nazianzen (No. 1). But he was certainly a heathen when Gregory addressed him, and though (as Galland holds, *Bibl. Patr.* tom. vii.) it is not impossible that he may have subsequently become a convert to Christianity and have attained the episcopate, it is hardly probable, and there is not the least evidence in favour of such an hypothesis, which is decidedly rejected by Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* viii. 448; and Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ix. 541, 607). Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 839) places Nemesius fifth among the bishops of Emesa, between Paul I., who attended the council of Seleucia, A.D. 359, and Cyriacus, the friend of Chrysostom. Cave throws unfounded suspicion on the fact of his having been bishop of Emesa, and says that all is uncertain about him (*Hist. Lit.* i. 276). The date of his writing may however be determined with tolerable certainty by his mentioning the doctrines of Apollinaris and Eunomius and the Origenists, but not those of Nestorius, Eutyches, or Pelagius. The last named he could hardly have avoided mentioning if his teaching had been known to him, in the portion of his treatise relating to free will. That he was bishop of Emesa is stated in the title of his treatise in the various MS. copies, and by Maximus (ii. 153, ed. Combefis) and Anastasius Sinaita (*Quaest.* xviii. and xxiv.) in their quotations from his work. He is also quoted, though without his name, by Joannes Damascenus, Elias Cretensis, Meletius, Joannes Grammaticus, and others. The treatise of Nemesius is a pleasing and interesting little work, which will well reward perusal, and has received much praise from able judges of style and matter. Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philosoph.* iii. 530) writes of it thus: "Si lectionis varietas, verborum delectus, rationum pondus, iudicii tenor, methodi ordo, disputandi acumen, argumenti demum dignitas tractatum aliquem lectoribus suis conciliare poterit, utique hic fuerit longe commendatissimus." Nemesius establishes the immortality of the soul against the philosophers, vindicates free will, opposes fatalism, defends God's providence, and proves by copious examples the wisdom and goodness of the Deity. As a natural philosopher Nemesius has obtained celebrity by indications given in his book that he was not ignorant of the circulation of the blood and the functions of the bile (cc. xxiv. xxviii. pp. 242, 260, ed. Matthaei). The book was first published in a Latin translation by G. Valla, Lugd. 1538. The first edition of the Greek text was by Nicasius Ellebodus, Antv. 1565. It also appeared in the *Auctarium Duceanum*, Paris, 1629, ii. 466; and in the *Bibl. Patrum*, Morell. xii. 748;

also in the *Bibl. Vett. Patr.* of De la Bigne, 1609, tom. viii. in the *Magn. Bibl.* 1618, tom. v. pars 3, and 1654, tom. xii.; and the *Maxima Bibl.* 1677, tom. viii. It was published at Oxford, 1671, with copious notes, by Dr. (afterwards Bp.) Fell. The best edition is that by C. F. Mathaei, Halae, 1802. Nemesius's treatise has been translated into most modern European languages, into Italian by Pizzimenti (no date), English, G. Wilkes, 1636 and 1657, German by Osterhammer, Salzburg, 1819, and French by Thibault (J. R.), Paris, 1844. [E. V.]

NEMESSIANUS (*Νεμεσιανός*), a scholasticus addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. iii. ep. 339 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxviii.), censuring the too exclusive application of the Old Testament to Christ. [C. H.]

NENNITA, mother of St. David of Menevia (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 6). [NONNA.] [J. G.]

NENNIUS, British historian, presents a study akin to that of Gildas, alike in the indecisive results but unlike in the breadth of historical enquiry and traditional material. Nennius is uniformly spoken of as author of the *Eulogium Britanniae sive Historia Britonum*, but this is ascribed to others besides Nennius. Unless as author, compiler, or editor of this work, he has no existence, and this ascription of authorship rests upon a late and doubtful basis, yet for convenience and from long-established usage he will probably continue to be quoted simply as the author. At the same time, to quote Stevenson (*Nennius*, p. v.): "The information which is extant concerning Nennius, the presumed author of the work entitled 'Historia Britonum,' is so scanty, and the literary history of that production, external and internal, is so obscure and contradictory, that we may despair of being able to decide, with any degree of accuracy, either as to the age, the historical value, or the authorship of this composition." It will be most convenient to consider (a) The work itself, (b) The authorship, (c) The time, (d) The editions.

(a) The *Historia Britonum*, contained in at least thirty-three MSS., which date from the 10th to the 17th century, and presenting great variety in matter, arrangement, and dates, professes to give a history of Britain to the arrival of the Saxons. It gives the usual Celtic traditions in a confused form, traces the Britons to Brutus, the Scots to the immigration under the Spaniard Partholomaeus, and ends with the foundation of the kingdom of Northumbria, A.D. 547, or its establishment on Penda's defeat and death in the year 655. It is of no special historical value, and is of even less interest than the *Historia et Epistola Gildae*, to which it bears a certain relation, as well as to the *Historia Britonum Galfredi Monemutensis*.

(b) If we accept the two prologues as genuine and conclusive, we must believe that Nennius was disciple of Elbodius (d. A.D. 809), and under a priest Beulanus whom he styles master, and to whom he inscribes a copy of his work with some verses to his son Samuel; that he was member of some religious community, compiled his history "seniorum jussu," and finished it in the year 858, being the twenty-fourth year of Mervin king of the Britons; and that he

gathered his materials from the traditions, writings, and monuments of the ancient British inhabitants, from the Roman annals, from the chronicles of the holy fathers Jerome, Prosper, and Eusebius, and from the histories of the Scots and Saxons. But both prologues are of late and very doubtful authority, being not older than the 12th century, and therefore usually held as spurious, while the date 858 cannot synchronise with the twenty-fourth year of Mervyn, which would probably be 843. If a later writer was only embodying an earlier tradition with regard to the authorship, we could understand the anachronism through ignorance, but not feel otherwise supported by the authority. But the weight of earlier tradition is to attribute the *Historia Britonum* to Gildas without mention of Nennius, and Stevenson (*Ib.* xiii.) says: "It is an important fact, that one of the earliest manuscripts, if not the earliest, extant, ascribes it neither to Nennius nor to Gildas, but to one whom it styles Mark the Hermit." This Mark was an Irish bishop who became an anchorite at St. Medard's at Soissons about A.D. 870. The real author is thus unknown; but Nennius, if more than a name, probably lived in the first half of the 9th century. The works ascribed to Nennius as the monk of Bangor in the 6th or 7th century are evidently either feigned, or, if they ever existed, spurious and based upon the *Hist. Brit.* (For lists see Balaeus, *Brit. Script. Sum.* f. 36; Pitseus, *De Ill. Angl. Script.* i. 106; Cave, *Hist. Lib.* ii. 217; Tanner, *Bibl.* 542; Wright, *B. B. Lit.* 135 A.-S. per.; Nicolson, *Eng. Hist. Libr.* 33, 3rd ed.)

(c) The date assigned to Nennius, when considered as the author of the *Historia Britonum*, has varied from A.D. 620 (Gale, *Praef. ad Lect.*) to 858 (*Prol.* i.), and even as late as 946, the 5th year of Eadmund king of the Angles (*M. H. B.* 53 n.). The cause of this is the difficult question of the chronology of the work itself, and hence that of its composition. There appears to be no room for doubt, amid the endless corruptions and interpolations of the extant manuscripts, that it is a compilation which dates from the 7th or beginning of the 8th century, if not even a century earlier, in the time of Gildas, and has received additions at the hands of unknown authors, whose work can be but guessed at in the attempt to disentangle the original form from the later recensions. But the editor of *Mon. Hist. Brit.* (Intro. Rem. Chron. p. 107 sq.) traces five editions (A.D. 674, 823, 858, 907, 977), distinguishable by their chronology; while Dr. Skene (*Four An. B. Wales*, i. 37 sq. and *Chron.* xxiv. sq.) supposes a Welsh original translated into Latin, and prints separately the *Saxon and Welsh Additions to the Hist. Britonum*, A.D. 974 (*Chron.* 11), and the *Irish and Pictish Additions*, A.D. 1040-72 (*Ib.* 23). The Irish version of Nennius, *Hist. Brit.*, is a translation made by Gilla Caemhain (d. A.D. 1072), into which he has introduced many purely Irish matters without apology for interpolation. (See this version published by Ir. Arch. Society, 1848, with translation and notes by Todd and Herbert; O'Curry, *Ir. MS. Mat.*)

(d) Editions of Nennius, *Hist. Brit.*, are by Gale (*Hist. Brit. Script.* xv. 1691); Gunn (Nennius, *Hist. Brit.*, with English version and notes, 1819); Stevenson (Nennii *Hist. Brit.* 1838); Giles

(*Hist. Anc. Brit.* ii. 1847); and *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 1848 (*Eccl. Brit. sive Hist. Brit.* auct. Nennio), and under the name of Marcus Anachoreta, by Cardinal Mai, *App. ad Opera*, pp. 99-111. Dr. Giles has translated Nennius, and followed Gunn's Latin (Bohn, *Six Old Eng. Chron.*).

(See on Nennius, Gale's *Nennius*, *Pref. ad Lect.*; Stevenson, *Nenn.* *Pref.*; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* *Pref.* and *Intro.*; *Irish Nennius*, by Todd and Herbert; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 185 sq., A.S. period; Gunn, *Nenn.* *Pref.*; Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 318-37, pt. ii. 852; Lappenberg, *Engl. under A.-S. Kings*, ed. Thorpe; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* x. 261.) [J. G.]

NENNOCA, ST. (NINNOCA, NENNOC), daughter of king Brechan, migrated to Brittany, and founded the nunnery of Lan Ninnok, in 6th century. Her day was 4th June. (*Acta Sanctorum*, June, i. 407 to 411; Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 83, 86; *Proceed. of Roy. Irish Acad.* vii. 373.) [C. W. B.]

NEO, of Seleucia. [NEONAS.]

NEO (1) (NEON), Jan. 17, martyr at Langres. [SPEUSIPPUS.]

(2) A child martyr, c. 257 (Baron. ann. 259, xv. xvii.; Tillem. iv. 29, 33, 34).

(3) A martyr at Aegae. [CLAUDIUS (4).] (Baron. ann. 285, iv.; Tillem. iv. 414; Ceill. ii. 465, 466.) [C. H.]

NEO (4), bishop of Laranda, in Lycaonia, probably at the beginning of the 3rd century, permitted the layman Euelpis to preach in his presence. His example is cited as a precedent by Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Caesarea to justify their having given similar permission to Origen (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19).

[G. S.]

NEO (5), a Pamphylian bishop, an antagonist of the Messalian heresy at the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century. (Phot. *Cod.* 35; Ceill. viii. 572; Tillem. xii. 432.) [G. T. S.]

NEOM (NEON, NEONAS), archbishop of Ravenna, received from pope Leo (*Ep.* 135) a reply upon the case of those who had been carried into captivity and did not know about their baptism in infancy (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liv. 1191; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 8). As a contemporary of St. Leo (A.D. 440-461), he was later than A.D. 425-430 as given by Agnellus (*Pont. Ep. Rav.* ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cvi. 451, 764), and probably succeeded Petrus Chrysologus in A.D. 454 [CHRYSOLOGUS], which would allow the letter to be in the year 458 as given by Ceillier (*Ib.*) and Fleury (*H. E.* xxix. 11), but Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 717) gives A.D. 449-452. He built the church of St. Peter the Great, and founded one called Tricolis, but in Agnellus, *Vita S. Neonis* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cvi. 517) there is no history of him: he died 11 Feb., and was buried in the church of St. Peter. [J. G.]

NEONAS (NEO), bishop of Seleucia in Isauria at the time of the synod of 359, when he allowed his church for the ordination of

Anianus to the see of Antioch. At the close of the year he signed the letter of the deputies of the synod of Seleucia to those of Rimini (Hilar. *Frag.* x. in *Pat. Lat.* x. 705). In 360 he was deposed by the Acacian synod of Constantinople. (Soc. ii. 42; Soz. iv. 24; Le Quien, ii. 1011; Ceill. iv. 578; Tillem. vi. 477, 486, 493.)

[C. H.]

NEOPHYTUS (1), a martyr at Nicaea, aged fifteen, under Diocletian (Boll. *Acta SS.* 20 Jan. ii. 297; Tillem. v. 159).

[C. H.]

NEOPHYTUS (2) (*Νεόφυτος*) a monk upon whom Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 301 in *Pal. Gr.* lxxix.) urges that the very least precepts ought not to be disregarded

[C. H.]

NEOPLATONISM. This profound and most remarkable system of philosophy took its rise in Alexandria, in the person of Ammonius Saccas, about the beginning of the 3rd century A.D. Its most celebrated master, and by far the most powerful of all those whose treatises have come down to us, was Plotinus, the pupil of Ammonius Saccas. Next to him in reputation comes the last great master of the school, Proclus, in whose time philosophy had receded from all other places where it had once flourished, and taken refuge in its first cradle and most congenial home—Athens; in which place, more than forty years after the death of Proclus, the philosophic schools were at last suppressed by the zealously orthodox Justinian, A.D. 529. Between Plotinus and Proclus lie Porphyry and Jamblichus, some of whose treatises have come down to us; Amelius, of whom we possess only fragments; the celebrated and unfortunate Hypatia; the emperor Julian, with his friends and advisers, Sallustius, Aedesius, Maximus, Chrysanthius; the estimable and intelligent Hierocles; and Syrianus, the master of Proclus. The duration of the school in its separate identity was thus about three centuries and a quarter, though individual Neoplatonists are found even in the latter half of the 6th century A.D.

What is the central character of Neoplatonism? It is known as a philosophy, as a Platonic philosophy. And, indeed, it does in great part consist, and especially in the pages of Plotinus, of that penetrating research into first principles, into our own nature, bodily and spiritual, and the nature of the universe around us, and that attempt at systematic exposition, which is what we understand by philosophy. But mingled with this is another element. Neoplatonism seeks not merely to give men clear knowledge, but also to make them enter into a certain high state of feeling, not without kinship to religious emotion, a state which Plotinus himself termed "ecstasy" (*ἔκστασις*), and of which no better description can be given than that contained in the final and culminating words of his great treatise: "Such is the life of the gods; such also is the life of divine and happy men; detachment from all things here below, disdain of earthly pleasures, the flight of the soul towards God, on whom it gazes face to face and alone."

Now, in so far as Neoplatonism is pure theory, its origin can be traced with very fair, though not absolute, certainty. It is a kind of summing up of the results of all previous Greek and

Roman metaphysics; it would be too much to say, of all previous philosophy; for natural science and political philosophy are alike left out of its range, the former, doubtless, by reason of the defectiveness of the school in accurate external observation, the latter from the circumstances of the time. But in metaphysics there is scarcely any preceding theory (unless the Epicurean atomic theory be considered an exception) to which Neoplatonism is not in some way or other affiliated; in particular it sought with great diligence to reconcile Plato and Aristotle, though always preserving the supremacy of the former. Nor was it content with inquiring into the Greek and Roman systems. It is generally conceded that the principal philosophers of the school knew and were influenced by the works of Philo; and there is reason to think that a still wider influence, foreign to Greece and Rome, extended to them. As to this point, indeed, there is no agreement among critics. Vacherot boldly says that the Alexandrian philosophy is "essentially and radically oriental." This is one of those broad assertions which is seldom left in peaceful possession of the field of inquiry; and Zeller, in criticising it, goes so far to the other extreme as to consider all the elements which contributed to form Neoplatonism, apart from the recognised classical sources, of insignificant weight. It is, he thinks, quite in the normal line of development of Platonic, Aristotelian, and Stoic thought (Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. v. p. 394). This is a conclusion which, in the judgment of the present writer, cannot stand; though Zeller's great learning, and the care which he has bestowed on this question in particular, entitle his opinion to most respectful consideration. It may be conceded that Vacherot goes too far when he affirms that Neoplatonism teaches a theory of the emanation of all things from the Deity manifestly derived from some oriental source. The question is not one of technical language, and any conclusion about it based merely upon some one specific doctrine, such as that of emanation, is necessarily unsatisfactory. When, however, we consider the entire tone and character of Neoplatonism, it is perfectly impossible to consider that it merely continues the line of which Stoicism was the immediately preceding link.

In fact, in so far as Neoplatonism was derived from Greek sources, it was not, in its main bias, the natural development of any then existing philosophy, but was a retrocession, as its name implies, to the original Platonic philosophy; a retrocession, however, in which, while many elements are omitted, others, and especially the religious side, are pressed with a force, a fervour, and a comprehensiveness excelling anything that we find in Plato himself. We have then to inquire why the Alexandrian philosophers were thrown back for their principles to the first seminal ground of all Greek ethical philosophy; why they were forced out of the natural developments of their own age; and why, being so forced back, they resumed the original Platonic impulse so exclusively in the religious line, and resumed it in this line with such force and enthusiasm.

It must be observed that Zeller himself lays great stress on this religious side of Neoplatonism, and he attributes it partly to the example

of Stoicism, partly to the general spirit of the time: "a time," he says, "in which the nations had lost their independence, the popular religions their power, the national forms of culture their peculiar stamp, in part, if not wholly; in which the supports of life on its material, as well as on its spiritual side, had been broken asunder, and the great civilised nations of the world were impressed with the consciousness of their own downfall, and with the prophetic sense of the approach of a new era; a time in which the longing after a new and more satisfying form of spiritual being, a fellowship that should embrace all peoples, a form of belief that should bear men over all the misery of the present, and tranquillise the desires of the soul, was universal" (*Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. v. pp. 391-2). It has already been intimated that the narrow, stern, practical religion of Stoicism cannot rightly be held to be the parent of the enthusiastic, idealistic religion of Plotinus. And with respect to what Zeller says of the general spirit of the age, it is true, no doubt, that there was a general feeling of depression, unrest, and dissatisfaction in the world at this time; it is not true that the remedy was by any means universally looked for in religion, still less in such a religion as Plotinus taught. For instance, no one, perhaps, expressed the sense of dissatisfaction and depression here referred to so powerfully as the great critic Longinus at the close of his treatise "On the Sublime;" but Longinus, notwithstanding his intimate friendship with the leading Neoplatonists, had not imbibed their spirit; and accordingly we find that he looked for the restoration of his age and the removal of its ills, not through the means of a religious revival, but by a return to the ancient republicanism of Athens. Not only did he entertain this opinion theoretically, but he endeavoured to realise it practically under Zenobia at Palmyra, an attempt which led to his own death, a heroic martyr to an ideal of less permanent value than in his enthusiasm he believed. It is needless to say that many had recourse to less worthy remedies, in the way of superstition and magic, or of keen and cold satire, as in the case of Lucian. But if we want to find any religious spirit in that age strong enough and broad enough to be considered as in any way the actuating source of Neoplatonism, we shall find it in Christianity alone.

And it is to Christianity that Vacherot would seem naturally to refer (though whether he intended the reference is uncertain) in the following passage, which goes to the heart of the matter: "It is known by authentic testimony that Platonism was, of all Greek doctrines, the one which obtained least success in the Museum [of Alexandria]. When Ammonius appeared, the schools of the Museum had fallen into the most miserable impotence; no sign of life, no symptom of change announced that a new philosophy would arise there. The impulse came from without. It was the spectacle of the great religious schools of the East in contrast with the pitiable state of Greek philosophy; it was, above all, the inspiration of a new spirit that aroused the Neoplatonism of Alexandria. Far from being its origin and guiding principle, one can scarcely say that the Museum was even the cradle of Neoplatonism" (vol. i. p. 341). Of

the "great religious schools of the East," which Vacherot here mentions, it is undeniable that Christianity was by far the most powerful, by far the most likely to have influenced Neoplatonism.* And when we find that Ammonius, the founder of Neoplatonism, was born a Christian; when we remember the great mutual intercourse between Christian theologians and heathen Platonists at Alexandria, and find that men of such power as Origen and Clement were deeply influenced by Platonism, and could hardly have been so influenced without exercising a reciprocal influence in return; when we find Amelius, the pupil of Plotinus, speaking in highly respectful terms of the doctrine contained in the opening verses of the fourth gospel, it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that the influence here indicated was a real and effective one. But we must be careful not to mistake its nature. How far Ammonius or Plotinus borrowed doctrinal elements from Christianity is uncertain. To the present writer it seems probable that the character of the Supreme Deity in the Neoplatonic system, the emphatic unity attributed to him, and the fatherly relation in which he is said to stand towards men, were suggested—certain that they were strongly promoted—by the kindred elements in Christianity. No one surely can doubt that the strong religious bias in the philosophy of Fichte (a philosophy so much resembling that of Plotinus) was due to Christianity; though Fichte, like Plotinus, appears to seek to found religion on a system of intellectual abstraction which, in truth, it is not easy to reconcile with religious feeling.

Still, as has been said, the amount of direct borrowing which took place on the part of the Neoplatonists from Christian doctrine is an uncertain point. The belief that the trinity of the Neoplatonists was derived from the Christian doctrine of that name, though assumed by Cousin, is an unsafe supposition. It is the indirect influence of Christianity on Neoplatonism which is so important, and which has hitherto been too little noticed. The nature of this influence is indicated precisely by Vacherot in the passage above quoted. The philosophers were kindled by a sense of rivalry; they felt, present in the world and actually working, a power such as they themselves sought to exercise, moralising and ordering the hearts of men; and this stirred them to find a parallel power on their own side, and the nearest approach to it, both in character and degree, was found in Plato. To Plato they attached themselves with the fervour of pupils towards an almost unerring master; but they selected from Plato those elements which lay on the same line as that Christian teaching whose power elicited their rivalry.

At all events, this seems by far the most

* It has been suggested that Buddhism may have been an originating cause of Neoplatonism. But the similarities between the two systems are rather superficial than deep: Buddhism, while far more full of moral teaching, is far less hopeful and enthusiastic than Neoplatonism. And India was too remote from the Roman world to be able to affect it with any powerful impulse, though the Hindoo systems were not unknown in it: they were, however, objects rather of curiosity than of knowledge.

probable account of the religious bias of Neoplatonism, and of the way in which that religious bias overflowed into theoretical philosophy. It is impossible quite certainly to know the whole truth about influences in so remote a past, which must often have been so apt from their nature to be buried in secrecy. But alternative accounts of the matter do not easily suggest themselves. Though, for instance, we might attribute something to the personality of Ammonius or of Plotinus in themselves, some power parallel to that which was exerted by the heroic life and death of Socrates; yet, were this an influence of sufficient force to create by itself a philosophy such as Neoplatonism, it could hardly have helped leaving a mark on history of a kind that we do not now find there. It is to be observed, as an indication that the Alexandrian philosophers were not altogether likely themselves to be able to penetrate into the roots of their own teaching, that, with all their reverence for Plato, the true significance of the personality of Socrates was in a singular degree ignored by them; the great master of Plato is to them nothing more than Plato's dramatic mouthpiece.

In Plotinus, we find Neoplatonism at its very best. It is a system which, in his hands, is far from deserving the disparagement with which it is sometimes mentioned. It is a most unjust accusation against Plotinus to affirm, or imply, that he preferred obscurity for obscurity's sake. A system that deals strenuously with first principles is not often (to judge by the philosophies that have hitherto appeared in the world) easy realising: but it may be questioned if Plotinus, when the true key to his meaning is found, is so difficult as Plato. The comparison is seldom fairly made; the incidental advantages of Plato are so many, in his exquisite dramatic art, in the historical interest which surrounds his personages, in the familiar light which the researches of many generations have shed upon his principal theories, that questions respecting the real meaning of his philosophy are apt to be regarded as in a more subordinate position than is possible in the case of a writer who, like Plotinus, has nothing but his philosophy to depend upon. However this may be, the sincerity and intellectual energy of Plotinus are not to be questioned; and it is impossible, in any account of Neoplatonism, not to give some statement, however brief, of his philosophical position.

God, the highest principle of the universe, is, according to Plotinus, known to us through self-reflection; not indeed through every kind of self-reflection, but through such alone as shews to us the dignity of the spiritual part of our nature as compared with external things. When we know and feel our own worth in respect of our soul, the spontaneous reflection is forced upon us—What is that universal soul which breathes life not only into ourselves, but into all nature, penetrating through all regions of earth, sea, and sky? But next, says Plotinus, when we through our own soul have attained to a right esteem and reverence for the universal soul, the next necessary thought is this—What is that mind and intelligence by which the universal soul receives and preserves its own divine life-giving power? And the last and highest step is this—What is that first single cause, that absolute unity and goodness, from

which, in the Divine nature, even mind and intelligence have their birth? These are the three constituent elements in the Divine nature, as regarded by Plotinus:—first, absolute unity and goodness; secondly, mind or intelligence; thirdly, the life-breathing soul. The whole universe is set in motion, and receives its power from the Divine Being, each member in the hierarchy of existences receiving strength from those above it. (See especially the beginning of the 5th *Ennead*, and for what follows, the 4th and 5th books of the 3rd, and the 3rd and 4th books of the 4th *Ennead*.) Between God, or the absolute First Cause, and man, intervene, first, the high heavenly powers, which, on their spiritual side, come nearest to the pure Divinity, and on their material side are known to us as the starry constellations; and next, the powers (not very satisfactorily defined by Plotinus) which have a superhuman nature, but yet are in part mixed with sensuous elements. There can be little doubt that Plotinus was led to include these superhuman or demonic powers in his system through a leaning to the popular heathen religion, which, however, would not have prevailed with him if it had not been for the great example of Plato. After the demonic powers comes man; lower again than man are the brutes; till true or spiritual existence dwindles into feebleness, and at last vanishes in the realm of mere earthy matter. All spirit, and the human soul among other spirits, is, according to Plotinus, essentially immortal; but it may rise or fall in the scale of existent beings in proportion to its own excellence. Moreover, in every link of this great chain, the higher is perpetually giving strength to the lower, and raising it to its own level; and the highest state to which any being can attain is that intimate union with the supreme God, in which thought and sense are alike swallowed up in a spiritual state more noble than either—a state which Plotinus designated by the name of ecstasy. To this state Plotinus did not think that man could attain, except transiently and occasionally, while he remained in this fleshly life.

Perhaps, even from so brief and imperfect a sketch as the above, it may be seen that the philosophy of Plotinus was one of remarkable power and symmetry. More than that; though it cannot be said to be quite free from fanciful elements, there is a real soberness in the mind of its author; the difficulties connected with the divine self-subsistence and universality, in relation to the individuality of men, though they cannot be said to be solved, are presented in a manner to which little objection can be taken intellectually, and against which no serious charge of irreverence can be brought. Again, though Plotinus was deeply penetrated with the sense of the inferiority of material things to spiritual, he did not allow this sense to blind him to the beauty of the world even on its material side, as is powerfully shewn in his criticism of the Gnostic theories (*Ennead*. ii. 9).

It must be said, however, that Plotinus was by no means so strong on the practical side of his philosophy as he was on the theoretical side. In the inculcation of practical conduct he is as inferior to the Stoics as he is superior to them in enthusiasm and in theoretical completeness. His relation to them was very similar to the

relation of Origen to Augustine, and of the Greek mind to the Roman mind generally. His practical defects reach their climax when he comes to the central point of his whole system, the "ecstasy," or union of the soul with God. When once the possibility of such a state is granted, the question, how to attain it, becomes of transcendent importance. But into this question Plotinus never enters with any seriousness. He tells us, indeed, that we are to retire into ourselves, into the silence of our own hearts. But when this is said, other considerations imperatively press for an answer: How is such a retirement into ourselves to be distinguished from indolence and vanity? How is it related to our conduct in external matters? Is it to be considered an intercourse with God, and if so, is it the same as prayer? For prayer is not unrecognised in his system, though his treatment of this subject too is of the slightest and most theoretical kind. Is it a duty to cultivate this "ecstasy" directly, or is it a reward that comes to us in the fulfilment of our duty? Practical questions of this sort are ignored by Plotinus; and yet the vivifying power of his whole system depends on their answer. And the fact is, that while far from any conscious purpose of undervaluing morality, he yet regards the whole material scene in which we are cast as so low a region, as to think that our conduct in that region needs scarcely any detailed or careful scrutiny from a philosopher. The guidance of feeling, when questions of conduct are put aside, necessarily assumes a bare and abstract form; and bare and abstract the ethical teaching of Plotinus undeniably is. Here it was that Neoplatonism, even at its very best, was so vitally inferior to Christianity. It is in the ground of daily practical life that the most sublime spiritual excellence has its root; this the Neoplatonists never knew; of this Christianity as a whole has never been ignorant.

Perhaps, indeed, the inferior minds among the Neoplatonic philosophers had more discernment of this truth than Plotinus himself, though in the most celebrated of them, such as Porphyry and Jamblichus, the discernment of it was not merely partial, but distorted by an unworthy bias. The practical morality of Neoplatonism, after the death of Plotinus, tended more and more to centre itself in the polemical advocacy of the pagan worship. Nor can there be any mistake as to the reason why this was the case. If it were possible to doubt that the nobler elements of Neoplatonism were kindled by a desire to emulate Christianity, it would still not be possible to entertain a similar doubt with respect to this, its worst side. The alliance of paganism with the Neoplatonic philosophy culminated, as is well known, in the time and in the person of Julian. It is wholly out of the question to suppose that the extraordinary development of ceremonialism which Julian introduced for the honour of Jupiter and Apollo was occasioned by any sudden access of genuine fervour for those deities, or in fact was the result of anything but a resolution to outshine Christianity in religious enthusiasm. Nor is this merely a deduction from the general nature of the case: it is supported by remarkable specific points, both as exhibited by Julian himself and by other more philosophic minds. We know that Julian ardently desired, not merely

philosophic insight, but supernatural power; this led him to take for his ally and counsellor that arrogant dealer in magical arts, Maximus, rather than advisers who professed nothing more than the teaching of wisdom. (See Art. MAXIMUS OF EPHEBUS.) Long before Julian, the attempt to bring the supernatural into close connection with the daily life of man appears in well-known writings of Neoplatonist philosophers; in the lives of Pythagoras by Porphyry and Jamblichus respectively, to which should be added the life of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus (for though Philostratus is rather known as a Pythagorean than as a Neoplatonist philosopher, the two schools were closely connected. See Art. on APOLLONIUS OF TYANA). In all these biographies are found two elements, never seen in Greek or Roman philosophy till Christianity became a power that forced itself on the attention of men: first, the setting up of some individual philosopher, not merely as a teacher however great, but as divinely inspired and exercising command over men by supernatural influence; and secondly, the attribution to such philosopher of miraculous powers. No tenable account has ever been given of such biographies as those here referred to, except that which regards them as composed with the purpose (conscious or unconscious) of intimating, that heathenism could equal Christianity in points in which Christians appealed to the popular mind with a force which no mere exhibition of reasoning powers could pretend to equal. Nor did the tendency here spoken of ever leave Neoplatonism; we find it in the biography of Jamblichus by Eunapius; in the life of Proclus by Marinus.

But though an unworthy rivalry was the original incentive to such representations as those just noticed, and also to the excessive ceremonialism of Julian, it would be incorrect to suppose that the Neoplatonic philosophy was putting any severe or unnatural strain on itself in taking into its system elements such as these. The teaching of Plato himself was so rich in sympathetic power, that it allied itself naturally to cravings of the popular mind which colder reasoners despise, such as the desire for religious association and for ceremonial worship. Thus when Neoplatonism proceeded to press these points on the notice of men, and to treat them as an integral part of its own theory, it had plenty of sanction in its inherited doctrines for such a course, though the immediate impulse came from an external quarter. The following passage from Vacherot puts the natural affinities of Neoplatonism for mystic ceremonial religion very strikingly, though it must not be taken as exhibiting the whole case.

"The Alexandrian philosophy soon allowed itself to be drawn into extravagance and superstition. . . We of this age can scarcely comprehend how a philosophical school could lend itself seriously to such a part. But our surprise is due to our judgment of oriental philosophy being framed on the lines of the modern spirit. That philosophy bridged over the gulf which separates the world of sense from the world of intellectual truth by an innumerable multitude of powers of every nature and rank, and supposed an intercourse more or less intimate to exist between man and these powers. Why then

should it not have accepted, with the necessary reserves, the belief in the gods? Was it so difficult for it to see in the apparition of a God the communication with such or such a power? The soul of man, in the teaching of the Alexandrians, is distinct but not separate from the divinity; it touches the divinity on all sides of its nature. It possesses the faculties which enable it to communicate with the divine in every degree of the intervening scale. By ecstasy, it unites with the supreme God; by pure thought it enters into relations with the world of intellectual truth; by the soul and the imagination, it has communion with deities, genii, heroes and all the intermediate powers which transmit life and light to the natural world. What then is there surprising in the fact that the philosopher sacrifices, invokes or evokes supernatural powers at his need, just as the priest does? . . . The creed of the Alexandrians bases itself on the identity of religious belief with philosophic doctrine. . . . Its extravagances and superstitions have their origin entirely in the philosophy itself." (Translated from Vacherot, vol. ii. pp. 147-9.)

True it is, as Vacherot here states, that the Neoplatonic philosophy was invoked to aid, and naturally did aid, the Neoplatonic theurgy, with its splendid ritual and its vaunted miracles. But it is going too far to say, as Vacherot does, that the philosophy was the parent of the theurgy and the ritual. The tokens are not those of true parentage. The philosophy had subtle affinities for the ritual; but those affinities would not have been brought into active manifestation had not a grosser and more powerful motive come into play. And that motive was, the desire to maintain the imperial supremacy of Rome on the spiritual as well as on the material side, and the consequent jealousy of Christianity, and attempts to rival the peculiar power which Christianity exerted. It is impossible of course not to treat this aspect of Neoplatonism (which is remarkably absent from Plotinus) as one much to be regretted.

It would, indeed, be unjust to judge of the whole series of Neoplatonic philosophers after Plotinus by these points of their practice. They have this merit, that they preserved the good elements of philosophy, as well as its lapses; its free spirit of inquiry, its tolerance, the sense of duty and reverence for the past inspired by it. Yet, if they preserved much of this, they added nothing; the whole substance of Neoplatonism is contained in Plotinus, and in Plotinus alone. The additions and expansions of Jamblichus, and the much more elaborate ones of Proclus, contain no new element; if they are not purely arbitrary, they rest at all events on quite superficial grounds. It may be suspected, as Zeller suggests, that a religious motive, namely a desire to introduce some stronger support for polytheism than any which Plotinus had given, was what induced Proclus to frame in his philosophy the hypothesis of the independent unities, which are subordinate to the supreme unity.

But if Neoplatonism had no fresh developments (in the true sense of that word) after Plotinus, it had an important history; and it is necessary briefly to sketch the leading elements of this, and the characteristics of the chief members of the school. Porphyry (about A.D. 233 to A.D.

305), the ablest pupil of Plotinus, was the first in whom the bias of antagonism to Christianity appeared, and the philosopher in whom of all others it appeared most keenly. It is indeed in this relation that Porphyry is chiefly known; and though we cannot tell what effect his attack on Christianity had in the way of actually promoting the cause of paganism, the manner in which he is mentioned by the Christian fathers proves that his treatise *Against the Christians* possessed more than ordinary learning and acuteness. The treatise itself, however, does not survive, and what we know of it is mainly derived from the references made by Jerome and Eusebius. We may infer from what Augustine tells us (*De Civ. Dei*, xix. 23. 2) that Porphyry would not have been unwilling to set Christ on a level with such a philosopher as his own hero, Pythagoras; this is in the ordinary eclectic manner which prevailed so largely at that epoch, both in philosophy and religion. In respect of his own philosophy, Porphyry is rather to be considered as the populariser of Plotinus; not that he was equal to his master in comprehensiveness or real soberness (as of course he fell far short of him in originality); but he had the advantage in clearness of style, and he knew what ordinary men would understand. When he expresses his own feelings of religion and duty, as in the epistle to his wife Marcella, he does it not without dignity and simplicity.

It is a descent from Porphyry to his pupil Jamblichus; for in Jamblichus we first find definitely that admixture of the crudities of the pagan religion with philosophic research of which so much mention has been made above. The extraordinary reputation of Jamblichus in his own and succeeding ages, is not justified by any of his extant writings; but where so much has been lost, it would be unfair to insist too much on the weakness of that which has been preserved.

But it is in the emperor Julian (A.D. 331 to A.D. 363) and his philosophic friends that Neoplatonism goes down to its nadir. The, in many respects, strong and admirable character of Julian cannot disguise from any one the fact that he lent an enthusiastic aid to a religious system of the most contemptible kind; and that his philosophy shared in many respects the faults of that religion.

When paganism was finally overthrown, and incapable of developing on any large scale into that system of theurgic, mystic, and magical rites in which Julian delighted, there is a certain revival of excellence among the philosophers of the Neoplatonic school. This is most pleasingly shewn in Hierocles, who lived in the first part of the fifth century, and whose adherence to the pagan religion is supposed, with some reason, to have subjected him to persecution. But, to judge from his extant writings, the paganism of Hierocles had in it very little of superstition or even of excessive ceremonial; his religious doctrines are of an extremely pure character, and his morality is of that benevolent, self-sacrificing, yet not ascetic type which we are accustomed to think of as the natural product of Christianity.

Of a different spirit was Proclus (slightly later than Hierocles, A.D. 412 to A.D. 485), though he too appears to have suffered for his adherence

to paganism (less severely, however, than Hierocles). Of all the Neoplatonic school Proclus was the greatest and most persevering systematiser, the writer most determined to let no element drop which his predecessors had insisted on. If those elements had been universally trustworthy, such systematisation could still not have been satisfactory without the most penetrating insight. But when it is remembered that the Neoplatonic system had before his time been subjected not merely to arbitrary philosophical accretions, but also mixed and entangled with the follies of a decaying religion, the task which Proclus set himself may well be thought a hopeless one. Nevertheless, modern critics have not spoken unfavourably of Proclus; though no one has been found to second the bold opinion of Cousin, that in Proclus all the rays of ancient philosophy, from Orpheus to Zeno and Plotinus, are concentrated and re-emitted. But that Proclus was a laborious and conscientious student there can be no doubt; as also that the asceticism which he practised (though like the monastic asceticism it does not meet the approval of the present age) was the proof of a sincere and self-denying spirit. He closes the line of important Neoplatonic philosophers; of Simplicius and Olympiodorus it will suffice to mention the names. Nevertheless, a last ray of the philosophy lingered in the celebrated and unfortunate Boethius; whose undeserved death, noble character, and touching treatise *De Consolatione*, form a not uninteresting or unworthy close to a philosophy of mixed though striking character.

Though almost all the names connected with the Neoplatonic philosophy are heathen, and though the philosophy itself was turned into one of the great bulwarks of falling paganism, the names of Boethius, and long before him, of Proaeresius (the instructor of Eunapius) are probable exceptions; that of Synesius, the well-known bishop of Cyrene, a certain exception.

The connexion of Neoplatonism with Christianity may be summed up in the following way. About the beginning of the third century, ancient philosophy was kindled into new and sudden life in Alexandria, through influences of which it is reasonable to believe that Christianity was an important part; and was thus led to strike backwards into regions which had been long ago left behind, the original Platonic channel, which of all ancient philosophies had most of that freshness and enthusiasm, that feeling after a higher world, which the heathen saw among Christians. For some time, Christianity and Platonism went side by side in peace. It might have been hoped that with men like Clement and Origen on the one side, and Ammonius and Plotinus on the other, religion and philosophy might have been reconciled and coalesced. But that did not happen; on both sides a recession took place; and philosophy became the bitter rival and opponent, with more and more deepening antagonism, of the rising religion. The crisis took place in Julian's time; it ended in the thorough defeat of philosophy, which had attached itself to paganism. After that time philosophy, though not without writers worthy of esteem, has no fresh or original spring; and it at last succumbs without a struggle, partly to arbitrary despotic suppression, partly to the growing darkness of the middle ages.

The principal recent authorities on Neoplatonism are Jules Simon and Vacherot, in their respective histories of the Alexandrian school, and Zeller, in his fifth volume of *Die Philosophie der Griechen*. See also Bouillet's translation of Plotinus into French (Paris, 1859). Richter's *Neuplatonische Studien* (Halle, 1867), and Kirchner's *Die Philosophie des Plotin* (Halle, 1854). See, further, the articles on AMMONIUS SACCAS, PLOTINUS, PORPHYRY, JAMBlichUS, HIEROCLES, PROCLUS, and EUNAPIUS in the present dictionary. [J. R. M.]

NEOPTOLEMUS, a gentleman of rank to whom Theodoret wrote a consolatory letter on the death of his wife. (Theod. *Ep.* 18.) [E. V.]

NEOTERIUS (1) (NEOTHERIUS), identified as the praefect in A.D. 385 (Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 508-510; *Cod. Theod.* i. pp. cxx. sq.), who in vain urged upon St. Ambrose the giving up of the church of Portiana, in Milan, at the order of the empress Justina for the Arians. (Ambrosius, *Ep.* xx. ap. *Pat. Lat.* t. xvi. 995; Tillemont, x. 168; Ceillier, v. 384.) [J. G.]

NEOTERIUS (2), count, addressed by Meletius of Mopsuestia from his exile at Meletina, A.D. 436 (*Synod. adv. Tragoed.* cap. 141, Baluz. *Conc.* 842). [J. G.]

NEPHALIUS, an abbat of a monastery near Gaza, one of the heads of the moderate Eutychian party. In 487 he went to Constantinople and complained to the emperor Zeno of the violent proceedings of Peter Mongus in Egypt. He was sent to Alexandria in company with the governor Arsenius to promote healing measures, but with no result (*Evag. H. E.* iii. 22). Nephalius afterwards deserted the Eutychians and held a dispute with Severus, who was then in his monastery. Nephalius and his party triumphed and Severus was expelled. (*Evag.* iii. 33; *Tillem.* xvi. 378, 684.) [C. H.]

NEPOS (1), an Egyptian bishop in the latter part of the first half of the 3rd century. He was the leading champion of the Millenarians in that country, and wrote a book called a "Refutation of the Allegorists," in which he confuted those who gave an allegorical interpretation to the passages in the book of Revelation which seem to speak of a reign of our Lord upon this earth for a thousand years. Soon after the death of Nepos, the influence which his book had gained caused it to be made the subject, first of a *vis à voce* discussion, afterwards of a formal treatise by DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA (see that article). Dionysius, though combating the views of Nepos, speaks of him with the highest respect for his piety and his knowledge of the Scriptures, and in particular gratefully acknowledges the service he had rendered the church by the composition of hymns, in which many of the brethren took great delight (*Euseb. H. E.* vii. 24). [CHILLASTIS.] [G. S.]

NEPOS (2), JULIUS, the last but one of the Roman emperors of the West. He was the nephew of Marcellinus the patrician, and apparently inherited the whole or part of his uncle's Dalmatian principality. The emperor Leo gave him in marriage the niece of the empress Verina (Jornandes, *De Regn. Success.*), and con-

ferred on him the rank of emperor. As Leo died in January 474, this must have been at latest at the end of 473. He was first proclaimed emperor at Ravenna by Domitianus, an officer of Leo, and, after vanquishing his predecessor Glycerius [GLYCERIUS (8)], was proclaimed at Rome, June 24, 474. His short reign did not justify the praises and the hopes of Sidonius (*Epist.* v. 16 and viii. 7 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 546, 598). Almost his only recorded act is the cession of Auvergne and its brave defenders to the Visigoths [EURIC (1)]. The following year, Orestes the patrician entered Ravenna, at his approach on August 28 (*Chronicon Cuspinianum*) Nepos fled to Salona in Dalmatia, where he retained his hereditary principality, and perhaps some other fragments of the Western Empire, with the title of emperor. The only attempt he made to regain his throne seems to have been to send an embassy to the emperor Zeno, in 477 or 478, entreating his assistance. Zeno gave him fair words, but no substantial help (Malchus, p. 236, ed. Dindorf). In 480 he was murdered, May 9, in his own villa near Salona by Viator and Ovida (Marcellinus, *Chronicon*, in *Patr. Lat.* li. 932). According to one account his predecessor was implicated in his death. [GLYCERIUS (8).] [F. D.]

NEPOTIANI. [NEPOS (1).]

NEPOTIANUS (1), FLAVIUS POPILIUS (Ducange, *Fam. Byzant.* 85), son of Eutropia, who was sister of Constantine the Great. His father was perhaps the Nepotian who was consul in A.D. 301, and he himself was probably consul in A.D. 336.

In the troubled year that followed the death of Constans and the usurpation of Magnentius (A.D. 350), he made a bold attempt to seize the empire. On the 3rd June (Idatius, *Fasti*), he assumed the purple near Rome, assembled a band of desperadoes and gladiators, marched against the city, defeated with great slaughter Anicetus, the praetorian prefect, and made himself master of Rome. He used his victory cruelly; the houses, streets, and temples were filled with blood and corpses, and the prefect himself was put to death. His triumph, however, was a short one; Magnentius sent against him Marcellinus the master of the offices, who defeated and killed him on the 1st of July, and his head was struck off and carried about the city on a pole. (Zosimus, ii. 43; Victor *de Caes.* 42, and *Epit.* 42; Eutropius, x. 11.) [F. D.]

NEPOTIANUS (2), bishop of Clermont in Auvergne (Greg. Tur. *Glor. Conf.* cap. 37, *Hist. Fr.* i. 41); believed to have died Oct. 22, 388. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 22 Oct. ix. 613; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 228; Tillem. viii. 126, xiv. 129.) [C. H.]

NEPOTIANUS (3), a presbyter at Alitium, under his uncle Heliodorus, the bishop of that place. His death in 396 elicited an interesting letter from Jerome to Heliodorus. It relates his relinquishment of a military life in favour of voluntary poverty and monachism, which he intended to pursue in Egypt, Mesopotamia, or the solitudes of the Dalmatian islands; his ordination, from which at first his modesty greatly shrank; and finally his intense and

unwearied devotion to his pastoral duties. One of Jerome's letters (ep. 52, ed. Vall.), *De Vita Clericorum et Monachorum*, A.D. 394, is addressed to Nepotianus. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Mai. ii. 627; Tillem. viii. 402, xi. 536, xii. 13, 29, 31, 150-155, 200-202; Ceill. vii. 603, 605, 606.) [HELIODORUS (7).] [C. H.]

NEREUS, martyr with Achilleus in the reign of Trajan. The priest of a church dedicated to their memory at Rome subscribes a decree of Gregory the Great (*Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 1339; Mansi, x. 488). See more under NEREUS in *D. C. A.* and Tillem. i. 189, 316, ii. 127. [C. H.]

NERIANUS, nobleman, addressed in a false decretal attributed to pope Anastasius. (Isidor. Mercat. *Decret. Coll.* ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cxxx. 693; Tillem. xii. 257; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vi. 94, discussing its sources.) [J. G.]

NERIENDA, one of the abbesses mentioned in a spurious charter of Wihtred king of Kent, c. 604; but for the reading "Aebbam et Neriendam," another is "et Aebbam reverendam." (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 246.) [C. H.]

NERO (1), CLAUDIUS CAESAR, emperor (13th October, A.D. 54-9th June, A.D. 68). For the purposes of the present work the interest of Nero's life centres in his persecution of the Christians. For the general history of his reign, see Merivale, c. lii.-lv. During the early part of it, Christianity was unmolested and seems to have spread rapidly at Rome. No doubt it received a great impetus from the preaching of St. Paul during the two years that followed his arrival, which probably occurred early in A.D. 61. For a prisoner of his rank, he appears to have been treated kindly and to have met with no hindrance in his work. But before long a terrible storm was to burst on the infant church.

On the night of the 16th of July, A.D. 64, a fire broke out among the wooden booths and shops that were built against the Circus Maximus in the valley between the Palatine and the Aventine. That part of the city contained no great houses or temples of solid masonry to resist the flames, but consisted of a crowded mass of humble dwellings and shops full of inflammable contents. Thus the fire soon got such a hold, that all attempts to check its progress were vain. The lower parts of the city became a sea of flame, which occasionally swept over parts of the hills themselves. For six days the fire raged till it reached the foot of the Esquiline, where it was stopped at last by pulling down a number of houses, and thus leaving a vacant space in front of it. Soon afterwards a second fire broke out in the gardens of Tigellinus near the Pincian, and raged for three days in the northern parts of the city. Though the loss of life was less than in the first fire, the destruction of temples and public buildings was more serious. By the two fires, three of the fourteen regions into which Rome was divided were utterly destroyed, four escaped entirely, in the remaining seven but few houses were left standing. Nero was at Antium when the fire broke out, and did not return to Rome till it had almost reached the vast edifice which he had constructed to

connect his palace on the Palatine with the gardens of Maecenas on the Esquiline.

Though judicious measures were taken both for the immediate relief of the houseless and starving multitude, and for the restoration of the city on a regular plan, and with materials better adapted to resist future fires, and though various ceremonies were performed to appease the offended gods, the horrible suspicion that Nero himself was the author of the fire gained strength. This is asserted as a positive fact by Suetonius (c. 38), Dion (lxii. 16), and Pliny the Elder (xvii. 1), the last being a contemporary, but Tacitus alludes to it only as a prevalent rumour. Whether it was well founded or not, and whether, supposing it to be true, the emperor's motive was to clear away the crooked, narrow streets of the old town in order to rebuild it on a new and regular plan, or whether it was a mere freak of madness, need not be discussed here. At any rate Nero found it necessary to discover some scapegoats to divert from himself the rage of the people. For this purpose he selected the Christians.

The only author who lived near the time of the persecution that gives an account of it is Tacitus. As the passage is short and obscure, and has been the subject of various interpretations, it seems best first to give a translation of it, and then to notice the various explanations that have been proposed. After describing the origin of the sect he proceeds as follows:—"First were arrested those who confessed (*correpti qui fatebantur*), then on their information a vast multitude was convicted, not so much on the charge of arson as for their hatred of the human race. Their deaths were made more cruel by the mockery that accompanied them. Some were covered with the skins of wild beasts and torn to pieces by dogs; others perished on the cross or in the flames; and others again were burnt after sunset as torches to light up the darkness. Nero himself granted his gardens (on the Vatican) for the show, and gave an exhibition in the circus, and, dressed as a charioteer, mixed with the people or drove his chariot himself. Thus, guilty and deserving the severest punishment as they were, yet they were pitied, as they seemed to be put to death, not for the benefit of the state but to gratify the cruelty of an individual" (*Ann.* xv. 44). This brief narrative has been the subject of the most various interpretations. Gibbon (c. xvi.) was the first to put forward as a conjecture that the persons who really suffered were not Christians but Jews. Though the general body of Jews might have been protected by Poppaea's influence, it might easily have been suggested, he argues, that the sect of Galileans which had arisen among them was capable of the most horrid crimes. He then goes on to assume a confusion between two classes known as Galileans, namely, the Christians and the Zealots who followed Judas the Gaulonite. The latter sect being extinguished in the ruins of Jerusalem, Tacitus transferred their guilt and sufferings to the Christians.

Merivale, c. liv., without going so far, suggests that the turbulent Jews, who were notorious for their appeals to the name of Christ as an expected prince, were the first objects of suspicion; when some were arrested and questioned, not so much as to the burning as to their political

creed, they sought to implicate the Christians in the same charge; and that the true Christians, thus associated in the charge of Christ-worship, avowed the fact in their own sense, a sense which their judges did not care to discriminate; and that finally the historian, finding that the name of Christ was the common shibboleth of the victims, imagined that the persecution was directed against the Christians only.

Lightfoot on the other hand (*Philippians* 24-27) considers that the Christians were at this time sufficiently numerous and conspicuous to attract the fury of the populace. He further adduces the evidence of the Apocalypse, and inquires how the language applied to Babylon, by which Rome is meant, can be explained if the Neronian persecution be a figment of later date.

The German critics are no less divided, and here we may notice one of the ambiguities presented by the passage in Tacitus. What is the meaning of "*fatebantur*"? Is it "first were arrested those who confessed they were Christians, who openly confessed Christianity," or "first were arrested those who confessed they were guilty of the burning;" and there is a minor doubt as to the right translation of "*correpti*." Merivale translates it "arrested," but it may also bear the Tacitean sense of "accused." The second explanation is adopted by Schiller (*Geschichte des Röm. Kaiserreichs unter Nero*, 435). He argues that "*fateri*" in Tacitus is always used of the confession of a crime. According to his view, as many of the shops near the circus where the fire originally broke out were occupied by Jews, suspicion would fall upon them, which would be strengthened by the fact that the Transiberine, the Ghetto of that time, was one of the few quarters that had escaped the fire. At that time Jews and Christians lived in the same part of the town and in the same manner. Some Orientals were probably arrested on suspicion and put to the question; by torture and promises of pardon an admission of their guilt was extorted, with the names of their accomplices; while some of the fanatical Jews may voluntarily have made confession in the hopes of thereby extinguishing Christianity. Possibly too, some faithless Christians may have made a similar confession to regain the good opinion of the Romans. He treats the proceedings as being purely a measure of police, pointing out that Suetonius (c. 16) refers to the persecution merely incidentally among a number of police regulations, and argues that if religion had been the motive Nero would have referred the matter to the senate.

Nipperdey on the other hand, the latest editor of Tacitus, with Weizsäcker and Holtzmann (*Hist. Zeitschrift*, xxxii. 13), adopts the first interpretation of "*fatebantur*." Thus Weizsäcker (*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, xxi. 269, &c.) considers that Nero and his advisers having decided to select the Christians as the victims of the popular indignation, those were first seized who were conspicuous members of the sect, some of whom, no doubt, were already known to the police. They were then charged as incendiaries, and from them the names of others were ascertained, and these were then treated in the same way. Thus a vast number were arrested, so many that they could not all have been guilty of arson. We are here

parenthetically cautioned against supposing that any real confession of the crime was made either under torture or through Jewish hatred of the Christians. The charge of arson thus breaking down, that of "odium humani generis" was brought forward, and it was on this they were convicted. On what grounds could such a charge be based; on their practice or their doctrine? As to the former, the mind of the historian may indeed have been coloured by the calumnies of a later date, the *θυεστία δέικνα*, and the like, but it is not unlikely that such dark rumours were already current, and inflamed the passions of the mob. Still the expression, "odium humani generis," is too vague, had the trial been decided for such reasons, while a superficial examination of their doctrines would supply ample grounds for the conviction which had been previously determined. One of the beliefs most cherished and insisted upon by the early Christian was that the end of the world was close at hand when all things should perish in the flames. Such a doctrine was sufficient justification of "odium humani generis," and it was consistent that those who believed in the approaching destruction of the world by fire should anticipate it by burning the chief city of the world. Thus though arson was the crime for which they were put on their trial, it was not that for which they were convicted. Though the original charge had broken down, yet enough had transpired on the trial to shew that they deserved to be punished, and accordingly they were found guilty. A regular trial was necessary for Nero's purpose, and the more formal it was, the better it would clear his character. Thus though the Christianity of the victims was not directly the cause of their sufferings, yet indirectly it was in two ways. The fact that their religion was hated and evil spoken of was, in the first place, the cause that they were selected by Nero and his advisers as scapegoats; and in the next, the original charge having broken down, the cause of their condemnation was not indeed the circumstance that they belonged to a particular religion, but the character with which they were invested in the eyes of the public by the mere fact of their belonging to it.

In such a conflict of authorities it seems impossible to arrive at any positive conclusion, but it may be proper to indicate as shortly as possible the view that seems most probable.

Nero, in search of some victims to divert the popular indignation from himself, selected the Christians. Why he did so must remain uncertain. The Jews, who at first sight would seem more likely to be chosen, as being more conspicuous and probably more unpopular, were in the first place protected by their influence at court [ΠΟΡΡΑΕΑ], and in the next they were strong enough to make even Nero think twice about attacking them. A Jewish persecution in Rome might excite a dangerous revolt in Judaea. A variety of causes on the other hand might point out the Christians as convenient objects for the emperor's purpose. While they were conspicuous and numerous enough to furnish a plentiful supply of victims, they were too few and weak to be formidable. Possibly the Jewish influence at court which has been alluded to may have thrown its weight into the scale. The

predictions current among the Christians of the approaching destruction of the world may have lent a colour to the accusation, and some of them may have incautiously expressed their satisfaction at the destruction of so many heathen temples, which must have appeared to them as an anticipation of the approaching catastrophe. The victims thus being selected, Weizsäcker's account of the subsequent proceedings against them seems on the whole to be fairly probable.

From the allusions of St. Clement (Epistle to the Corinthians, c. 6), a little more information can be obtained. Like Tacitus, he speaks of the vast multitude, and mentions that women underwent terrible and unholy tortures. From the MS. reading of the passage (*διὰ ζήλος διωχθείσαι γυναῖκες Δανάδες καὶ Δίρκαι, αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι*), it has been supposed that they were tortured to death on the stage or in the circus, being compelled to represent various mythological stories ending in the death of the performer. Such scenes were not uncommon on the Roman stage, e.g. a Hercules was represented burning to death in the fatal Nessus shirt (Tert. *Apol.* 15), or an Orpheus being torn to pieces by a bear (Mart. *Spect.* xxi.), and the account agrees well with the expression of Tacitus, *percutibus addita ludibria*. The famous group at Naples generally known as the Farnese Bull, shews how the myth of Dirce might be adapted for such a purpose; it represents her being tied by Amphion and Zethus to the horns of a wild bull. On the other hand no plausible conjecture has been made as to how the story of the Danaids could be scenically represented so as to serve as a means of torture, and if St. Clement's meaning was that women in the characters of Danaids and Dirces suffered tortures, the form of expression he has chosen seems very strange and unnatural. For these reasons Bishop Wordsworth has conjectured *γυναῖκες, νεάνιδες, παιδίσκαι*. This reading is approved by the bishop of Durham, by Bunsen, and by Lipsius (Lightfoot, 51 and 409). The meaning would then be wives, tender maidens, even slave-girls. M. Renan (*L'Antechrist*, 167-181) expands these two words into fourteen pages.

Was the persecution confined to Rome, or did it extend to the rest of the empire? There is little evidence in favour of the latter conclusion. The acts of the saints who are mentioned by Tillemont (*Mén. Eccl.* ii. 73-89) are all more or less fabulous, and assuming them to be authentic there seems to be little or no ground for placing them in the reign of Nero. Renan (*L'Antechrist*, 183) argues that the persecution must have extended to Asia Minor, from the allusions in the Apocalypse, especially in the epistles to the seven churches. But to support this inference, first the theory that the Apocalypse was written in the reign of Galba must be adopted, and, even if this were established, the allusions in question may be explained without assuming that a regular persecution was commanded. The accounts in the Acts of the missionary journeys of St. Paul shew how easily an outbreak of popular fury might be excited by Jews or heathens, who either on religious or private grounds, were hostile to the new doctrine, and how easily in such an outbreak a conspicuous Christian might be murdered without any edict against

Christianity being issued by the state, or indeed without the public authorities interfering at all, and also it is not unreasonable to suppose that, when Nero set the example of persecution, many of the provincial magistrates would take a harsher view in the case of any Christian that might be brought before them than they had previously done. As for inscriptions, that given by Cyriac of Ancona as found in some unknown place in Spain has long been considered a forgery (*Corpus Inscript.* ii. 25*).

An attempt has been made to find an allusion to the Neronian persecution in a graffiti discovered at Pompeii in 1862, an account of which is given by M. Anb  (*Pers cutions de l' glise*, 415-421). But in the first place the only word in the inscription which is legible with certainty is *Christianos*, and in the next place it apparently must have been traced shortly before the destruction of the city in A.D. 79, that is ten years at least after the end of Nero's reign.

There finally remain the late testimonies of Orosius, vii. 7, and Sulpicius Severus, ii. 29. But they wrote many centuries after these events and at a time when the idea of a general proscription of Christianity was familiar. Against their evidence is to be set the silence of contemporary history, and especially the fact that Tacitus in his narrative seems to consider that the only places where Christians were then found were Judaea and Rome.

A few words remain to be said on the question of the connection between Nero and Antichrist, which has been lately brought into prominence by the interesting work of M. Renan. The significance of the Neronian persecution lies in the fact that it was the first. Hitherto the attitude of the state officials to Christianity had on the whole been favourable; at the worst they treated it with contemptuous indifference. All this was now suddenly changed. The head of the state has made a ferocious attack on the infant church. Henceforth the two powers are to be in antagonism more or less violent till the struggle of 250 years is closed by the conversion of Constantine. Whatever be the date of the Apocalypse, it can hardly be doubted that the Neronian persecution with all its horrors was vividly present to the mind of the author.

To have perished obscurely by his own hand seemed both to Pagans and Christians too common-place an end for a monster who for fourteen years had filled such a place in the eyes and the minds of men. Such a career seemed to demand a more dramatic, a more striking termination. At the same time few had witnessed his death, so that the notion easily arose that he was still alive, had taken refuge with the Parthians, and would reappear again. Tacitus mentions two instances (*Hist.* i. 2, ii. 8-9) of the appearance of false Neros, and Suetonius (c. 56) alludes to another. In the days of his prosperity diviners had predicted his fall, and had added that he would gain a new dominion in the East and Jerusalem and would at last regain the empire (Suetonius, c. 40).

According to the theory of M. Reuss (*Histoire de la Th ologie Chr tienne*, i. 429-452), adopted by Renan, the Apocalypse was written during the reign of Galba, that is at the end of A.D. 68 or the beginning of A.D. 69, when men's

minds were agitated, especially in Asia Minor, by the appearance of a false Nero in the island of Cythnus (*Tac. Hist.* ii. 8). M. Reuss interprets the first six heads of the first beast as the emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero, and Galba, of whom the first five were dead, while the sixth, Galba, was then on the throne. As the latter was then seventy-three his reign must soon terminate; then a seventh was to follow and reign for a short time, and then one of the preceding emperors who was supposed to be dead was to reappear as Antichrist. The first four emperors had not been hostile to the Christians, and none of them, except Caius, had perished by a violent death. Nero therefore is the only one that answers the description. Finally M. Reuss interprets the number of the beast as the numerical value of the letters composing the words *N ron K isarap* when written in Hebrew, and explains the existence of the ancient various reading 616 by supposing it was due to a Latin reader who had found the solution, but pronounced the name Nero and not Neron, the omission of the final *n* making the difference of 50.

Whether this theory be well founded or not, it is certain that the opinion that Nero would return again as Antichrist continued for centuries. Commodianus, who probably wrote about A.D. 250, alludes to it (xli. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* v. 231), and even in the fifth century St. Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xx. 19, in *Patr. Lat.* xli. 686) mentions that some then believed he would rise again and reappear as Antichrist, and that others thought he had never died, but would appear again at the appointed time, and recover his kingdom. Another view was that Nero would reappear again, but would be distinct from Antichrist and would be his precursor. (*Lact. Mortes 2*, Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* ii. 14 in *Patr. Lat.* vii. 197, xx. 211.) [F. D.]

NERO (2), magister and ex-consul, addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 319 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.), who predicts that his wickedness will not go unpunished. (Tillem. xiv. 198.) [C. H.]

NERSAN, a Persian nobleman who apostatised from Christianity in the reign of Sapor, and perished miserably (*Boll. Acta SS.* 9 Apr. i. 825, § 3; Tillem. vii. 95, 96.) [C. H.]

NERSAPUS, bishop of Daron in Armenia, and the great supporter of the Julianist section of the Monophysite party in that country. (Le Quien, i. 1424.) [G. T. S.]

NERSAS, bishop and martyr in Persia. *Vid. D. C. A.*

NERSES. [NORSESES.]

NERVA, Roman emperor, A.D. 96-98. M. Cocceius Nerva was the third in succession of a family conspicuous for legal and administrative power in the first century of the empire. His grandfather, eminent as a jurist, had been consul under Tiberius (*Tac. Ann.* iv. 58, vi. 26) in A.D. 22, was the emperor's chosen companion, and starved himself to death in A.D. 33. His father was consulted as an advocate at the age of seventeen, and is mentioned by Tacitus as a

praetor designatus. The future emperor was born A.D. 32 at Narnia in Umbria, but the family is said to have been originally from Crete (Aurel. Vict. *Epit.* xii.). In conformity with the traditions of the family he acquired a civil rather than a military reputation, and was consul with Vespasian A.D. 71, and with Domitian in A.D. 90. On the assassination of Domitian by Stephanus, the freedman and agent of Domitilla, he was elected as emperor by the soldiers, the people and the senate, and his reign was distinguished by a reversal of the policy of his predecessor. The connexion of Stephanus with Domitilla, if we accept the tradition that she and Flavius Clemens were Christians [DOMITIAN] may indicate that the movement that placed Nerva on the throne of the empire was in part, at least, designed to further a more tolerant system of government than that which had prevailed under Domitian. Such, at any rate, was its effect. St. John was recalled from his exile in Patmos (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20). The crowd of *delatores*, who, under the heads of treason, atheism and Judaism, had preferred accusations which, in the nature of the case, fell most heavily on the Christians, were banished, and those who had been sent to prison or exile on these charges were recalled and set at liberty. Other measures of the emperor, though not distinctly Christian, tended in the same direction. Provision was made for the poor by the purchase and cultivation of lands. Institutions, afterwards supported and enlarged by Trajan, were founded for the education of orphans and destitute children in the cities of Italy. The prohibition of the growing practice of castration indicated a higher morality (Dion Cass. lviii. 2). The conspiracy of Calpurnius Crassus, a man of senatorial rank, and the demands of the Praetorian Guard, headed by their prefect, Aelianus Casperius, for the punishment of the murderers of Domitian, a demand to which the emperor reluctantly yielded by the execution of Petronius Secundus and Parthianus (Plin. *Panegy.* c. 6; Aurel. Vict. *Epit.* 12; Dion Cass. lviii. 3), made him feel the necessity of associating a younger man with him in the cares of government, and his choice fell on M. Ulpius TRAJANUS, then in command of the legions on the Rhine. In connexion with a victory obtained in Pannonia, Nerva took the title of Germanicus, conferred the same distinction on Trajan, together with the title of Caesar and the *Tribunicia potestas*, and the two were elected as consuls in A.D. 98. In the course of the same year he died after a short illness, was carried to the sepulchre of Augustus on the shoulders of the senators, and his memory honoured by the customary apotheosis which added the title of *Divus* to his name. The reputation which he left behind him is best summed up in the words of Tacitus, who speaks of his reign as having opened the "*beatissimum saeculum*," which included the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian and the Antonines, and of the emperor himself as having united "*res olim dissociabiles, principatum ac libertatem*" (Vit. Agric. c. 3). [E. H. P.]

NESTABUS, martyr. [EUSEBIUS (113).]

NESTEROS. [NISTEROUS.]

NESTOR. See also under NESTORIUS.

NESTOR (1) (*Νέστορ*) a confessor at Gaza, who died of wounds inflicted by the populace in the reign of Julian. (Soz. v. 9.) [C. H.]

NESTOR (2), a gladiator, martyred under Maximian, according to Simeon Metaphrastes (Surius, *De Prob. SS. Hist.* 8 Oct., pp. 107, 108, num. vii.-ix.; Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Oct. iv. 60). Tillemont (v. 638) comments on the narrative, which he calls fabulous and scandalous. [C. H.]

NESTOR (3), bishop of Tarsus, one of those banished from their sees in 489 by the emperor Zeno, as related by Theophanes (*Chronog.* sub. A.C. 482). The text, which is here confused, gives his see incorrectly, but the Latin of Anastasius Bibliothecarius amends it (*Pat. Gr.* cviii. 325, 1239). [C. H.]

NESTOR (4), Feb. 14, bishop of Trimitus in Cyprus, placed by Le Quien (ii. 1070) before 680 (cf. Boll. *Acta SS.* 7 Mart. i. 643). [C. H.]

NESTORIANISM. (The adherents of this party were named Simoniani by an edict of the emperor Theodosius. They reject the name Nestorians, and call themselves Chaldaeans.) Nestorianism was the heresy which marked the earlier portion of the 5th century, as Arianism marked the earlier portion of the 4th century. It marked, too, one of the great stages on the road towards that complete Christological conception to which the church has since clung. We shall discuss the subject in the following order: I. The sources of Nestorianism and its relation to previous heresies. II. Its rise and progress to the council of Ephesus. III. Its subsequent history within the empire till the suppression of the school of Edessa by the emperor Zeno, A.D. 489. IV. Nestorianism in Persia.

I. As to the sources of Nestorianism and relation to previous heresies we may describe it as a reaction against Apollinarianism. Nestorianism was a product of the school of Antioch. The school of Antioch was marked by one doctrinal tendency, the school of Alexandria by an opposite tendency. To quote the very clear words of Neander (*H. E.* iii. 500, ed. Bohn), "In the Alexandrian school, an intuitive mode of apprehension inclining to the mystical; in the Antiochene, a logical reflective bent of the understanding predominated." The Alexandrian school fixed its attention therefore almost entirely on the Divine side of Christ's person, a tendency which found its final development in the Monophysite heresy; to which even Cyril, with all his dogmatic precision, at times approached perilously near. The Antiochene school fixed its attention chiefly, though not exclusively, on the human side of Christ's person, insisting on its completeness and therefore its separate personality, a tendency which found its final development in Nestorianism. The full exposition and proof of these statements will be found in Neander, *l. c.* iii. 499, iv. 107-123. The Antiochene school holding fast to the completeness of Christ's human nature was brought by its dogmatic tendencies, as well as by local contact, into sharp conflict with the Apollinarian view, Apollinarianism being a Syrian bishop. Now Apollinarianism, in defining the unity of Christ's person, made much use of the theological principle

called the interchange of attributes (communicatio idiomatum; ἀντιμεθέσταις τῶν ὀνομάτων); and was fond of such expressions as "God died," "God was born," which were most abhorrent to the great writers Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, who shaped the fortunes of the Antiochene school towards the end of the 4th century, and the beginning of the 5th. In Theodor's writings, indeed, can be traced all the principles of Nestorianism, of which he was the real founder. Thus, in his treatise on the Incarnation in Mai's *Nova Coll. Vett. Scriptt.* t. vi. p. 305, we see Nestorianism appearing full blown as a reaction against Apollinarianism. There he teaches that both natures in Christ are complete, and as such are each of them personal, personality being an essential part of a complete nature. He therefore rejects the use of the term union (ἔνωσις), preferring conjunction (συνάφεια), in reference to the two natures in Christ. He allows the application of the term θεοτόκος to the Blessed Virgin only, in a figure preferring the term ἀνθρωποτόκος; and maintains that God dwelt not in the man Jesus either by nature or by energy, which cannot be limited or conditioned (περὶγραφόμενος), but solely by the Divine Complacency (εὐδοκία) in his eminent virtue just as he dwells in the saints, only in a higher degree, inasmuch as the virtue of the man Christ surpassed all human virtue. On this point of the connexion between Theodore and Nestorianism the reader may consult Neander, *l. c.*, Dorner's *Doctrine of Christ's Person*, Div. ii. t. i. p. 25 pass., and Leontius of Byzantium in his treatise against Nestorius, where this view is expounded at length. (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxxvi. 1386, cf. *de Sectis*, 1222.)

II. History of heresy to the council of Ephesus. Theodore of Mopsuestia was the real founder of Nestorianism, but, as has often happened, the heresy has gained its name from a man who merely popularised principles which a deeper and more retired thinker had previously elaborated. The following was the occasion of its rise. Sisinnius, patriarch of Constantinople, died Dec. 24th, 427. The school of Antioch was then in high repute at Constantinople, owing to the saintly memory of St. Chrysostom. From it therefore Nestorius was chosen as his successor. [NESTORIUS.] Nestorius was a disciple of Theodore, a monk of the monastery of Euprepus, near Antioch, and celebrated for his eloquence and austerity. He was consecrated bishop of Constantinople the 10th of April, 428; when he at once set himself to crush out by force various forms of heresy which had hitherto found toleration in the imperial city and neighbourhood; a course of conduct in which he must have advanced to great lengths, as even the public opinion of the orthodox turned against him and branded him as an incendiary (*Soc. H. E.* vii. 29). He soon, however, fell himself under suspicion. He had brought with him from Antioch a presbyter, Anastasius, as his syncellus or private chaplain. This man was a thorough-going adherent of Theodore's doctrines, and came to Constantinople evidently determined to use his official position to advance them in every way. [ANASTASIUS.] This Anastasius, preaching one day in presence of Nestorius, said: "Let no one call Mary Theotocos; for Mary was but a woman, and it is

impossible that God should be born of a woman." These words created a great sensation, as the title had become a popular one for the Blessed Virgin, sanctioned as it had been by Athanasius and many orthodox fathers, and even by Eusebius in the third book of his life of Constantine. Nestorius, instead of condemning the preacher, threw the shield of his episcopal authority over him by delivering several discourses in maintenance of the same view. These sermons are still extant in the works of Marius Mercator, a devout African layman, who, being just then in Constantinople, took the greatest interest in this controversy. A report of these discussions was rapidly borne to Egypt, where it stirred up considerable debate among the monks, whereupon Cyril, at Easter A.D. 429, addressed to them an elaborate exposition of the orthodox doctrine in twenty-seven chapters (*Mansi, Concil.* iv. 587). A copy of this epistle was soon carried to Constantinople, and excited the wrath of Nestorius, who handed it over to Photius, one of his clergy, for refutation. This being reported to Cyril, he wrote an epistle to Nestorius in July of the same year, pointing out that he had taken up no new position in special opposition to Nestorius when writing to the monks, but had simply reiterated views he had already enunciated in his work on the Trinity, published during the episcopate of Atticus, bishop of Constantinople. He also called the attention of Nestorius to the conclusions which some of the monks had already deduced from his teaching, refusing to style Christ God, and calling him merely the instrument of the divinity. Nestorius replied to the expostulation in a brief and scornful manner, whereupon a very embittered controversy began, wherein each party charged the other with the most extreme consequences he could deduce from his adversary's premises. Cyril charged Nestorius with denying the real divinity of Christ, like Paul of Samosata, while Nestorius retorted by charging his opponent with attributing the temporal accidents of birth, suffering and death to the Divine Nature like the pagans. Each combatant strove to secure the pope for his own side. They did not indeed formally appeal to him, as Roman writers like Lupus (*Opp.* t. vii.) maintain. They simply strove as independent patriarchs to gain his powerful alliance. Nestorius took the initiative in this proceeding early in the year 430. He made an excuse of the presence of Julian, a Pelagian bishop and his associates from the West to request full information from pope Celestine about their case. This led him to notice his own perplexities. Views, as he puts it, akin to Arianism and Apollinarianism were popular at Constantinople, so much so that some say "that God the Word had taken his origin from the Virgin, the mother of Christ, and that Christ's flesh after the resurrection had been changed into the nature of the divinity." The pope not having replied at once to this letter, Nestorius addressed another to him on the same topic. Whereupon Celestine sent an epistle (*Mansi*, iv. 1026), telling Nestorius that the delay was unavoidable, as his letter and documents had to be translated into Latin, a fact which clearly shews the decline of Greek learning in Rome one hundred years after the change of empire to Constantinople. Cyril meanwhile had been informed by his emissaries

at Constantinople of the correspondence between Nestorius and the pope. The interval of delay afforded him time to communicate with Celestine, who was a very poor theologian. The pope completely adopted Cyril's views, and plainly told Nestorius that his tenets were simple blasphemy. Events now proceeded apace. The literary activity of Cyril was immense, as the collected edition of his works in Migne's *Patr. Graec.*, the documents collected in Mansi, (t. iv.) and the works of Marius Mercator abundantly prove. Cyril addressed lengthened treatises to the emperor Theodosius, who was however completely under the influence of Nestorius, to the empresses Pulcheria and Eudoxia, to the bishops of the East, and to his sympathisers and adherents among the clergy and monks of Constantinople, whom Nestorius had excommunicated. The pope held a council at Rome in August, A.D. 430, which excommunicated Nestorius, unless he repented within ten days of the reception of their sentence. Cyril assembled another at Alexandria, which ratified this sentence, and forwarded it to Constantinople, together with twelve anathemas, which he called on Nestorius to accept. To these Nestorius replied by a series of counter-anathemas. The emperor and his advisers, seeing no prospect of peace, consented at last in November, A.D. 430, to summon a general council, the writs for which were addressed to all metropolitan bishops, requiring them to meet at Ephesus by the following feast of Pentecost, attended by such a number of their holiest bishops that a sufficient supply might be left at home to discharge necessary episcopal functions; a limitation so vague that Cyril and his friends easily evaded it, and packed the council with their own adherents. [JOHN (31) OF ANTIOCH.] There is no necessity to repeat the story of the general council of Ephesus, and the struggles of Nestorius on the one hand and of Cyril on the other, as this has been already told in Cyril's life (t. i. p. 767) cf. EPHEBUS, Councils of, in *DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES*, Vol. I. It must suffice to say that the bishops attendant on Cyril and on Memnon, the local bishop of Ephesus, so completely outnumbered their opponents that Nestorius did not even appear at the council, but allowed judgment to go against him by default. In connexion however with John, metropolitan of Antioch, he held a council of his own adherents, some thirty or forty in number, who in turn excommunicated and deposed Cyril and Memnon. Nestorius seems to have completely relied on the imperial protection. Cyril, on the other hand, though very violent, seems to have realised more deeply the great spiritual issues involved, and therefore openly defied the imperial wishes. The atmosphere of Constantinople had too often an enervating effect on the fibre of its prelates. They became secularised, mere courtly sycophants, more ready to rely upon imperial favour or humour imperial wishes, than to depend upon spiritual forces and arguments. Cyril had much more of the sturdy spirit of Western independence. He at least had not been nurtured in and weakened by the atmosphere of a court. An epistle of count Irenaeus, an imperial official entrusted with the maintenance of order, is very instructive on this point. It is found in Mansi, iv. 1390. It is addressed

to the emperor, and dwells on the contempt for imperial authority and wishes shewn by Cyril. Letters addressed by the Nestorian party to the magistrates and to the provost or head of local police of Ephesus prove that the populace were bitterly hostile to Nestorius (l. c. 1383-1386). They complain of insults, houses attacked with stones, churches closed against them, all because of their obedience to the imperial commands, and they petition the crown for the assembling of a new council, where each metropolitan should appear, attended by two bishops alone. They assert that Cyril had brought with him a crowd of "ignorant rustics," whose violence overawed all others, together with fifty Egyptian bishops; while Memnon had summoned forty more from his jurisdiction, a statement which is fully borne out by the admissions of Cyril and his friends as found in Coptic MSS. published by Zoega in *Cat. Cod. Copt. MSS.* [cf. SENUTI]. While the bishops spent the summer of 431 in bitter wranglings and disputes, venting themselves at times in personal encounters, Cyril and his friends called to their aid powerful allies in the monks of Constantinople, headed by the archimandrite Dalmatius, who for forty-eight years had never left the cell in which he had immured himself. [DALMATIUS (4).] This man headed a procession of monks to the imperial palace, and terrorised the weak emperor into compliance with their wishes. But Cyril depended not alone upon the influence of monks, or the power of his arguments and treatises. He lavished bribes right and left, in order to gain powerful court officials to his side. His course of proceedings in such cases is disclosed to us by a letter of his archdeacon and syncellus Epiphanius, preserved for us in the Synodicon, c. 203 (Theodoret, *Opp. t. v. Ep. 173*). This letter was addressed to Maximianus, the patriarch of Constantinople, appointed, instead of Nestorius, in October 431. [MAXIMIANUS.] It is an interesting specimen of the way theological and political considerations were intermingled at Constantinople. Epiphanius tells the patriarch that Cyril had written to the empress Pulcheria, and to her influential chamberlains, and bribes, or, as he more elegantly puts it, presents (*εὐλογίαι*) had been sent to such as were worthy of them. An attempt had been made to gain over one of the chief chamberlains, Chrysoretos, who was hostile by sending him magnificent presents "ut tandem desisteret ab oppugnatione ecclesiae." The patriarch was requested to urge Pulcheria to use her influence with the palace officials. The patriarch was to give these officials whatever their avarice demanded, although they had already received presents enough. Various court ladies were to be induced to cooperate in effecting a separation between John of Antioch and Nestorius. The abbat Dalmatius must protest earnestly before the emperor, so as to alarm his conscience. The abbat Eutyches even, whose name afterwards became so famous, was called upon to act with vigour as one of the tools of Cyril's party. Appended to the letter was a list of the persons to whom bribes had been sent from Alexandria, that the patriarch Maximianus might see how much the Alexandrian church had interested itself in his cause, because of course he could only retain his office, if the deposition of Nestorius remained valid. The

clergy and church of Alexandria even mourned over the poverty brought upon them by the excessive expenditure incurred. The patriarch was also requested to procure the appointment of Lausus as chief chamberlain, that so the power of Chrysoretes might be destroyed and the orthodox faith confirmed. (Cf. Hefele's *Councils*, t. iii. pp. 112, 134, Clark's ed. for a very weak defence of Cyril's conduct in this matter.) [CHRYSORETES. LAUSUS.] The upshot of all the imperial vacillations and episcopal intrigues was that Nestorius was deprived in Sept. or Oct. 431 of his patriarchal throne, and relegated to the monastery of Euprepius, near Antioch, whence he had been summoned to the episcopate, and Maximianus was substituted in his place. It is unnecessary now to enter into all the subsequent details, as they will be found stated under the names of the various actors in the controversy, Cyril, John of Antioch, Ibas, Rabulas, Theodoret, &c. We will therefore only present a rapid summary of the course of events between the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. After the deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, like a skilful general, perceiving that the forces of his opponents were too strong for him when united, determined to effect a division in their ranks. With this end in view he endeavoured to win over John, whose metropolitan position at Antioch marked him out as the natural leader of the Syrian opposition. An opportunity soon offered. The emperor was weary of controversy, and determined to effect an ecclesiastical peace. He therefore put pressure upon the Syrians who opened negotiations with Cyril through Paul of Emesa. Paul had belonged to the party of Nestorius at the council of Ephesus, where his address and knowledge of affairs had made him a natural leader. He now lent himself to the imperial wishes, and towards the latter part of 432 visited Cyril at Alexandria, and explained the views of the Orientals as set forth in a symbolic document, which applied the term *θεοτόκος* to the Blessed Virgin in the sense that two natures were united in Christ, while each remained pure and unmingled in its individuality. To this Cyril consented, while, on the other hand, John and his adherents agreed to acquiesce in the condemnation of Nestorius, and recognise the ordination of his successor as valid. From this time John completely abandoned the cause of Nestorius. He even demanded that more rigorous action should be taken against him. His presence just at the gates of Antioch was felt by John as a standing reproach against his own inconsistency. In 435, therefore, the joint influence of Cyril and John obtained the adoption of stronger measures against Nestorius and his followers. His disciples were to be called Simonians; his books were to be burnt; the republication or preservation of them was made a penal offence; the bishops who adhered to his views were to be deposed, while the poor man himself was exiled first of all to Petra in Arabia, a destination afterwards changed to the great oasis of Egypt. The treaty between Cyril and John was met, however, with the sternest opposition. Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata were satisfied with Cyril's explanation, but could not agree to the deposition of Nestorius; while, as for the zealots of the Syrian party, men like Alex-

ander of Hierapolis and Meletius of Mopsuestia, they threw all their energies into organising an active opposition. Cyril and John, however, using the forces of imperial law, by degrees crushed all opposition, and drove their opponents across the border into Persia, where the Nestorian party organised itself afresh. Within the empire the controversy was silenced only for a little time. The opposing doctrinal tendencies shewed themselves in the controversies which burst forth anew after Cyril's death in A.D. 444 between Theodoret and Dioscorus, the new patriarch of Alexandria, which led up to the synod of Chalcedon, where by the force of reaction Theodoret's orthodoxy was vindicated, and Syrian theology became triumphant. [DIOSCORUS (1).] Theodoret at the same time, like John of Ephesus, seems to have become bitterly hostile to Nestorius himself, as the cause of the whole quarrel. He speaks very severely of him in his fourth Book on *Heresies*; so severely indeed that grave doubts have been expressed concerning the authorship of the passage. Cf. Theodoret, t. v. Diss. 2, p. 251, *Opp.*; ed. Garner; see *contra*, Ceillier, x. 84. Unsuccessful men like Nestorius are, however, apt to meet with but slight sympathy from their more fortunate brethren. The continued existence of Nestorianism as an organised system is due, however, not to episcopal controversialists within the empire, but to the great ecclesiastical school of Edessa, and its Persian disciples beyond the border. That school had been famous for ages, and had served as a great Christian literary centre for all the neighbouring lands, Armenia, Syria, Chaldaea, and Persia. Its influence on Armenia and its church has been noticed under MESROBES and MOSES (5) of Khoren. At the time of the council of Ephesus the bishop of Edessa was one Rabulas. He was in entire accord with Ibas, the head of the Persian school in Edessa, and both were devoted disciples of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Rabulas attended at Ephesus, and took a most decided part with John of Antioch and Nestorius in opposition to St. Cyril. He soon, however, recognised the winning side and joined it. Immediately upon his return he held a synod, where he excommunicated John and his party, anathematised Theodore, who was dead, committed the writings of Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata to the flames, and expelled the Persian school from Edessa. This must have occurred towards the close of 431, or early part of 432 A.D., as even John of Antioch, who that same year abandoned the side of Nestorius, wrote a letter reprobating the proceedings of Rabulas. It is from the celebrated letter of Ibas to Maris, bishop of Hardascir in Persia, that we learn the details of his bishop's conduct, and at the same time get a glimpse of the views taken by the more moderate party in the Syrian church about the whole controversy, as Ibas deals out blame to Nestorius as well as to Cyril. [IBAS.] [MARIS (4).] Ibas, however, took up a bitterly hostile position towards Rabulas, and by his translation into Persian of the works of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore laid the foundation of the Nestorian movement in that country. In 435 he was elected bishop of Edessa in succession to his opponent Rabulas, a choice which must of course have given a great impulse to the progress of Nestorian views. The tyrann-

nical expulsion of the Edessene school by Rabulas drove into Persia a scholar named Barsumas, to whom the foundation of Persian Nestorianism was specially due. He obtained the bishopric of Nisibis in 435, and continued to hold the see for fifty-four years, till his death in 489. He there established a flourishing school, which was largely increased and strengthened by the final dissolution of the Edessene school by the emperor Zeno in A.D. 489, on account of its incorrigible Nestorianism. The Nestorians, indeed, devoted themselves in those early times to education, and established other flourishing schools at Seleucia and many other places, as fully described by Asseman. iv. cap. xv. sec. ii. p. 924; cf. sec. iv. p. 937, where the very liberal course of study pursued therein is set forth. By his age and learning Barsumas obtained immense influence even over the kings of Persia. He cleverly used their political jealousies to advance his own party. He represented that the Catholic party were the friends and spies of the Roman power, while he and his friends were persecuted by it, and therefore necessarily hostile. The Nestorian sect rapidly consolidated itself in Persia, by conforming more or less to the ideas and prejudices of the Persians. The Zoroastrians specially abhorred celibacy and the monks. In fact they taught and practised incest in its worst forms, permitting the marriage of the nearest relations, as of a brother and sister, or of a son and his mother. In 499 a synod was held by the Nestorians under Babaeus, the metropolitan of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, at which clerical celibacy was abolished, and the clergy of all ranks up to the bishops themselves permitted to marry. The Nestorian sect rapidly extended itself into all the lands south and east and north of Persia. COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES (cf. s. v. t. l. p. 693) is a sufficient witness to this fact in the 6th century. His narrative, compiled about A.D. 547, proves that within half a century the Nestorians had organised churches in India and Ceylon, whose bishops acknowledged the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Seleucia. They had also diffused the gospel among the Bactrians, Huns, Armenians, Medes and Elamites. They gained a firm hold, too, upon the Tartars and Chinese. A monument describing their progress in China was discovered at Siganfu by the Jesuits. It described their first mission to China in A.D. 636, and related its history till the current year, A.D. 781, or, as the monument calls it 1092, of the era of the Greeks. This inscription has been the subject of much controversy, rather however, as Milman puts it, "from hatred to the Jesuits by whom it was made known" than from any other motive. The arguments on either side can be seen in E. Renaudot, *Relat. Ancienn. des Indes*, p. 228-271, Paris, 1718; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* iv. 502-552; *Mém. de l'Acad. des Ins.* xxx. 802-819; Gibbon, cap. xlvii. note 118, ed. Milman; Remusat, *Mélang. Asiat.* i. 33; Schmidt, *Gesch. der Ost Mongolen*, p. 384. This last denies that there is any satisfactory proof that this monument was ever found in China. He declares that it was manufactured in Europe by the Jesuits, but does not explain how it could benefit the Jesuits to invent a monument which only re-ounds to the credit of Oriental heretics; as Mosheim has well remarked in his learned note on this inscription (*H. E.* cent. vii. par. i. cap. i.).

Cf. for latest discussions of it, Gibbings's edit. of Mosheim's *Mem. of Church in China*, Dub. 1862; Neumann, *Zeitsch. der deutsch. Morgenland. Gesellsch.* iv. 38 (1850); Renan, *Hist. Lang. Sémit.* p. 282. These last two writers are dubious about it. We meet with rather a curious account of Nestorianism as it existed in Central Asia in the 10th century in Albîrûni's *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, p. 306, whose importance as a historian has been already pointed out (t. iii. p. 794). He lived at Khiva between A.D. 973-1048. In his account of the Nestorians he dwells on their intellectual activity as a specially notable feature distinguishing them from the Catholic party. The original tone imparted by Theodore and the great Syriac writers at once struck the acute Mahometan. "Nestorius," he says, "instigated people to examine for themselves, and to use the instruments of logic and analogy in meeting their opponents." He gives us some very curious details about their feasts and ritual. He noticed that Nestorians and Melchites, as he calls the orthodox party, agreed about the observance of Lent, Christmas and Epiphany, but disagreed about other feasts and fasts. The Nestorians evidently retained, or perhaps adopted, some Jewish ideas from the great Jewish schools in Babylonia. On the feast of Ma'al'tha (Ingressus), Albîrûni tells us, they wandered from the naves of their churches up to their roofs in memory of the return of the Israelites to Jerusalem. According to this writer the majority of the inhabitants of Syria, Irak and Khurâsan were Nestorians, their catholicus being appointed by the khalif on the nomination of the leaders of the sect. The direct influence of Nestorianism on the West was not very great. During the 6th and following centuries they seem to have followed closely in the train of the Persian and Saracen invasions of the empire, till under the khalifs their hierarchy extended from China to Cyprus and Jerusalem. A considerable Nestorian element, indeed, continued to exist in the leading cities of the empire, notwithstanding the severe edicts of Theodosius and succeeding emperors. In A.D. 433, on the death of his intruding successor, the friends and partisans of Nestorius were numerous enough in Constantinople to raise a riot demanding his restoration, while again in the next century we find that Cosmas Indicopleustes, to whom we have referred, was a Nestorian at Alexandria (La Crose, *Christianisme des Indes*, i. 40-55; Asseman. *l. c.* iv. 605, 606). Tillemont, indeed, discovers traces of it in the empire till the close of the 6th cent. (*Mém.* t. xiv. p. 615 sqq.) But indirectly Nestorianism has had a considerable intellectual influence on the West through the controversy about the three chapters and the writings of JUNILIUS and FACUNDUS in the 6th century (cf. Kihn, Theodor von Mopsuestia, Freiburg, 1880). The leading dogma of Nestorianism was revived in a modified shape by the Adoptionists of Spain (cf. vol. I. p. 44 and FELIX of Urgel; Neander, *H. E.* v. 218).

Literature.—The most exhaustive work on Nestorianism, ancient and modern alike, is Asseman. *Biblioth. Oriental.* t. iv. This volume, of 950 pp., is occupied with this subject alone. It collects information from all quarters, especially from the Oriental writers, concerning their history, ritual, organisation, schools and mis-

sions. In other volumes of the same work Assemani gives more information on the same subject, cf. t. i. p. 203, t. iii. 64-70, 378-395, 396-410, 580-589; and t. ii. 387-463 for an elaborate catalogue of the patriarchs of the Nestorians (cf. Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 1078-1341). These two works bring down their history to the last century. The original documents concerning the councils of Ephesus, and the other councils and synods held in connexion therewith, will be found in Mansi (*Concil.* tt. iv, v. and vi.). There is a careful statement of the history in Natalis Alexander (*H. E. saec. v. cap. iii. art. 12*, p. 56-64, ed. Mansi), and an exhaustive monograph in Hefele's *Councils*, lib. ix., which will be found in the third vol. of Clark's translation of that work. Among the most recent works on the subject are Badger's *Nestorians and their Ritual*, London, 1852; Renan, *Hist. Lang. Semit.*, very useful upon the spread of Syriac through Nestorian agencies, p. 277 passim; Mosheim's *Authentic Memoirs of Christian Church in China*, ed. R. Gibbings, B.D., Dublin, 1862; Georgius Ebedjesu Khajjath, *Syri Orientales seu Chaldaei Nestoriani et Roman. Pontiff. Primatus*, Rom. 1870; Petermann's art. *Nestorians*, in new ed. of Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* [G. T. S.]

NESTORIANUS, a Greek historian, who flourished A.D. 474. He wrote the lives of the Roman emperors to the death of Leo the younger. He is cited by John Malalas, who calls him the wisest of the chronicographers. Garnerius in his preface to Liberatus, Num. 11, makes him the same as Nestorius bishop of Phragones [NESTORIUS (4)], but, as Cave thinks, on the most flimsy grounds. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 454.) [G. T. S.]

NESTORIUS (1), ST. (NESTOR), Feb. 26, the first known bishop of Side in Pamphylia Prima, one MS. calling him, but incorrectly, bishop of Perga (Le Quien, i. 997). He was a martyr in the Decian persecution, A.D. 250, under a president variously called Publius, Pollion, or Polius. His Acts in a Latin version have long been known. They are given in a concise shape in Ado's martyrology; and in a longer shape in *AA. SS. Boll.* Feb. iii. 627. He is also commemorated in *Martyr. Vet. Rom.* and Usuard. The acts have been hitherto considered worthless. Aubé, however, discovered the original Greek Acts in a MS. of the National Library at Paris, which he printed in the *Revue Archéologique* for April, 1884, pp. 215-234, together with the Latin version and an elaborate commentary. He was arrested by the local Irenarch, required to sacrifice, and on his refusal despatched in charge of two lictors to the court of the president Pollio, who tortured and then crucified him. The martyr's answer to the president's queries sufficiently indicate his theological position. Pollio said to him, "Are you willing to take part with us or with Christ?" To which Nestor replied, "Cum Christo meo et eram, et sum, et ero;" to which the indignant president replied that as he was devoted to Jesus who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, he should be crucified like his God. The acts fix even the day and hour of his martyrdom; it happened on the fifth day

of the week at the third hour. Le Blant, in his *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 46, points out the accuracy of the details. [G. T. S.]

NESTORIUS (2) (NESTOR), prefect of Egypt in 349 (*Athanas. Ap. c. Ar.* § 56, *Hist. Ar.* § 23, *Vit. Ant.* § 86; Tillem. viii. 122, 125, 135). [C. H.]

NESTORIUS (3), patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 428-431. He was a native of Germanicia, the birthplace of Leo the Isaurian and Iconoclast some three centuries later. He became a monk of the convent of St. Euprepius near the gates of Antioch, where he attained great popularity as a preacher, having a fine voice and a great reputation for ascetic holiness. He was very diligent as a student of theology, so that on one occasion he even denounced some expressions of Theodore of Mopsuestia as unorthodox, though in general he was a devoted adherent of the system taught by Theodore and Diodore of Tarsus. After the death of Sisinnius, the church of Constantinople was so divided into opposing factions that the emperor resolved that none of that church should fill the vacant see; he therefore promoted Nestorius to the post, hoping that his eloquence would be useful in the instruction and guidance of the people. He was consecrated on April 10, 428, more than three months after the death of Sisinnius, which had happened on Dec. 24 of the preceding year. His first sermon proved him to be of a fierce and intolerant spirit. Addressing the emperor, he said, "Give me, my prince, the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven as a recompense. Assist me in destroying heretics, and I will assist you in vanquishing the Persians." He proceeded at once to put his intolerant views into practice. Five days after his consecration he demolished a private oratory used by the Arian community; an act which caused a conflagration, for when the Arians saw the work of destruction going forward, they set fire to the building, which, spreading on all sides, reduced many other buildings to ashes. He next assailed the Novatians, being jealous of the reputation for piety enjoyed by Paul their bishop. The emperor, however, would not allow them to be persecuted. He attacked the Quartodecimans in Asia, Lydia, and Caria, causing fearful riots and loss of life at Miletus and Sardis. His example proved contagious. Antony, bishop of a city of the Hellespont, began to persecute the Macedonians with such violence that two of that sect assassinated him. This increased the rage of Nestorius, who immediately deprived them of their churches at Constantinople, and throughout his whole province. In this course of action he was ably seconded by a presbyter, Anastasius, whom he had brought with him from Antioch to assist in the management of his diocese. This man was an extreme adherent of the Syrian school of theology, and his preaching first raised the controversy which proved fatal to Nestorius. Anastasius was intolerant of all opposition to his views. Apollinarian dogmas were specially repugnant to his school, to which heresy the popular theology of Constantinople seemed to him to incline. He therefore assailed it in a controversial sermon, in which he said, "Let no man call Mary Theotocos; for Mary was but

a woman, and it is impossible that God should be born of a woman;" a statement which caused great excitement, especially when endorsed and defended by the patriarch himself in a series of set discourses. The further history, however, of this controversy must be sought in the article NESTORIANISM and the references there given. We shall here confine ourselves to the events of his personal life. After the council of Ephesus, Nestorius was deposed from his bishopric by the emperor's authority. Socrates indeed, who takes a very moderate and dispassionate view of Nestorius, tells us (*H. E.* vii. 34) that when he found his cause hopeless, he cried out in bitter regret, "Let Mary be called Theotocos, if you will, and let all disputing cease." His regrets, however, availed him nothing. His friends fell off on every side, even including John of Antioch, who had stoutly supported him. He was banished first to his former monastery of St. Euprepius, near Antioch. John of Antioch, however, felt his presence near his episcopal seat a reproach to his own inconsistency, so, after a lapse of four years (*Evag.* i. 7), John prayed for his exile to some more distant place, whereupon he was sent to the Oasis of Ptolemais, whither the worst criminals were usually transported, and exposed to the attacks of the nomadic Arabs or Ethiopians who, under the name of Blemmyes, were known as the most formidable enemies of the Roman power in North Africa. He occupied himself in the preparation of a defence of his conduct, and his doctrines, addressed according, to Evagrius, (*l. c.*) to a certain Egyptian. He was captured after some years by the Blemmyes, and liberated in the Thebaid, whence he addressed pitiful supplications to the governor of the locality, extracts from which are given by Evagrius. He was then re-arrested, dragged hither and thither, and finally died of his ill-treatment, though ecclesiastical bitterness represents that "when his tongue had been eaten through with worms, he departed to the greater and everlasting judgment" (*Evag. l. c.*). He died some time subsequent to A.D. 439, for he was yet alive when Socrates wrote his history. E. Revillout, in a mem. on the Blemmyes read before the Acad. des Inscr. and published in their Mem. t. viii. 1st Ser. 1874, pp. 396-401, discusses his place of exile, his persecution by the celebrated monk Senuti, and the time of his death, which he fixes about A.D. 454. He maintains out of a Coptic MS. of the life of Dioscorus of Alexandria (discovered among the Fayûm MSS., and lately printed in the *Revue Egyptologique*, 1880-1883, cf. Krüger's *Monoph. Streitigh.* p. 12 sqq. Jena, 1884), that Nestorius was summoned to the Fourth General Council, but died before the summons reached him; a view which gains some support from Evagrius *H. E.* ii. 2. [SENUTI]. The writings of Nestorius were consigned to the flames by an edict of Theodosius; they were therefore diligently extirpated by the magistrates (cf. Jac. Gretser, *de jure prohibendi libros malos*, lib. i. cap. 9); while a passage in John Moschus (*Spirit. Prat.* c. 46) proves that the clergy were not backward in the work of destruction [HESYCHIUS (26)]. We have therefore almost none of his writings, save what have been preserved in the replies of his adversaries.

His principal works seem to have been—a treatise, *De Incarnatione Domini*, which contained sixty-two passages of scripture, interpreted according to his system; a volume of sermons arranged in the order of the alphabet, and his apology composed in Egypt (cf. Gennadius, *de Vir Illust.*, cap. 53). An accurate statement, however, of all his admitted and dubious writings is contained in Fabricius *Bib. Graec.* ed. Harles, t. x. p. 529-549. The liturgy attributed to him will be found in Eus. Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient. Collect.* t. i.

The tomb of Nestorius continued to be for ages a subject of interest to the Persian Nestorians. Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* t. ii. p. 316, tells us how incensed they were in the year 805, when they heard that his tomb was subjected to insults in Egypt. A certain historian, Gabriel, physician to the Khalif, used his master's influence, and obtained a letter demanding from the ruler of Egypt possession of the sacred relics. The Nestorians were, however, appeased by a hermit of their sect, who assured them that the tomb which had been insulted was not really that of Nestorius; and that Nestorius was like Moses in this respect, no man knew of his real sepulchre. The original authorities for his life have been all quoted, either in this article, or in that on Nestorianism. For a convenient summary of his life and list of his reputed writings, see Ceillier, t. viii. 366-374. Fabricius (*l. c.*) gives six reasons assigned by Nestorius justifying the imprecatory psalms, as published by Scipio Maffeius from a *Catena inedita ad Psalm. xxxix.* They are these—(1) To make David's adversaries better through affliction. (2) To secure their eternal good through present afflictions. (3) To edify and instruct others. (4) To remove evil-doers from the earth and thus benefit society. (5) To warn others by fear of like punishments. (6) To prevent atheism and manifest a providence. [G. T. S.]

NESTORIUS (4), bishop of Phragones in Egypt, a prelate of orthodox convictions at the time of the Eutychian controversy. He attended the council of Chalcedon and subscribed the condemnation of Nestorius; assisted at the election of Proterius to the see of Alexandria, A.D. 452 (*Liberatus, Breviarium*, cap. xiv.); carried a letter of Proterius to Leo the Great at Rome, A.D. 454 (*Leonis Epp.* cxxix. cap. 1), and an accompanying letter of the emperor Marcian (*Leon. Epp.* cxxx. cap. 1). Afterwards, in 458, fled, with other bishops and clerics, to Constantinople, to escape the persecution of Timotheus Aelurus (q. v.). Leo addressed to them there a letter of commendation and encouragement. (*Ep.* clx. and see Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. p. 566.) [C. G.]

NESTORIUS (5), addressed by Theodoret, *Ep.* 172. [C. H.]

NESTORIUS (6), fourteenth Nestorian bishop of Adjabene (called also Hazza and Arbela) on the Tigris, A.D. 800. (*Assem. Bibl. Or.* iii. 492; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 1232.) [J. G.]

NETHALENUS, NETHELMUS. [NETHALAN.]

NETRAS. [NATHYRAS.]

NICAEAS of Romaciana. [NICETAS (3).]

NICANDER (1) (*Νικάνδρος*), an exceptor, advised by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 148 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxix.) to take no heed to works of magic and sorcery. [C. H.]

NICANDER (2), a stylite to whom Nilus (lib. ii. epp. 114, 115) addressed the warning text, "He that exalteth himself shall be abased." [NILUS ()]. But Tillemont doubts, on chronological and other grounds, if these letters could have been written by St. Nilus. (Tillem. xiv. 214; xv. 362, 365.) [C. H.]

NICANDER (3), martyr in Moesia. [MARTIANUS (23) in *D. C. A.*]

NICARETE (*Νικαρέτη*), a lady belonging to one of the noblest and richest families of Nicomedia, who devoted herself to perpetual virginity in connection with the church of Constantinople. She was warmly attached to Chrysostom, and was punished for her devotion to his cause by the confiscation of the greater part of her property in the troubles that followed his expulsion. She was at this time advanced in life, and had a large household dependent on her, but she managed her lessened resources with such wise economy that she not only had enough for their wants and her own, but also to give largely to the poor. She was skilled in the compounding of medicines, often succeeding in curing those who had derived no benefit from regular physicians. Her humility and self-distrust were such that she would never become a deaconess, and declined the office of lady superior of the consecrated virgins which was earnestly pressed on her by Chrysostom himself. She retired from Constantinople to avoid the persecution in 404 A.D. (*Soz. H. E.* viii. 23). She is commemorated on December 27. [E. V.]

NICARETUS (1) (*Νικάρητος*), reproved by Nilus (lib. ii. 284 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxix.) for frequenting the theatre. [C. H.]

NICARETUS (2), a scriniarius addressed by Nilus (lib. i. ep. 231) on the overwhelming nature of sorrow when left without aid and sympathy. [C. H.]

NICASIUS (1), reputed first bishop of Rouen, ordained by St. Dionysius of Paris cir. 250, but more probably a presbyter, martyred in the Vexin. (*Gall. Chr.* xi. 4; cf. Tillem. iv. 485.) [C. H.]

NICASIUS (2) (NECASIUS), a bishop in Proconsular Africa, designated "Culcitanus," at the council of Carthage in 348. At his suggestion it was enacted in the sixth canon that the clergy should not act in the capacity of stewards and legal directors in families. (Mansi, iii. 147, 155; Morcelli, i. 148.) [C. H.]

NICASIUS (3), Dec. 14, eleventh bishop of Rheims, slain by the Vandals in 407, with his sister Eutropia. (Flodoard, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* i. 6, 7, ii. 5, § 27, 6 in *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 36, 40, 42, 105, 106; *Mart. Usuard.*; *Gall. Chr.* ix. 6, 203; Tillem. x. 463.) [C. H.]

NICEA, NICAËA, martyr. [GALONICA.]

NICEAS of Romaciana. [NICETAS (3).]

NICEAS (1), subdeacon of Aquileia addressed by St. Jerome in 375 or 376 (*Ep.* 8 in *Pat. Lat.* xxii. 341, and note; Tillem. xii. 11, 13, xv. 817; Ceill. vii. 582). He is sometimes identified with the Nicetas praised by Paulinus. [NICETAS (3).] [C. H.]

NICEAS (2) (*Νικέας*), a Christian charioteer at Neapolis (Sichem) in 529, when Julian, recently crowned by the Samaritans [JULIANUS (110)], celebrated the Circenses in that town. Niceas carried off the first prize, and on presenting himself to receive it was asked by Julian of what religion he was. He avowed himself a Christian and was executed on the spot. (Joan. Malal. pt. ii. p. 180, Oxon.) [T. W. D.]

NICENTIUS, mentioned by Ambrose (*Ep.* v. 8), with reference to the affair of Indicia, as an ex-tribune and notary who had ordered a slave girl to be examined by a midwife on a charge of unchastity. A story is told of him by Paulinus in his life of Ambrose (§ 44). He suffered from gout in the feet; and when once, on approaching the altar to receive the sacrament, he was accidentally kicked by Ambrose, the pain made him cry out. Ambrose thereupon said to him, "Go, and thou shalt straightway be whole." That he never suffered again, he testified with tears at the time of Ambrose's death. [J. Ll. D.]

NICEPHORUS (1) (NICEFORUS, Hartel), Roman acolyte, A.D. 251, went to Rome with METTIUS (*Cyp. Ep.* 45) and took from Cornelius to Cyprian the news of the accession to the side of the former by Novatianizing confessors [MAXIMUS (7)], and of the sailing for Carthage of Novatian's second batch of emissaries. (*Cyp. Ep.* 49, 52.) [E. W. B.]

NICEPHORUS (2), Feb. 25, martyr in Egypt, with six others, under the emperor Numerianus and the governor Sabinus. They belonged to Corinth, where they confessed the faith in the Decian persecution before the proconsul Tertius. (Asseman. *AA. MM. Orient. et Occident.* t. ii. p. 60; Ceill. ii. p. 464.) [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (3), Feb. 9, martyr at Antioch about the year 260, under the emperor Valerian. His story is a very interesting one. He was an intimate friend of a Christian priest called Sapricius, but they had a quarrel. Nicephorus sought in every way to bring about a reconciliation, but Sapricius was inexorable. The persecution after a time waxed very hot. Sapricius was arrested, endured torture, and was condemned to die by the sword. Nicephorus again sought his favour, and was again refused. Thereupon God withdrew the grace of constancy, which Sapricius had hitherto possessed. He consented to sacrifice, notwithstanding the entreaties of Nicephorus, who at once took his place, and suffered death for Christ. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 244; Ceill. ii. 392.) [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (4), praised by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 183; Tillem. x. 353). [C. H.]

NICEPHORUS (5), of Antioch, surnamed the Heavenly, on account of his eloquence. He was also called *Μαγίστρος*, a title equivalent to Professor. Cf. Suiceri *Thesaur.* s. v. *Μαγιστεριάρχος*. The surname Malalas belonging to John of Antioch seems to have had much the same meaning. [MALALAS.] His only extant work is the Life of Symeon Stylites, Jr., which will be found in Migne, *P. G.* t. lxxxvi. Pars Posterior. col. 2984. Nicephorus Callist. (*H. E.* xviii. 24) says that Simeon's life was written by another *Συμεώνι μαγίστρον τῷ Οὐνφῷ*. This last word seems a contraction for *δουλόμωφ*. [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (6), a presbyter of St. Sophia in C. P., A.D. 480, who wrote the life of a fanatic named Andrew, who pretended to be a fool for Christ's sake. He lived under Zeno the Isaurian. The MS. is extant in the Imperial Library of Vienna. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 456.) [G. T. S.]

NICEPHORUS (7), bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, exiled by the emperor Justin in 518. (Assem. *B. O. t.* ii. *Dissert. de Monoph.* num. 2; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 425.) [C. H.]

NICEPHORUS (8) I., emperor, was descended from an Arabian king, who had become a Christian, and had fled to Constantinople in the reign of Heraclius. He held the office of grand logothete or treasurer under the empress Irene. In A.D. 802 a conspiracy to place him on the throne was formed by some of the great officers of the palace, who were displeased at the ascendancy the eunuch Aetius had acquired over the empress. On the night of October 31st, the conspirators seized the palace, pretending that it was by Irene's orders that Nicephorus was proclaimed emperor. Guards were placed round the palace of Eleutherius where the empress was, and at dawn she was removed to the palace and placed in confinement. Nicephorus was then crowned at Saint Sophia. The next day he had an interview with his dethroned mistress; and, by promising that she should be kindly treated, and professing that he had been forced to ascend the throne against his will, persuaded her to disclose where the imperial treasures were concealed. Having thus attained his object, he banished her first to the island of Prinkipo and then to Lesbos, where she died in the following August [IRENE II. vol. iii. p. 285].

The early years of his reign were troubled by rebellion at home and war abroad. He refused on his accession to continue the tribute which Irene had paid to Haroun al Raschid. The indignant caliph invaded Asia Minor and attacked Heraclea. The army which had been sent against him revolted in July, proclaimed their commander, the patrician Bardanes, emperor against his will, and advanced on Chrysopolis. The citizens refusing to admit him he withdrew, and obtaining from Nicephorus an amnesty for himself and his adherents, guaranteed by the patriarch and all the nobles, he retired in September to the island of Prote, where he assumed the monastic habit. Nicephorus in violation of his promise confiscated his property, banished his chief adherents, and deprived his troops of their

pay. Bardanes, the following year, was blinded by some Lycaonian brigands who had made a descent on the island; and it was suspected that the emperor was implicated in the crime. Nicephorus, in consequence of this rebellion, was obliged to make peace with the caliph, but broke it as soon as the latter had retreated. The Arabs, however, recrossed Mount Taurus in the middle of winter, and in the August of A.D. 804, Nicephorus, who had taken the command in person, was defeated with heavy loss at Crasus in Phrygia, by Djabril Ibn Jahja, having a narrow escape of being made prisoner himself. An armistice followed, which was violated the next year by the emperor rebuilding Ancyra and some other fortresses, and making incursions into Syria. In A.D. 806, Haroun, who had been engaged the previous year in Persia, again invaded Asia Minor at the head of 300,000 men. He built a mosque at Tyana as a token of its annexation to his dominions, ravaged the whole country, and took several strong places. Nicephorus was obliged to sue for peace, which he obtained on condition of paying an annual tribute of 30,000 pieces of gold, and three in addition as a personal tribute from himself, and the same from his son. This peace was again violated by the Greeks rebuilding the demolished fortresses, and defeating two Arabian armies near Tarsus. The Arabs retaliated by another invasion, by ravaging Cyprus, and, in September A.D. 807, Rhodes. (Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, ii. 158-162.)

To strengthen himself at home, Nicephorus had his son Stauracius crowned in Saint Sophia in December A.D. 803, and four years later selected as his wife Theophano, a relation of the deposed empress, though she was already betrothed to another man.

In February A.D. 806, the patriarch Tarasius died; and Nicephorus seems to have taken considerable pains to choose a fitting successor (Ignatius, *Vita S. Nicephori* 21, in Migne, *Patr. Græc.* c. 64.) He finally selected his namesake, Nicephorus, who was still a layman. The new patriarch was forbidden to hold any communication with the pope, whom the emperor regarded as the adherent of his rival, Charlemagne (Theophanes, 419 in *Patr. Græca*, cviii. 993). The same year a synod was held, in which the oeconomus JOSEPHUS (30), who had been degraded from the priesthood for having celebrated the marriage of Constantine and Theodote, was, at the instigation of the emperor, restored. (Michael, *Vita S. Theodori Studitæ*, 43, 44; S. Theod. Stud. *Epp.* xxxiii. in *Patr. Græc.* xcix. 156, 1017.) Theodore, abbat of Studium, and his brother Joseph withdrew from communion with the patriarch. Their conduct soon attracted notice. The emperor had been previously inclined to expel them from Constantinople, because they had opposed the appointment of Nicephorus on the ground of his being a layman, and he had only been dissuaded by representations of the odium that would be caused by the banishment of 700 monks and the destruction of so famous a monastery, and he now took advantage of his opportunity. In January A.D. 809 a synod was convened, by which Theodore and Joseph with the recluse Plato and ten other monks, who adhered to them, were banished from Constantinople.

The same synod declared that emperors were above the divine law, and asserted that each bishop had the power of granting dispensations from the canons (S. Theodor. Stud. *Epp.* xxxiii.).

In February A.D. 808, a conspiracy of many influential persons was formed to place the quaestor Arsaber on the throne. The plot was detected by Nicephorus, who compelled Arsaber to become a monk and banished him to Bithynia, and punished his supporters with corporal punishment, banishment, and confiscation of their property, not sparing certain bishops and monks, and the syncellus, sacristan, and librarian of Saint Sophia, who were among the conspirators.

In A.D. 809 we first hear of Bulgarian inroads. In the spring of that year their king Crumm took Sardica. Nicephorus marched against him, declaring that he would keep his Easter in his palace. His hopes were frustrated by a dangerous mutiny in the army, which was with difficulty appeased. The following winter he caused military colonies to be planted on the Bulgarian frontier, a measure which, according to Theophanes, occasioned much discontent. In October A.D. 810 he had a narrow escape from a mad monk who attacked him with a sword.

In May A.D. 811 he again, with his son Stauracius, took the field against the Bulgarians. He entered their territory on July 20th, and appears to have been at first successful and to have taken the palace of Crumm himself. The account of what follows is very obscure; we hear of desertions to the Bulgarians, who at last surrounded the whole Roman army, and finally attacked at dawn on the 25th. They were completely successful, Nicephorus himself was killed, his son mortally wounded, and the greater part of the officers and soldiers perished. The head of Nicephorus was exposed on a pole for some days, and the skull was mounted in silver as a drinking cup, and preserved in the royal family of Bulgaria.

His relations with the West may be briefly noticed. At the deposition of Irene, ambassadors from Charlemagne were at Constantinople, who had come to negotiate a reunion of the Eastern and Western empires by means of a marriage of their sovereigns. On their return they were accompanied by ambassadors from Nicephorus, who concluded a treaty with Charlemagne on the banks of the Saal, by which Venice and the cities of the Dalmatian coast were left to the Eastern empire. Notwithstanding this treaty, attempts on the Dalmatian towns in A.D. 806, and one on Venice in A.D. 808, the latter under the command of Pippin king of Italy in person, are mentioned. The fleets of the Eastern empire, commanded in the former year by the patrician Nicetas, and in the latter by Paul the governor of Cephalonia, seem to have successfully repulsed these attacks, and in A.D. 810 a new treaty was concluded between Nicephorus and Charlemagne. (Einhard, *Annales* in *Patr. Lat.* civ. 463-473; A. Dandolo. *Chron.* in Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Scr.* xii. 151-158.)

Nicephorus appears to have been a skilful though rapacious financier. A list of his chief financial measures is given by Theophanes (411, 412). The only one that need be noticed here is his extending the hearth-tax to monasteries and charitable institutions, and making it retro-

spective to the first year of his reign. He also quartered his officers in bishops' residences and in monasteries, and blaming those who had dedicated gold or silver in churches, declared that church property ought to be applied for the service of the state. He favoured the Paulicians and Athingans who lived in Phrygia and Lycaonia, and is accused of having had recourse to their divinations. (Theophanes, *Chron.* 402-416; G. Cedrenus, 829-843 in *Patr. Gr.* cxxi. 912-928; Zonaras, xv. 13-15 in *Patr. Græc.* cxxxiv. 1352-1361; Finlay ii. 92-107.) [F. D.]

NICETA, martyr. See GALONICA.

NICETAS (1), legendary brother of Clement of Rome (*Rec.* vii., *Hom.* xiii.). [G. S.]

NICETAS (2), the father of Herodes the Irenarch (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 15). [G. S.]

NICETAS (3) (NICAÆAS, NICEAS, NICIAS), bishop of Romaciana or Remetiana in Dacia, a place which is identified in an article on Bulgarian topography by Professor Tomaschek, of Graz, in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 1881-82, t. xcix. p. 441. Our knowledge of him is derived from the epistles and poems of Paulinus of Nola, whom he visited, A.D. 398 and 402, and who has devoted to him two poems (Nos. 17 and 24), composed for the feast of St. Felix. He was probably a native of Dacia, and may have been the Nicias, or Nicaeas, subdeacon of Aquileia, to whom St. Jerome wrote (Hieron., *Ep.* 42 (or 8) ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xxii. 341), yet many doubt it. He evangelized the Seythæ, Getæ, Daci, Bessi, and Riphæi, but settled specially among the Daci, reducing the wild manners of the barbarians to meekness and honesty. He was noted for eloquence and learning, honoured by the Romans when he visited them, and specially beloved by Paulinus at Nola, but we cannot define the extent of his see or the dates of his episcopate. He is identified by Baronius (*Mart. Rom.* Jun. 22) with Nicaeas, or Nicetas, of Aquileia, who must, however, be later, A.D. 454-485 (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 773; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 399). The double form, NICETAS and NICEAS, has introduced much difficulty, and has allowed the double commemorations of Jan. 7 and June 22. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 365; and Jun. iv. 243; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 263, sq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xxi. c. 31; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* v. 458, viii. 84.) [G. T. S.]

Gennadius (*De Vir. Ill.* c. xxii.) says he composed, in a simple and graceful style, six instructions to neophytes, regarding their general conduct and the gentile errors, also "de fide unice Majestatis, adversus genealogiam (or genealogiam), de symbolo, de agni paschalis victima;" they are all lost. Gennadius mentions another, "*ad lapsam virginem libellum*," which from the nature of the subject alone has been identified with the *De Lapsu virginis consecratae*, which is usually found attached to the works of St. Ambrose (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 367), but the conjecture is unsupported by evidence, and many might write on the same subject. [J. G.]

NICETAS (4), bishop of Aquileia, in 458. Leo the Great addressed him a letter (*Ep.* clix.) answering a number of questions he had asked as to the course to be pursued in certain disci-

plinary difficulties, arising mainly out of the Hunnish invasion (e.g. when a woman had married a second husband during the captivity of her first, believing him to be dead, what was to be done in the event of his return?) Of this prelate nothing further is known. He is to be distinguished from *Niceas*, the archdeacon of Aquileia, to whom Jerome wrote, and who seems to be identical with *Niceas* or *Nicetas*, bishop of Romesiana in Dacia, mentioned by Gennadius, etc. (Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, vol. v. p. 24, edit. 1720.) [C. G.]

NICETAS (5), a commander of the imperial guard under Heraclius. He presented, A.D. 613, to the great church of Constantinople the sacred sponge and lance used at the crucifixion. The sponge was affixed to the relics of the true cross. (*Chron. Pasch.* in Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. xcii. col. 987-990.) About the legend of the sacred sponge see Willelm Tyr. lib. xx. cap. 25; Bondelmontius in *Descript. C. P.* iii. et t. iii. *Hist. Franc.* p. 343. [G. T. S.]

NICETAS (6), 48th patriarch of Constantinople, 78th bishop, unorthodox, A.D. 766-780, successor to Constantinus II. Nicetas was an eunuch of Slavonic origin, presbyter of the church of the Holy Apostles, and was, contrary to canon law, consecrated by order of the emperor, Nov. 16. (Nicephorus puts it in August.) The brutal treatment of his deposed predecessor in 767 [CONSTANTINUS II.] is a stain on Nicetas. In A.D. 768 Nicetas carried out some repairs in the great church; and took the opportunity to remove some tessellated or mosaic pictures of Christ and the saints from a neighbouring wing of the patriarchal palace which was used in connection with processions and as a lodging for the emperors on ceremonial occasions. Nicetas died A.D. 780, on Feb. 6th, and was succeeded by Paul. (Baronius, A.D. 766-780; Theoph. *Chronog.* 369, 370, 371, 373, 382; St. Niceph. *Patr. C. P.* 84, 85; Fleury, *Hist. du Christ.* xliii. 42, 49, 50; xlv. 16, 38.) [W. M. S.]

NICETAS (7), bishop of Dadybra in Paphlagonia. He was present at the seventh general council. He may have been the same as Nicetas the Paphlagonian, whose *Encomia* on the Apostles Combefis has published in his *Auct. Nov. Bib. PP. Graec.* There is great uncertainty upon the whole question. (Cf. Fabr. *Bib. Graec.* lib. v., cap. v., where he is identified with a Nicetas of the 9th cent.) (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 557.) [G. T. S.]

NICETAS (8), Mar. 20, bishop of Apollonias and confessor for images (*Menol. Graec.* Sirlet.). Le Quien (i. 614) believes his see to be the Bithynian Apollonias, and places him next to Theophylact, who flourished in 787. [C. H.]

NICETIUS (1), May 5, bishop of Vienne, in succession to Nectarius (*Gall. Chr.* xvi. 13). Under the year 379, and calling him *Niceta*, Ado (*Chron.* in *Pat. Lat.* cxxiii. 96 A) represents him as an eminent upholder of the faith against the Arians. After *Mart. Hieron.* the Bollandists (*Mai.* ii. 9) commemorate him and Nectarius together on May 5. Tillemont (iii. 624) considers there is reason to make him and Nectarius the same person. Hefele (*Councils*, ii. 405) is

inclined to identify our Nicetius with him of 374 NICETIUS (), and the NICESIUS of 394. See Tillem. xvi. 104. [C. H.]

NICETIUS, ex-tribune. [NICENTIUS.]

NICETIUS (2), FLAVIUS, an eminent orator of Gaul in the time of Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. viii. ep. 6 in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 594; Tillem. xvi. 269, 270, 279, 749). [C. H.]

NICETIUS (3) (NICET, NICESSE), ST., 25th archbishop of Trèves, between Aprunculus and St. Magnericus (circ. A.D. 527-566), is a figure of some importance in the 6th century. In his day the bishop was already beginning to pass into the baron, and the holy pope Nicetius was already a territorial lord (Freeman, *Augusta Treverorum, Histor. Essays*, 3rd series, p. 111). Our principal knowledge of him is derived from Gregory of Tours, who received his information from St. Aredius, an abbat of Limoges, Nicetius' disciple (*Vitae Patrum*, cap. xvii.). The story is that from birth he was marked out for the spiritual life, being born with the tonsure (corona clerici). As a youth he entered a monastery, apparently at Limoges (Ebervinus, *Vita S. Magnerici*, i. Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vi. 183), and becoming, in time, abbat, shewed himself a strict disciplinarian, setting his face as sternly against idle conversation as bad actions. On the death of Aprunculus the clergy desired St. Gallus for a successor, but king Theoderic had destined him, by his own wish, for Clermont, and Nicetius was appointed (*Vitae Patrum*, cap. vi.). At Trèves, his position was a difficult one. The Franks who surrounded him were little else than barbarians, rioting in the license of an older civilization, and scarcely more than nominal converts to Christianity. Their respect Nicetius won by personal asceticism, an inflexible temper, and fearless demeanor in the face of the strong, activity in good works, and uncompromising orthodoxy. Gregory says of him, on the authority of Aredius, "nec minitantem timuit, nec a blandiente delusus est" (*Vitae Patrum*, cap. xvii.). His weapon was the power of excommunication, and this he used freely against princes and nobles in cases of oppression or flagrant immorality (cf. Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 462-4). While still an abbat he is said to have confronted king Theoderic, and won his esteem by laying bare to him his wrong-doings. On his way to Trèves to be consecrated, he sternly rebuked his escort of nobles for turning their horses into the standing corn of the poor, and, himself, drove them out. Theoderic's successor, Theodebert, came into conflict with him, and some of his court were excommunicated by the bishop. Clotaire, into whose power Trèves came in 555, was an object of reprobation to the church for the incestuous marriages he had contracted. Wearied of the reproofs which these and other iniquities brought on him, he obtained the bishop's exile by the judgment of a corrupt assembly of fellow-bishops. He was, however, restored by Sigebert after Clotaire's death (circ. A.D. 562), and there is extant a letter of warm congratulations from an anonymous ecclesiastic upon the event (Honthelm, *Hist. Trevir.* i. 40). The councils which he attended shew his wide-reaching activity. He was at Clermont in 535, at Toul in 540, at

Orleans in 544, at the second of Clermont a little later, and at Paris in 555 (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 380). He also convened one himself, under Theodebald, about 550, at Toul to consider the subject of insults which had been levelled at him by certain persons whom, after his custom, he had excommunicated for contracting incestuous marriages. To this council relates the angry letter of Mapinius, bishop of Rheims, who had not been properly invited (Mansi, ix. 147-50; *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1165-6). His orthodoxy is illustrated by two extant letters; one written by him to Clodosinda, the wife of Alboin the Lombard, urging her to turn her husband to Catholicism; the other to the emperor Justinian, whose lapse in his latter days into a form of Eutychianism, Nicetius declares, is lamented by all Italy, Africa, Spain, and Gaul (*Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 375-80; Hontheim, *ibid.* 47-51). Nicetius set himself to restore the churches which had suffered in the storms of the previous generations, and in part rebuilt the metropolitan church of Trèves, the foundation of which patriotism ascribed to Helena, the mother of Constantine, though it was probably a secular building of the time of Valentinian and Gratian (Venant. Fort. *Misc.* iii. 11, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 134). His alterations and additions are described by Wilmowsky, *Der Dom der Trier*, p. 37 sqq., and Freeman, *ibid.* p. 113. For his own defence in those troublous times he built a castle on a lofty hill overlooking the Mosel. The walls, with thirty towers, stretched down to the river banks, and the bishop's hall, with marble columns, occupied the highest point (Venant. Fort. iii. 12, *Patr. Lat.* *ibid.* 135). It is the first recorded building of a class which later ages were greatly to multiply, but its site is unknown (Freeman, p. 112). For his architectural undertakings he summoned workmen from Italy (Rufus, *Epist.*, Hontheim, *ibid.* p. 37). The high position he made for himself is also evidenced by the letter of Florianus, abbat of Roman-Moutier, near Lake Como, begging his influence with Theodebald (Hontheim, *ibid.* 35-6), and the praises of Venantius Fortunatus (*Misc.* iii. 11, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 134). He left numerous disciples, chief among them being St. Aredius (Yrier) and St. Magnericus, his successor. (*Vita S. Aredii*, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1120; Ebervinnus, *ibid.*; Venant. Fort. iii. 13, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 137.) He died about 566, and was buried in the Church of St. Maximin, where his tomb still is. Even in Gregory's time it was famous for its miracles (*De Glor. Conf.* 94; *Vitae Patr.* xvii.). The day of his death is given as Dec. 5, but he is also commemorated Oct. 1 (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 382).

Besides his two letters mentioned above, he was the author of two little treatises called *De Vigilis servorum Dei* and *De Psalmodiae Bono*, first published by d'Achéry in 1659. They are slight works of a didactic character, which may well have been written while he was still a monk. They are to be found in the *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 365-76, and, with the letters, are discussed at some length by Ceillier, xi. 203-6, and in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 294-6. The authorship of the *Te Deum* has been erroneously ascribed to Nicetius, but it is older than his time. (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 294; Tillem. xiii. 963.)

[S. A. B.]

NICETIUS (4) (NIZIER), ST., Ap. 2, abp. of Lyons, between St. Sacerdos and St. Priscus (circ. A.D. 552-573), "vir totius sanctitatis egregius, castae conversationis" (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 36), and one of the few bishops in the West dignified with the title of "patriarcha" (*ibid.* v. 21). We possess two early biographies of him, one written about the year 590, by a clerk of Lyons, at the bidding of Etherius, second occupant of the see after Nicetius, the other a few years later by the historian Gregory of Tours, whose mother was a niece of Nicetius, and who was himself taught by him in early years. Dissatisfied with the meagre information of the earlier life, he undertook to supplement it, though unfortunately he adds little but a string of miracles. The former life was first published by Chifflet and is also to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 100, (cf. *Hist. Litt.* iii. 360-1). Gregory's is found in cap. viii. of his *Vitae Patrum*. A briefer account of him is also contained in his *De Glor. Conf.* (cap. 61); and he is often alluded to in the *Hist. Franc.* (iv. 36, v. 5, 21, viii. 5, and see *De Glor. S. Julian.* cap. 1).

His father was that Florentius of senatorial rank, whose wife Artemia persuaded him to decline the bishopric of Geneva, prophesying that the child she then bore in her womb was destined to be a bishop of his own flesh and blood [FLORENTIUS (42)]. This child was called Nicetius "quasi victorem futurum mundi." He was carefully brought up in ecclesiastical learning, and living on in his mother's house after his father had died, and he had entered the ranks of the clergy, was not ashamed to labour with his hands. At the age of thirty, he was ordained priest by Agricola, bishop of Châlons-sur-Saône (circ. A.D. 545), and occupied himself much in teaching the young. Five years later St. Sacerdos the archbishop of Lyons, on his death-bed obtained a promise from king Chilbert that Nicetius, his nephew, should succeed him. [SACERDOS.] We know very little of his episcopate except that he presided over the 4th, or, as it is usually called, the 2nd council of Lyons, summoned by king Guntram in 566 (Mansi, ix. 785; Ceillier, xi. 887; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 386); that he was remarkable for his insistence upon the virtue of chastity, for his almsgiving, and for his hospitality to strangers, whose feet he would privily wash; and that, while energetically building churches and houses, cultivating fields and planting vineyards, he did not neglect the duty of prayer.

He died in 573, and his cult was firmly established when his earlier biographer wrote. Gregory enumerates many miracles performed both during his life and after his death, and refers to a heap of fetters preserved in his church which had fallen from the limbs of captives at his tomb. The church of the Apostles, in which he was buried and his body long preserved, took his name. Troyes and the diocese of Tours also possessed relics of him. For his epitaph in verse see *Gall. Christ.* iv. 34, and Boll. *Acta SS.* 2 Ap. i. 95. [S. A. B.]

NICETIUS (5), ST., archbishop of Besancon, between Silvester II. and St. Prothadius, according to an anonymous life to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Feb. ii. 168-9, was contemporary with

Gregory the Great, and received from him several circular postistles urging the extirpation of simony (none of which, however, have survived). He is also said to have entertained St. Columban when exiled from Luxeuil (circ. A.D. 610). The supposed day of his death was Feb. 8, on which he is noticed in the *Acta SS.*, but he is now commemorated Jan. 31 (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 13). He was buried in the church of St. Peter, which he had restored. [S. A. B.]

NICIAS (1), the bearer of Basil's letter to the members of the church at Satala in 372, informing them that he had granted their request that a relation of his own should be sent to them as bishop. (Basil, *Ep.* 102 [183].) [E. V.]

NICIAS (2), heretic bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima, an adversary of the council of Chalcedon and an ally of Philoxenus of Hierapolis against Flavian of Antioch (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 31; Le Quien, ii. 796). [C. H.]

NICIAS (3) (*Núκίας*), a monk, who wrote (cir. 601) against John Philoponus [JOANNES (564)]. Photius (*Cod.* 50) mentions the titles of his treatises: *Κατὰ τῶν τοῦ Φιλοπόνου Κεφαλαίων ἐπτά* (mentioned in the *Διατριβή* of Philoponus); *Κατὰ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Σεβήρου*, and *Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι δύο*. (Cave, i. 573; Dupin, ii. 8, ed. 1722; Ceill. xi. 653.) [C. H.]

NICIAS of Romaciana. [NICETAS (3).]

NICO (1), bishop of Cyzicus, a native of Naples, martyred in Sicily with numerous companions in the reign of Decius. His *Acta* are very fabulous. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 23 Mart. iii. 442; Le Quien, i. 749; Tillem. iii. 334.) [C. H.]

NICO (2) (*Νίκων*), a solitary of Mount Sinai cir. 400, falsely accused by a woman (*Apophth. Pat.* in Cotel. *Mon. Eccl. Gr.* i. 577), thought by Tillemont (xiv. 191, 192) to be the Nico commemorated by the Greeks on Nov. 26. [C. H.]

NICO (3), an archimandrite addressed by Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 119 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxiv.) on the discredit into which the monastic life had fallen. (Ceill. viii. 221.) [C. H.]

NICOBULUS (1), the husband of Gregory Nazianzen's favourite niece Alypiana. From the very favourable portrait of him drawn by his uncle, in whose esteem he deservedly stood very high for his loving and dutiful attention, we learn that Nicobulus was a man of good birth, of large wealth, and considerable literary attainments, writing prose and verse with equal facility. His personal qualifications were as conspicuous as those of his mind. He was very tall and singularly handsome. He was a favourite at court, and served with much distinction in various campaigns, especially that against the Persians. His wealth, high character, and aptitude for business marked him out for civil appointments. These, however, were by no means to his taste, as he preferred a domestic life, with leisure for his literary pursuits. The pen of his uncle Gregory was continually employed in writing to one high official after another to obtain his excuse from duties which had been assigned him. In one letter he begs Olympius the

governor of Cappadocia Secunda (c. 382) to relieve him of the office of postmaster of the province, and to substitute some other less onerous charge (*Ep.* 178). In another he urges Helladius, his friend Basil's successor as bishop of Caesarea, to use his influence to get him excused from such duties altogether (*Ep.* 234). There are other letters of a similar character relating to Nicobulus's troubles and difficulties, which it would be tedious to particularise (*Epp.* 47, 48, 107, 160, 166, 179; cf. Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ix. pp. 382 ff.; 527 ff.). It was at the instance of Nicobulus that Gregory compiled a collection of his own letters (*Ep.* 208), and at his request he drew up a code of rules for letter-writing, enforcing conciseness, perspicuity, and elegance, and, above all, naturalness (*Ep.* 209). Nicobulus died at an early age, c. 385, leaving his wife encumbered with the charge of a large family of children, in very different circumstances from those she had been accustomed to, and exposed to the machinations of evil-disposed persons, who brought suits against her imperilling her property (*Epp.* 44, 45). His eldest son was named after him [NICOBULLUS (2)], and his eldest daughter after her mother. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. ix. pp. 381 ff.; 527 ff., 545.) [E. V.]

NICOBULLUS (2), the eldest son of the above by Alypiana, the daughter of Gorgonia, the sister of Gregory Nazianzen. The aged Gregory lavished all the affectionateness of his nature on the boy, in whose religious and intellectual progress he took the keenest interest. He describes him as a quick, clever boy, but inclined to indolence and needing the spur (*Ep.* 116). On Nicobulus and his brothers being sent by their father to Tyana, c. 382, to learn "tachygraphy," Gregory wrote to commend them to the care of Theodorus, the bishop of that city, begging him to see that they had lodgings near the church. When in the same or the following year the boys were removed to Caesarea to study rhetoric, Gregory requested Helladius, the bishop, to take care that they were placed under the ablest and most diligent masters, and to allow them to visit him often, making them feel he did not look down on them (*Ep.* 218). Nicobulus and his brothers had as their private tutor Eudoxius, the son of an old friend of Gregory's, to whom he wrote frequent letters on the subject of the boys' training (*Epp.* 115-117; 119-121; 139) [EUDOXIUS (9) (10)]. A little later Gregory wrote a poetical epistle to Nicobulus the elder, in the name of his son, asking his father's permission to go abroad to study eloquence as his great-uncle had done with such happy results (*Carm.* xlix.). To this Nicobulus replied also in verse (if this be not also from Gregory's pen), granting the lad's request, but adding some sage counsels as to the company he kept and his general conduct (*Carm.* 50). In accordance with this permission the lad went to Constantinople, where he studied under a sophist named Photius, who delighted Gregory with his report of his great-nephew's marvellous progress (*Ep.* 118), and afterwards under Stagirius. This arrangement gave great offence to an old friend and fellow-student of Gregory's named Eustochius, who wrote violent letters complaining that the boy had not been placed under his charge (*Epp.* 61, 62). [EUSTOCHIUS (3).]

The early death of Nicobulus the elder plunged his family into trouble, and after the death of Gregory the boy with his brothers disappears from our view. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* tom. ix. pp. 542-545.) [E. V.]

NICOCLES, a Lacedemonian, the instructor of the emperor Julian in grammar (Soc. *H. E.* iii. 1). His name often recurs in the correspondence of Libanius. In Wolfe's edition of Libanius (*Ep.* 1137), Nicocles apologizes to him for the insults offered by a citizen of Antioch, on the ground that in such a populous city there must be some bad persons. Even in his own Sparta, with a Lycurgus as legislator, all the citizens were not equally good. From *Ep.* 1142 he seems to have been a pagan, at least under Julian. [G. T. S.]

NICODEMUS, counselled by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 22, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.) to be thankful for poverty, as it will diminish his responsibility in the day of judgment. [C. H.]

NICOLAITANS. The mention of this name in the Apocalypse (concerning which see *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE*, s. v.) has caused it to appear in almost all lists of heresies; but there really is no trustworthy evidence of the continuance of a sect so called after the death of the Apostle John. Irenaeus, we know, in writing his great work made use of a treatise against heresies by Justin Martyr; and there seems reason to think that Justin's list began with Simon Magus, and made no mention of Nicolaitans. This may be conjectured from the order in which Irenaeus discusses the heresies, viz. Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, the Ebionites, the Nicolaitans. That these last should have so late a place in the list is inconsistent with chronological order; and the most plausible account of the matter is that Irenaeus followed the order of an older list, which did not include the Nicolaitans, and which he afterwards proceeded to supplement by additions of his own. About the Nicolaitans he has nothing to say (I. xxvi. 3), but what he found in the Apocalypse; for the words "qui indiscrete vivunt," which is the only thing having the appearance of an addition, seems to be only an inference from Rev. ii. 13, 14, and 20-22. Irenaeus in a later book (III. x. 6) incidentally mentions the Nicolaitans as a branch of the Gnostics, and seems to ascribe to them the whole body of Ophite doctrine. It may therefore have been from Irenaeus that Hippolytus derived his view of these heretics. In his earlier treatise (see Vol. III. 93), as we gather from comparing the lists of Epiphanius, Philaster, and Pseudo-Tertullian, he brings them up into an earlier, though still too late a place in his list, his order being Simon Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Nicolaitans; and he ascribes to them the tenets of a fully developed Ophite system. Concerning this we refer to the article OPHITES, believing that there is no sufficient evidence that these people called themselves Nicolaitans. In the later work of Hippolytus, Nicolaus the deacon is made to be the founder of the Gnostics; but the notice is short, and goes little beyond what is told in the first book of

Irenaeus. It is needless to notice the statements of later writers.

Concerning Nicolas the deacon see the article NICOLAS (DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE). We merely repeat here the statement of Stephen Gobar (cf. *Phot. Bibl.* 232) that Hippolytus and Epiphanius make Nicolas answerable for the errors of the sect called after him, whereas Ignatius,* Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Theodoret condemn the sect, but impute none of the blame to Nicolaus himself. [G. S.]

NICOLAUS (1), Dec. 6, bishop of Myra in Lycia, at the time of the Diocletian persecution, and one of the most popular saints both in the East and West. His acts, which may embody some historical elements, are filled with legends and miracles which have become celebrated in hagiological literature. His father's name is reputed to have been Epiphanius, and his mother's Joanna. They lived at the city of Pataca, where they occupied a high position. Nicolaus is regarded as the patron of children, and their exemplar in piety. Accordingly we are told that as soon as he was born he stood up and returned thanks to God for the gift of existence. He rigorously observed the canonical fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays, even when an infant, by abstaining on those days from sucking his mother's breasts. As soon as he grew to man's estate he adopted the ascetic life, and went on a journey to Palestine to visit the holy places. Then began a series of miracles which have rendered him the favourite patron of sailors. He predicted bad weather when everything seemed fair and beautiful, calmed storms which threatened his ship with destruction, and healed a sailor who had fallen off the mast. He is said to have been present at the Council of Nice, where he waxed so indignant with the sentiments of Arius, that he rushed over and inflicted a tremendous box on the heretic's ear. Dean Stanley (*Eastern Church*, pp. 110, 132) represents Nicolaus as occupying the central place in all the traditional pictures of the council. Mr. Tozer in his notes to Finlay's *Hist. of Greece*, t. i. p. 124, notes that Nicolaus has taken the place of Poseidon in Oriental Christianity. Thus, in the island of Eleÿssa, a temple of Poseidon has been changed into the church of St. Nicolaus. His popularity in England has been very great, 376 churches being dedicated to him. His feast day was formerly connected in Salisbury Cathedral, Eton, and elsewhere with the curious ceremonial of choosing a boy-bishop, who presided till the following Innocents Day, over his fellow choristers, arrayed in full episcopal attire (cf. *The Antiquities of Cathedral Church of Salisbury*, A.D. 1723, pp. 72-80, where the ritual of the feast is given). We can trace the fame of this saint back to the 6th century, when Justinian built a church in his honour at C. P. (*Procop. de Aedif.* i. 6). His relics were translated in the middle ages to Barri in Italy, whence he is often styled Nicolaus of Barri. The acts of Nicolaus will be found at length in Surius *Hist. Sanct.*, and his legends and treatment in art in Jameson's *Sacred Art*, t. ii. p. 450. The figure

* The reference is to the larger form of the Epistle to the Trallians.

of St. Nicolaus is a leading one in the celebrated Blenheim Raphael, lately purchased for the National Gallery. [G. T. S.]

NICOLAUS (2), of Damascus, writer on the Deluge. (Hieron. *De Sit. et Nom. Loc. Heb.* lib. i.; *De Genesi*, in *Pat. Lat.* xxiii. 861 A.) [C. H.]

NICOLAUS (3), a monk at the end of the 4th century, to whom Marcus the anchorite inscribed the eighth book of his work. (Phot. cod. 200.) [C. H.]

NICOLAUS (4), presbyter and monk of the monastery of St. Publius at Zeugma, to whom, together with Theodotus and Chaereas his brother monks, Chrysostom wrote in 405, thanking them for their wish to visit him at Cucusus, from accomplishing which they had been kept by fear of the Isaurian banditti (Chrys. *Ep.* 146). It is probable that he is the same person to whom Chrysostom addressed three letters relating to the missionary work among the pagans of Phoenicia (*Epp.* 53, 69, 145). From the first of these we learn that Nicolaus took a very warm interest in those missions, and had sent monks thither to carry on the work of evangelization, in which he had exhorted them to persevere in spite of the opposition they met with, and the violence with which they were treated. Chrysostom wrote in 405 warmly commending his zeal, and entreating him to send able reinforcements, and to urge Gerontius to go to the mission field as soon as his health would allow (*Ep.* 53). Towards the end of the same year Chrysostom wrote again from Cucusus, expressing his earnest desire to see him, and begging him since that was impossible to write to him as often as he could. It would be a consolation to him, in his loneliness, sickness, and daily terrors of an Isaurian inroad, to know that his friend was in good health (*Ep.* 145). After his flight to Arabissus in 406 he wrote again, describing the danger he had been in with "death every day at the door," praising him for the interest Nicolaus continued to take in the Phoenician missions, and begging him to write if he had anything fresh to tell of them (*Ep.* 69.) [E. V.]

NICOLAUS (5), priest of Thessalonica, deputed by pope Leo I., A.D. 444, to act as his legate in eastern Illyria: this was at the request of Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica (St. Leo, *Ep.* vi.), and while Nicolaus received full instructions as to regulating the ordinations of bishops and clergy, and the general discipline, the Illyrian metropolitans were directed to receive him as the papal representative (*Ib.*, *Ep.* v. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liv. 616-7; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 202-3. On the legatine authority, see *Dict. Chr. Antiq.* ii. 967). [J. G.]

NICOMACHUS, an apostate at Lampsacus, A.D. 250, said to have been slain by demons (Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Mai. iii. 453 A; Tillem. iii. 321). [C. H.]

NICOMAS, bishop of Iconium, noted by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 28) as one of the leading bishops at the middle of the third century. [G. S.]

NICOMEDES (1), African bishop of Segermi (Segelmi, Secermi), which is not mentioned by

ancient geographers (nor in *Dict. Gk. & Roman Geog.*), but whose bishops occur twice or three times as belonging to Provincia Byzacena (see Morcelli). Its name does not occur in inscriptions. He is named fourth in *Syn. Carth.* 2 *de pace*, A.D. 251, *Cyp. Ep.* 57; fifth in *Syn. Carth. de Basilide*, A.D. 254, *Cyp. Ep.* 67; eighth in *Syn. Carth. de Bapt. H. i. Cyp. Ep.* 70; ninth in *Syn. Carth. de Bapt. iii. Sent. Epp.* [E. W. B.]

NICOMEDES (2), a monk, member of a coenobitic society at Nazianzus, one of those highly praised by Gregory Nazianzen in his poem extolling the virtues of these solitaries (*Carm.* 46, p. 108). Nicomedes was a kinsman of Gregory's, who had consecrated all his property to religious uses, and like a second Abraham had devoted his two children, a son and a daughter, to the service of God in coenobitic societies. [E. V.]

NICOMEDIA, MARTYRS OF. Under this head may be reckoned Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia and a great number of his flock who perished under suspicion of having set fire to the Imperial palace at the very beginning of the Diocletian persecution. Euseb. viii. 6, 13. The acts of Anthimus are given by the Bollandist in April t. iii. in Greek and Latin. Cf. Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 320, and Tillem. *Mém.* v. 23. [G. T. S.]

NICOSTRATUS (1), Roman deacon (*Cyp. Ep.* 31, tit.; *Ep.* 32), and confessor 253. From use of *patronae* (*Ep.* 50) probably a freedman. Slaves could be ordained (*Can. Ap.* 81), with consent of masters followed by manumission, but the word *dominae* would then probably have been used. At the council of Elvira freedmen were forbidden to be ordained during the life of patrons. One of the fellow-sufferers (*Ep.* 37) of MOYSES and MAXIMUS, and, like the latter and his friends, an adherent of Novatian. But at the time when they returned to the Catholic church and to Cornelius (*Ep.* 49, 51, 52) he left them and sailed with Novatus to Carthage to push the Novatianist cause. (*Ep.* 50.) He is accused by Cornelius of peculation in his office, or rather it may be transferring to what he considered the true church funds which he had in his keeping belonging to the church of Rome (*Ep.* 50, 52). In *Cat. Vet. Pontif.* (Pearson, *Ann.* p. 30 a) it is said that Novatus made or caused him to be made a bishop in Africa; but this seems to be a confusion, and so thinks Baluze: see EVARISTUS, who with Nicostratus, Novatus, Primus, Dionysius, composed the legation to Carthage. [E. W. B.]

NICOSTRATUS (2), a primiscrinus at Rome, c. 287, in the *Acta* of St. Sebastian, by whom he was converted while having in his custody SS. Marcus and Marcellianus. He afterwards suffered martyrdom. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 20 Jan. ii. 268-270, §§ 24, 30, 35, 68, 76; Tillemont, iv. 518, 519, 520, 528.) [C. H.]

NICOSTRATUS (3), eastern bishop, deposed probably by the emperor Anastasius I. Along with two other bishops, Helias and Thomas, who were in a like predicament, he is mentioned in several letters of pope Hormisdas, who in 519 and 520 was very urgent

with the emperor Justin I. for their restoration. For references see HELIAS. [J. G.]

NICOTYCHUS (1), a scholasticus charged by Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 8) with being secretly addicted to Gentile wickedness. [C. H.]

NICOTYCHUS (2) (*Νικότυχος*), a deacon warned by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 142) against indulging voluptuous thoughts. [C. H.]

NIDAN, Welsh saint, son of Gwrwyw, of the family of Coel Godebog, in the college of Penmon, Anglesey; patron of Llanidan in Anglesey. Feast Sept. 30. (Rees, *W. SS.* 295; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 504, 528, 558; *Myv. Arch.* ii. 49.) [J. G.]

NIDHARDUS, addressed by Winfrid c. 720 (*Ep.* 4 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 692). [C. H.]

NIERSES. [NORSESES.]

NIGIDIUS, a heretic, apparently a Gnostic, mentioned by Tertullian in his *De Praescript. Haeret.* cap. xxx. He classes him with Hermogenes and several others as "still perverting the ways of the Lord," whence we conclude he was still alive when this was written [HERMOGENES] (Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, 554). [G. T. S.]

NILAMMON (1) (*Νειλάμμων*), one of the bishops ordained by Alexander bishop of Alexandria, and banished by the Arians to Ammoniacia in the time of Athanasius. (Athanasius, *Ap. de Fug.* § 7, *Hist. Ar.* § 72; Tillem. viii. 697.) [C. H.]

NILAMMON (2), a solitary, elected bishop of Gera in Egypt, about the time of the expulsion of Chrysostom from Constantinople. He shrank from the honour, however, and died when Theophilus archbishop of Alexandria came to ordain him. (Soz. viii. 19; Boll. *Acta SS.* 6 Jun. 326 B; Tillem. xi. 214, 489; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 551.) [C. H.]

NILAMMON (3), a scholasticus, one or more, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium on the preference of deeds to words (lib. i. ep. 3 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxviii.), on the principle that religion cannot be fairly reproached with the crimes of its ministers (lib. iii. ep. 242), and on the terrors of conscience (lib. v. ep. 561). Other Nilammons addressed by Isidore are—

(4), two persons in one letter (lib. iii. ep. 288); their characters, in which as well as in name they resembled one another, are severely censured.

(5), a presbyter (lib. iii. ep. 293), who enquires why those under intoxication are differently affected in appearance.

(6), a deacon (lib. iii. ep. 364) on the guilt incurred by those who minister at the sacrament while indulging in sin.

(7), a deacon and physician (lib. iii. 71) on God being a God of judgment as well as of mercy.

(8), a monk (lib. iv. ep. 98) in reply to his enquiry why, since it behoved Christ to suffer, those who crucified Him should be punished.

(9), (lib. iv. ep. 150) in answer to the question why St. Paul should have written to the Corinthians, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." [C. H.]

NILO (*Νεΐλων*), addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. iv. ep. 108) on St. Paul's words, "having spoiled principalities and powers," &c. [C. H.]

NILUS (1), a proconsul and father of Pansophius, an Egyptian martyr during the Decian persecution. Pansophius is commemorated by *Bas Men.* Jan. 16. (Leo Allat. *Diatrib. de Nilis et eorum Scriptis*, sec. ii.) [G. T. S.]

NILUS (2), Sept. 19, an Egyptian bishop who suffered by fire in Palestine with another Egyptian bishop, Peleus, in the Diocletian persecution. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, *Mart. Palest.* cap. xiii.) [G. T. S.]

NILUS (3), Nov. 12, a famous ascetic of Sinai, who flourished at the end of the 4th century. He was probably born in Galatia, as he speaks of St. Plato, martyr of Ancyra as his countryman. He rose to high position at Constantinople, where he held the office of prefect. He married, and had two children, when he determined about A.D. 390 to retire to Sinai, taking with him his son Theodulus. His epistles are very curious, and interesting reading, detailing the assaults made on him by demons, and replying to the various queries of every kind, doctrinal, disciplinary, and even political, with which he was assailed by his admirers. GAÏNAS, the Gothic general, consulted him on the Arian controversy, but without changing his opinions (*Epp.* lib. i. 70, 79, 114). Nilus boldly took the side of St. Chrysostom when banished from C. P. in 404, and wrote in his defence to the emperor Arcadius (*Epp.* iii. 279), who in reply solicited the prayers of Nilus to protect Constantinople from impending ruin. The story of his ordination is a curious one. The Saracens invaded the desert of Sinai, and took captive a number of the solitaries, among whom were Nilus and his son Theodulus. They dismissed Nilus and the older men, but retained the young men, intending to offer them as sacrifices to the Morning Star on the next day. They overslept themselves, however, and then, as the propitious time was past, they sold Theodulus, who fell into the hands of a neighbouring bishop. There he was found by his father. The piety of them both so struck the bishop that he compelled them to accept ordination at his hands. They then returned to Sinai, and distinguished themselves by a severer piety than they had practised previously. Nilus died about the year 430. Theodulus is commemorated on January 14. Fabricius, in vol. x. 1-12 of his *Bibliotheca Graeca*, bestows a lengthened notice on Nilus, and gives a list of his works, which were first published in a complete shape in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, t. lxxix., where his letters will be found after the text of Leo Allatius. The bibliography of his works is detailed at length in Fabricius, *l. c.*, and in Ceillier, viii. 229. The study of his writings throws much light on the state of monasticism,

and of Christian society in general at the end of 4th century. Take his letters for instance:—The two last epistles in the collection lib. iv. *Epp.* 61 and 62 were quoted at the second Nicene council as bearing on the Iconoclastic controversy, both sides claiming support from such an eminent saint. They are, certainly, both of them most interesting and important documents for the illustration of church life at that period. Olympiodorus, an Eparch, was desirous of erecting a church which he proposed to decorate with images of saints in the sanctuary, together with hunting scenes, birds, and animals in mosaic, and numerous crosses in the nave, and on the floor. He designed a scheme of decoration, in fact, which we find carried out some time later in the churches of Central Syria, depicted in De Vogüé's great work on the *Civil and Ecclesiastical Architecture of Syria*. The reply of Nilus is important from the purely artistic and architectural point of view. He condemns the mosaics as mere trifling and unworthy a manly Christian soul. He rejects numerous crosses in the nave, but orders the erection of one cross at the East end of the sanctuary, "Inasmuch as by the Cross man was delivered from spiritual slavery, and Hope has been shed on the nations." Good pictures from the Old and New Testaments meet with his approval. They serve as books for the unlearned; teach them Scripture history, and impress on them the record of God's mercies. The church was to have numerous chapels. Each chapel may have a cross erected therein. Epistle sixty-two proves that his prohibition of mosaics only extended to hunting scenes, and did not probably include the images of saints. It was written for the purpose of exalting the fame of his favourite martyr, Plato of Ancyra, and it conclusively proves that the invocation of saints was then practised in the East [cf. FIDENTIUS (2)]. It tells a story of a father and son who were taken captive by the barbarians. The son invoked the help of Christ and of St. Plato, when the latter appeared to him mounted on horseback, and leading with him a riderless horse which the pious captive was compelled to mount, and was guided by the supernatural visitor to a place of safety. The martyr was recognized by the young man from the numerous pictures he had seen. Nilus did not approve of the extraordinary forms which monasticism was assuming. Lib. ii. *Epp.* 114 and 115 are addressed to one Nicander, a Stylite, who must have set the fashion which St. Simeon followed. In his first epistle, Nilus tells him his lofty position is due simply to pride, and shall find a fulfilment of the words, "He that exalts himself shall be abased." In the second epistle he charges upon him light and amorous conversation with women. Monastic discipline seems indeed to have been very relaxed in his time, as the same charges are often repeated in his letters and works. We often find in them the peculiar practices of the monks or of the early church explained with mystical references. Thus in lib. i. *Ep.* 24 he explains to one Marcianus, the reason of washing the hands before entering a church (cf. Bingham. t. ii. p. 398). *Epp.* 26–31 are taken up with a defence of the practice of ecclesiastical vigils, in reply to the arguments and objections of one Timo-

theus, a sub-deacon, who adopted the views of Vigilantius, while Nilus uses a more Christian style of argument than that employed by Jerome. *Epp.* 86 and 87 explain standing with outstretched arms at prayer as a figure of the Cross, with which may be compared, lib. iii. *Ep.* 132 expounding standing at prayer on Sundays as a testimony to the resurrection. *Epp.* 124–127 contain his replies to a Jew named Benjamin, who attacked Christianity. In the second book we find *Ep.* 116 reproving a nun, who had so far forgotten Eastern modesty as even to teach men publicly in a church. He refers her very briefly to the Apostolic prohibition. In *Ep.* 160, he writes to a bishop, Philo, who combined, like the ancient Celts, the office of bishop with that of abbat, advising him about the management of his monks. In *Ep.* 245, he refers to the custom of monks, who wore their cloaks over the right shoulders, while seculars wore theirs over the left; while in *Ep.* 289, he writes to a chamberlain, Methodius, explaining Christ's fear of death, and His prayer against it in the Garden of Gethsemane, as a mere pretence, to deceive the devil and to lead him to think Christ a mere man. Therefore the devil brought about His crucifixion; otherwise, had he known Him to be God, he would not have done so. These specimens of the matters contained in his letters will show how very various are the subjects discussed. In fact, there is no more copious source for illustrations of the life and times of the close of the 4th century, than this correspondence which he maintained with all classes from the emperor downwards. Another circumstance shows the wide influence Nilus exercised even in the distant West. Cardinal Pitra has published in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*, iii. 398, a letter, written by Nilus to one Nemertius, expounding the mystical meaning of the various parts of a church—the gates, columns, bishop's throne, etc. He explains the position of the episcopal throne in the midst of all the presbyters as representing the Seat of the Great High Priest, Jesus Christ. This original position of the episcopal throne, facing westwards in the midst of the twelve presbyters, is retained to this day in the Coptic churches of Egypt, in the 7th-century church of Torcelli, near Venice, and the cathedral of Parenzo in Istria (cf. Butler's *Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*, Oxford, 1884, p. 35 and p. 78, where a plan may be seen illustrating this arrangement). This epistle was found by Pitra in a manuscript of Cambrai, belonging to 9th century, in a Latin translation made by Anastasius Bibliothecarius; affording an instance of the percolation, at that period, of Syrian ideas into the West of Europe. The prevalence of the anchorite life in the Celtic church of the West may be largely due to his influence. He wrote a treatise in twenty-seven chapters in praise of it, entitled *De Monachorum Præstantiâ*, which can be consulted in the volume of the *Patrol. Græc.*, already cited, col. 1061. His treatise on prayer in one hundred and fifty-three chapters was highly praised by Photius, *cod.* 201. It is contained in the same volume, and embraces many noble thoughts. It rises above the narrow view of prayer, which limits it to petition merely, and defines it as a colloquy of the human spirit with the Divine.

Ceillier (viii. 205—230) has a good account of the life, doctrines, and bibliography of Saint Nilus. [G. T. S.]

NILUS (4), a scholasticus addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. v. epp. 240, 241).

(5), another person or more (lib. i. epp. 5, 56, 137, 219; ii. 160; iii. 69, 139; iv. 151, 158, 167, 179, 193; v. 130, 145, 157, 272, 287, 391, 438, 487, 492, 516).

(6), a deacon, who affirms that philosophy, rhetoric, grammar, &c., derive their ornament and grace from Christian truth (lib. iii. ep. 65), and comments on the passages, "If thine eye offend thee," &c. (iii. 66), and "The natural man receiveth not," &c. (iv. 127).

(7), a monk (lib. i. epp. 80, 427) on the passage "Agree with thine adversary quickly," &c., and on the hypocrisy of those who wear the sheepskin girdle, but do not mortify the flesh.

NILUS (8), a priest addressed by NILUS (3) (lib. iii. epp. 236, 256) on the value of prayer and on the passage St. John v. 7; a monk (lib. iii. epp. 155, 255) on the value of prayer and on Ps. xlii. 3; a scholasticus (lib. iii. ep. 153) on the spiritual conflict. Another person (lib. iii. ep. 170) on divine chastisements. [C. H.]

NILUS (9), bishop of Orthosias in Phoenicia, ordained by Leontius bishop of Tripolis, having been trained in the monastery of St. Euthymius in Palestine (*Vit. Euthym.* § 129, in Cotelier. *Ecll. Gr. Monum.* ii. 310; Le Quien, ii. 826). [C. H.]

NIMMIA, Aug. 12, martyr at Augsburg, with Hilaria, mother of St. Afra, and several other women. (*Mart. Us., Adon.*) [HILARIA (1).] [G. T. S.]

NINIAN (NINIAS, NINAN, NINAS, NINUS, NINYAS, NYNIA, NYNYANE, DINAN, RINGAN, RINGEN), bishop and confessor, commemorated Sept. 16. The general facts of his life and work present comparatively few points for dispute, owing perhaps to there being but one tradition, and that not materially departed from.

The primary authority is Bede (*E. H.* iii. 4), who makes however only an incidental allusion to St. Ninian in connection with St. Columba, yet touches therein the chief points embodied in the later *Life*—his converting the southern Picts a long time before St. Columba's day (*multo ante tempore*), his being "de natione Brittonum," but instructed in the Christian faith and mysteries at Rome; his friendship with St. Martin of Tours, in whose honour he dedicated his episcopal see and church at Candida Casa in the province of the Bernicii, and his building the church there of stone "insolito Brittonibus more" (*M. H. B.* 176). This is repeated in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* A.D. 565 (*Ib.* 303). Ailred's *Vita S. Niniani* appears to be little more than an expansion of these details, but in how far he, in the 12th century, had or had not authentic evidence of an earlier date to assist him in the compilation we have no means of knowing, beyond this that he specially refers to Bede's information and also

a "liber de vita et miraculis ejus, barbarico (barbarice) scriptus," but of its value we are ignorant. The chief life is *Vita Niniani Pictorum Australium apostoli, auctore Ailredo Reicallensi*, first printed by Pinkerton (*Vit. Ant. SS.* 1 sq. ed. 1789), and reprinted with translation and notes, by Bp. Forbes (*Historians of Scotland*, vol. v. 1874). Capgrave (*Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 241—3) has *De Niniano Ep. et Conf.* which appears to be taken from or based upon a Life in the Burgundian Library at Brussels; this is partly translated and commented upon by Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Brit.* 154, 161, 184). In *Brev. Aberdon.* (Prop. SS. p. Est. ff. 107 sq.) there are 9 lections with antiphons, hymns, &c. The Scotch annalists have been mindful of St. Ninian, and Ussher (wks. vi. 200 sq.) has collected their notices, but they are of no special value. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 16 Sept. v. 318—28) print no Life, but give a learned commentarius historico-criticus by Stickenus, in which most of the points in his life are considered. (See further Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. 44 sq. 853; Bp. Forbes, *Lives of SS. Kent and Nin.* Introd.; Grub, *Ecll. Hist. Scot.* i. c. 2 et al.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 3, 444; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 14, 35; Pinkerton, *Enquiry*, ii. 263 sq.; Pryce, *Anc. Brit. Ch.* 104 sq.)

Ailred's *Life of S. Ninian* is of the usual un-historic character, fuller of moralisings than of facts, and having only one fixed point to suggest a date. St. Ninian was of royal birth and belonged to the valley of the Solway; his father was probably a regulus in the Cumbrian kingdom, and, being a Christian, had his son early engrafted into the church by baptism. The youth soon manifested a desire to visit Rome, and crossing over to the Continent set out on a pilgrimage to the holy city, which he appears to have reached in the time of pope Damasus (A.D. 366—384), perhaps in A.D. 370. After devoting several years (*pluribus annis*) there in study of the Scriptures and holy learning, he was raised to the episcopate, A.D. 394, by the pope himself, probably Siricius (A.D. 385—399), and sent as bishop to the western part of Britain, where the Gospel was unknown, corrupted, or misrepresented by the teachers. Calling on St. Martin at Tours and receiving from him masons to build churches according to the Roman method, he returned to his native shores and built his church at Witerna, now Whithern in Wigtonshire, but whether it was near the site of the later abbey or on the island near the shore is uncertain. As he was building the church when the news reached him of St. Martin's death (A.D. 397), in whose honour he was careful to dedicate the church itself, this at the latest must have been in the spring of 398. Farther than this we have no landmarks for ascertaining his dates. The chief field of his missionary labours was in the central district of the east of Scotland among those barbarians who had defied the Roman power in the days of Agricola, and who were separated off from the Roman province of Valentia by the rampart of Antoninus; but the veneration in which his name is held is shown by his dedications being found over all Scotland. (For dedications see Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 424.)

His monastic school, known by various names as Magnum Monasterium, Monasterium Rosnattense, Alba, and Candida Casa, was famous

through Cumbria and Ireland, and was one of the chief seats of early Christian learning to which the Welsh and Irish saints resorted, till both school and see were destroyed by the irruptions of the Britons and Saxons. The see was revived for a time in the 8th century, under Saxon influence from York (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 7-8, 56 sq.; Stubbs, *Reg. Sac. Ang.* 184 et al.), to be again restored in the 12th cent. by King David I. of Scotland. The date usually assigned for his death, though on no definite data, is Sept. 16 A.D. 432, and Bede (*E. H.* iii. c. 4) relates that he was buried in his church at Candida Casa, which in the middle ages became a much frequented place of pilgrimage. (See Chalmers, *Caled.* iii. 42.) At the same time it must be noted that an Irish tradition (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 86; Todd, *B. of Hymns*, i. 100 sq.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 3, 46) carries him to Ireland as Monenn, &c., who founded a church at Cluain-Conaire in the north of Ui-Faelain, and died there. But this is probably fictitious. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 502) ascribes to him *Meditationes Psalterii* and *De Sententiis Sanctorum*, while Tanner (*Bibl.* 549), from Leland, mentions *Eulogium temporis*, all probably fictitious. The Clog-rinny or Bell of St. Ringan, of rude workmanship, is in the Antiquarian Museum, Edinburgh, and his cave is still pointed out on the sea-shore in the parish of Glasserton, Wigtonshire. His feast is Sept. 16th.

The era embraced in the life of St. Ninian (A.D. 360-432?) is a memorable epoch in the history of the Western church. While in the East were living and suffering for the faith the great St. Basil of Caesarea, the Gregories, and St. Chrysostom, there were no less saints in the West moulding the church's teaching and destiny, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine. And still further west St. Martin was consolidating at Tours the monastic system which was to prove so effectual in christianising Britain [MONASTIC BISHOP, *Dict. Ch. Ant.* ii. 1270]. But it was a time of barbarous warfare, and the Roman empire was falling to pieces before the inroads of the Goths from the north and east. Rome required her forces to protect, if possible, her own citadel, and the colonies were left to shift for themselves. The last of the legionaries were withdrawn from Britain in A.D. 410, while St. Ninian was preaching among the southern Picts, and for a time all intercourse was practically broken off with Rome. But up to this time Britain had formed part of the empire, and the road was open for soldier or pilgrim to the capital, and the youthful Briton from the Solway may easily have found his way to the holy city and been a witness of the wretched scenes which distinguished the episcopate of Damasus. Coming from Rome through the Gallican church and imbibing the views of his patron St. Martin, he would impress upon the new church in Britain the mark of a peculiarly Western character, and the first fruits of his mission would appear in the monastic establishment at Whithern, but of other foundation time or tradition has left no trace. Where the imperial legions had failed to maintain their footing, this pioneer of the Gospel entered to establish the kingdom of peace, and laboured for upwards of thirty years in the centre and south-west of what is now Scotland.

He died in peace, and, according to tradition, his work was taken up by St. Palladius, St. Ternan, St. Servanus, St. Kentigern, and other Scotch saints, but St. Ninian remains the first and greatest of the ancient British missionaries of whom we have a clear and distinct tradition.

[J. G.]

NINNIDH (NENNIUS, NENNIDH, NENNIUS, NAINNIDH), surnamed Saebhuisc or Laobhdhearc, of Inismacsaint, co. Fermanagh, in Loch Erne, bishop, commemorated Jan. 18; belongs to the 6th century, but his legend is doubtful. (*M. Doneg.* 23; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 111 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 319 sq.; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 451; ii. 233. For the architectural remains at Inismacsaint, and the rudely executed ancient cross of St. Nenn, see O'Hanlon *ut supr.* and Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. vii. 304.)

[J. G.]

NINNOCA. [NENNOCA.]

NINUS (Cyp. *Ep.* 56), in the Decian persecution with Florus and Clementianus endured the question before local magistrates, but broke down under more protracted torture before the proconsul. Their case was brought by Superius before six bishops at Capsa, who referred it to Cyprian and he to the council. He was inclined to restore them after three years of penance, counted from Feb. A.D. 250 to April 252.

[E. W. B.]

NIOBITES, a sub-division of the Monophysite party, who derived their name from a Niobes, an Alexandrian professor. They differed from the catholics only in the use of language. They flourished in cent. vii. (Hefele's *Concils*, sec. 208.)

[G. T. S.]

NISTHEROUS (Νισθηρώος), two fathers (if not the same) of the Egyptian desert, one of whom is designated *δ μέγας*, and called the friend of Antony, and the other a coenobite; but they may be the same person. The former gave more practical advice to a man who questioned him than monks often imparted. He was asked to point out the best course of action a man should follow, to promote God's glory. He replied that in God's sight all good actions are equally acceptable, all virtues stand on a level. Abraham was noted for hospitality, Elijah for retirement, David for humility, yet God accepted all equally. "Choose then the course your spirit inclines towards, and guard your heart," was his conclusion. The second Nistherous was supposed to possess miraculous powers. A famous anchorite of that day, Poemen or Pastor, brother of Nub or Anuph [NUB] [POEMEN], asked him how he obtained such spiritual power. Nistherous replied that when he entered on the monastic life, he said to his soul, "Tu et Asinus estis unum," and then acted accordingly. An ass when beaten replies not; so had he acted till he attained to the state depicted by the Psalmist (lxxiii. 21, 22), "so foolish was I, and ignorant: even as it were a beast before thee; nevertheless I am always by thee." (Cotelerii *Monum. Graec. Eccles.* i. 575, 577.)

[G. T. S.]

In Rosweyde's *Vitae Patrum* these fathers

occur under the forms Nisteron and Nesteron (v. 12, 30; vii. 12, 42), one of them being Nisteron major, who answers to the *ὁ μέγας*. One of them, apparently the coenobite, is met with again in Cassian, who visited him in 395. Two of the *Conferences*, the 14th and 15th, are held with him, the subjects being *De Spirituali Scientia* and *De Charismatibus Divinis*. He and his associates, Chaeremon and Joseph, are "senes tres . . . anachoretæ antiquissimi" [JOSEPHUS (27)] (Cassian, *Coll.* xiv., xv. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xlix. col. 953 sq.; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 10, 439, 442; xiv. 162, 163; xv. 154, 155; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 147.) [J. G.]

NITIGISIUS (NITIGIS, NIGESIUS), bishop of Lugo (561-585), to whom St. Martin bishop of Braga dedicated his collection of canons (*Patr. Lat.* cxxx. 575). He heads the subscriptions at the synod of Lugo in 572 (Mansi, ix. 841). For a fuller account of this prelate, see Florez, *Esp. Sag.* xl. 66. [MARTINUS (2), p. 847 a.]

[C. H.]

NITRIA, MONASTERIES OF. This district, which has contributed to the British Museum some of its most important manuscript treasures, is a desert valley situated between 30 and 31 degrees both of latitude and longitude, about thirty-five miles to the left of the most western branch of the Nile. The name of Nitria (Strabo, *Geogr.* xviii. i. 23, ed. Paris, 1858) belongs properly to the northern part of the valley, where the famous Natron lakes are situated; the southern part is more correctly the Valley of Scithis or Scete. It is also called the Desert, or Valley, of Macarius, from the convent dedicated to one of the three saints who bore that name. The Mohammedans commonly call the whole valley Wadi Habib, after one of their own saints, one of the Prophet's companions, who retired hither about the end of the 7th century. This valley has been the resort of ascetics from the earliest times; the Therapeutæ of Philo's day may have set the example (Neander, *H. E.* i. 84). Possibly, as Jerome seems to hint (*ad Eustoch.*), from some fancied virtues of purification in the lakes themselves, in allusion to Jeremiah xi. 22: "Oppidum Domini Nitriam, in quo purissimo virtutum nitro sordes lavantur quotidie plurimorum." Bingham (*Antiquit.* lib. viii. cap. i. sec. 4) has ably discussed the origin of monasticism, pointing out that while ascetic lives have been led from the very beginning of Christianity, monasticism took its rise in Egypt after the Decian persecution, when men fled to the neighbouring deserts for safety, where, finding not only a safe retreat, but also more time and liberty to exercise themselves in acts of piety and contemplation, they remained there when the danger had passed. The first person to organize the ascetics of Nitria was Saint Ammon [AMMON], who flourished under Constantine, and was a friend of Athanasius. He died about A.D. 345 (Ceill. iv. 314). He was succeeded by Macarius, who instituted the first community in that part of the valley which to this day bears his name. [MACARIUS (17).] The fame of this place rapidly extended. Ascetics thronged to it in thousands. Men of high position weary of the world, like Ausonius,

the preceptor of Arcadius and Honorius, retired hither. Rufinus, who visited Nitria about the year 372, mentions some fifty convents (cf. *Soz. H. E.* vi. 31), and Palladius, who in 390 passed twelve months here, reckons the devotees at five thousand (Pallad. *Hist. Lausiæ.* cap. vii.; Ceill. vii. 484). Jerome also visited them about the same time, and gives us numerous details of their life (cf. *Epp.* ad Eustoch., ad Rustic.). The influence of Nitria upon Western Europe was very great. Athanasius brought with him to Rome upon his second exile Ammon, a monk of Nitria; not, however, the same as the above-mentioned Ammon. From that time (A.D. 340) the introduction of the monastic life into Italy must be dated. [ATHANASIUS, Vol. I. p. 188; cf. Hieron. *Ep. ad Princip. Epitaph. Marcellæ*; Baron. *An.* 340, n. 7.] Even the very discipline of Western monasticism was modelled upon that of Nitria, as Cassianus introduced the knowledge of it into Gaul by his treatises, *De Institutis Renuntiantium*, and the *Collationes Patrum in Scithico Eremo Commorantium*, the latter of which St. Benedict ordered to be read daily by his disciples. [CASSIANUS.] This connexion between Gaul and Nitria was maintained during the 4th century, as we see from the conclusion of Jerome's treatise against Vigilantius, where he mentions the haste of the Gallic monk, Sisinnius, "who is about to proceed to Egypt for the relief of the saints," as an excuse for the brevity of his treatise. Sisinnius was the messenger of Exuperius of Toulouse, Riparius, and Desiderius, and carried their alms to the ascetics of Egypt (cf. Hieron. *Prolog. in Zachar.*). [EXUPERIUS.] For other instances of this Eastern and Syrian connexion with southern Gaul, cf. Boeckh. *Corp. Inscript. Græc.* 9886, 9891-93; Le Blant, *Chrét. Inscript. en Gaule*, i. p. 324. These inscriptions seem to relate to a regular Syrian colony settled at Arles and Vienne, about 450. From the above-named works of Cassianus, together with the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius, the *Monumenta* of Cotelierius, and Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogue I.*, the curious reader will gain the most ample details of the life, conversation, discipline, and religious observances of the Nitrian communities in the 4th and 5th centuries (Ceill. vii. 486; Du Pin, *H. E.* i. 425, ed. Dublin, 1723). [PALLADIUS.] Towards the conclusion of the 4th century they were torn with religious controversy. On the one hand, a section of the Nitrian monks, led by Pathomius, embraced anthropomorphism [ANTHROPOMORPHITAE], while, on the other hand, the vast majority of them followed the opinions of Origen, for which they were violently persecuted, even to death, by Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 401), and roundly denounced by Jerome. (Cf. Correspondence between Jerome and Theophilus among Hieron. *Epp.*; Sulpic. Sever. *l. c.*; Neander, *H. E.* iv. 464-66.) [THEOPHILUS, CHRYSOSTOM.] This Origenistic tendency reproduced itself in Cassianus and his followers in Gaul (Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christ.* t. i. 165-170, ed. 1867). It also prepared the way for that Monophysite view of our Lord's person, which the Nitrian monks, in common with the whole Egyptian church, maintained from the 5th century onwards.

Joannes Moschus tells us that in his time—the beginning of the 7th century—the Nitrian monks numbered three thousand five hundred, and gives us interesting details of the inner life of the monasteries at that time in his works, as published by Cotelierius in *Mon. Eccles. Graec.*, and in the *Vitae Patr. or Hist. Eremit.* in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* lxxiii., lxxiv., wherein will be found many of the ancient works already referred to in this article. After the invasion of the Saracens we principally depend upon the Arab historians for information, the chief of them being al-Makrizi, who died A.D. 1441. His *History of the Copts* was published with a German translation by Wüstenfeld, at Göttingen, in the *Abhandlung der Königl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* Bd. iii. and separately at the same place in 1845. The writings of Severus, bishop of Ashmunin, whose works form the foundation of Renaudot's *Hist. Pat. Alex.*, and of Georgius al-Makim (A.D. 1273), another Christian writer, also help to throw light on their mediaeval history. It is, however, with the history of the Convent of St. Mary Deipara, or of St. Suriani, as it is often called in modern works, that we must now deal. It is one of the four remaining out of the fifty or sixty which existed twelve hundred years ago. It is said to have been founded by a holy man named Honnes, whose tree is still shewn a couple of miles south of the convent. It was originally connected with the Syrian Monophysites, perhaps in some such way as to this day different nations are represented among the religious houses on Mount Athos. We find fairly conclusive evidence in the history of John of Ephesus that this Syrian monastery existed as such in his time—the middle of the 6th century—as we are told how that three bishops came to Nitria, and, by force, compelled the Syrian Theodore, who then presided over a monastery there, to accept the patriarchate of Alexandria (John of Eph. *H. E.* trans. by R. P. Smith, p. 262). This Syrian monastery seems ever to have been the most literary of the societies, as the school of Edessa, with which it was probably connected, was the most active and speculative of its age. They had strict rules for their library, and the members seem to have been bound to add a volume each to its stores, which were still further enlarged by gifts from private families in Syria, which practice continued so late as the 11th cent., as we learn from inscriptions still existing on the MSS. It was fortunate, too, in its abbat, when the ages of literary darkness were settling down over the West. A certain Moses entered the convent A.D. 907, bringing with him the book of Ecclesiasticus as a present from the family of Abu 'l-Bashar Abdu 'Itah of Tagrit (Wright, *Cat. Syr. MSS.*, No. cliv.). He was abbat in 927, in which year he was sent to Bagdad to procure from the caliph the remission of the poll-tax demanded from the monks. Having been successful in this, he journeyed through Mesopotamia and Syria, and returned in 932, bringing with him 250 volumes, which can be still recognised. In the same age Ephraim, or Abraham, patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 977–81, was a liberal donor to its library; and even as late as the beginning of the 16th century the abbat Severus tried to do something similar, but evil days of ignorance had come, when even the

preservation of the books was difficult. They were repaired and bound in 1194, 1222, 1493, and in 1624, when the library contained 403 volumes; but these successive reparations were the cause of the destruction of several of the most ancient and valuable MSS., especially those of classical authors. Some of them have been restored as palimpsests. We now come to the history of the convent and its library in later times. The first modern notice of the Nitrian MSS. which we discover is in Gassend's *Life of N. C. F. de Peiresc.*, p. 269, Paris, 1641, where we are told that a Franciscan monk, Egidius Loehiensis, informed that scholar of their existence in the year 1633. Some persons in Europe must have previously known of them, as we find several of them in libraries prior to that date, and specially two splendid ones in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. Visits in search of MSS. have been paid to Nitria by the following persons—by Robert Huntington, A.D. 1678, then chaplain at Aleppo, and afterwards provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and bishop of Raphoe, whose fine collection of oriental manuscripts now adorns the Bodleian Library (Huntingtoni *Epp.* ed. Smith, 1704, *Ep.* xxxix.); by the Assemanis, Elias and his cousin Joseph Simon, in 1707, 1715, and 1716, an account of whose mission will be found in their *Biblioth. Oriental.* t. i. praef. sec. vii.; by the Jesuit Claude Sicard in Dec. 1712, and again with J. S. Assem. in 1716; by Gen. Andréossy in 1799 (*Mém. sur la Vallée des Lacs de Natron*); by Lord Prudhoe in 1828; by Hon. R. Curzon in 1837 (*Monasteries of the Levant*); and by Archdeacon Tattam in 1838, who went looking for MSS. serviceable towards a Coptic edition of the Bible. He on that occasion secured fifty Syriac MSS., which included the *Theophania* of Eusebius, which Dr. S. Lee forthwith edited and published A.D. 1842. The interest excited by this discovery led to the despatch of Mr. Tattam a second time in 1842, who secured a further consignment of two hundred volumes, which arrived at the British Museum March 1, 1843. It was now thought that all the treasures of Nitria were exhausted, and Cureton wrote his celebrated article in the *Quarterly Review* of Dec. 1845 (vol. lxxvii.), under this impression; but the monks had been too long trading on them to part with all at once, notwithstanding the most solemn bargains. In 1844 Tischendorf paid them a visit, and got some more. And now the spirit of deception spread from the monks to others. Auguste Pacho, a native of Egypt, was sent from London in 1847 to search for more MSS. He obtained several, but only handed over a part of them to the English authorities in November of that year. He obtained others, which he disposed of, partly to the Museum in 1851, and partly to the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg in 1852. Even since 1870 rumours have been current of large quantities of MSS. being still for sale in Cairo or Alexandria, and one at least of importance has been secured by the famous Egyptologist, Dr. Brugsch, and sold to the Prussian Government. The full value of these MSS. has scarcely been yet ascertained. They have had, indeed, one important indirect result already in the vast development of Syriac studies within the last thirty years. The specimens which have been as yet translated by Lee,

Cureton, Smith, and others, such as the *Festal Epistles* of Athanasius, the *Theophania* of Eusebius, and the *Ecclesiastical History* of John bishop of Ephesus, throw much light on cent. iv.-vi. That of the Ephesian bishop is specially valuable as treating history from the standpoint of a Monophysite, for in general all the writings of heretics, real or reputed, have been destroyed. Canon Cureton's verdict upon them is this:—"The contents of these MSS. are most important. The copies of the Holy Scriptures are some of the oldest in existence, and the translations of the works of the great fathers of the church are most valuable. Moreover, this collection contains several really important works, of which the Greek copies have been long since lost, and are now only known to us either by their titles, or by being short extracts preserved by other writers. Besides, there are many original works of Syriac authors." For an exhaustive account of the whole collection in its different aspects, its biblical, historical, philosophical, and scientific value, the handwriting of the MSS., the binding, and the very materials thereof, the instruments used for writing, see the preface prefixed to Wright's *Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in Brit. Mus.* The catalogue itself, which has been the work of many years, gives an analysis of each MS., and is the best substitute for those translations which may alter very much our views of early ecclesiastical history. Among them we may, in conclusion, notice that Dr. Wright has discovered a work often quoted in this Dictionary, viz. the most ancient Christian martyrology. Its date Wright fixes for a few years prior to 412, some time at the close of the 4th century. He published it in the *Journal of Sac. Liter.* t. viii. ed. Cowper, pp. 45, 423, January, 1866. In addition to the articles of Canon Cureton and Dr. Wright's preface, already quoted, and to which this article owes much, the reader may consult Cureton's prefaces to the *Syriac Gospels* and to the *Festal Epistles of St. Athanasius*; Hahn's *Fathers of the Desert*, ed. Dalgairns; and for an account of the present state of Nitria Sir Gardner Wilkinson's *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, t. i. pp. 382-399.

[G. T. S.]

NIVARDUS (Nivo), ST., 25th archbishop of Rheims, was a brother of St. Gondebertus the martyr, and according to some of royal blood (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. i. 268 for his family). He had lived in the court of Austrasia before his accession to the episcopate (circ. A.D. 650). The church of Rheims he found in an impoverished condition which he set himself to remedy. His influence at court enabled him to obtain various privileges, and by purchasing here and exchanging there he extended and consolidated the estates (cf. Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 7, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 107-8; Boll. *ibid.* p. 270). With the consent of the bishops assembled at a council of Nantes (circ. A.D. 658), he rebuilt the ruined monastery of Altumvillare (Hautvilliers) on the Marne, near Epernay, endowed it and granted it privileges, and made St. Bercharius abbat (see *Gall. Christ.* ix. 251, and Boll. p. 272 for this monastery; and Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. vii. 993, seqq. for Bercharius). He also gave a church to the monastery of St. Basolus (Saint-Basle) at Verzy (see

CHRIST. BIOG.—VOL. IV.

Gall. Christ. ix. 195). After a long episcopate, extending apparently over a great part of the reigns of Clovis II., Clotaire III., and Childeric II. (A.D. 638-73), he died at Hautvilliers, and was either buried there, according to his 9th century biographer, Almannus, (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. i. 283), or carried to Rheims and buried in the church of St. Remigius according to Flodoard (*ibid.*). He is commemorated Sept. 1. For the history of his relics see Boll. *ibid.* p. 276-7.

[S. A. B.]

NIZIER, ST. [NICETIUS (4).]

NOBILIUS, a bishop to whom St. Augustine wrote, excusing himself on the score of health and winter season from accepting an invitation to be present at the dedication of a new building, perhaps a church. (*Aug. Ep.* 269 al. 251.)

[H. W. P.]

NOCHAITAE, an heretical sect mentioned by Hippolytus, without explanation of their tenets (*Ref.* viii. 20).

[G. S.]

NOETUS, a native of Smyrna according to Hippolytus, but of Ephesus according to Epiphanius (*Her.* 57), whose narrative is, however, in other respects wholly derived from Hippolytus; on this point, therefore, the transcriber probably made a mistake. He came from Asia Minor at any rate, whence Praxeas, some years before, had imported the same views as he taught. Hippolytus traces the origin of the Patripassian heresy at Rome to Noetus, who, in his opinion, derived it from the philosophy of Heraclitus. Hippolytus expounds this at length in the *Refutation*, lib. ix. cap. 3-5, cf. x. 23. Noetus had a brother who assisted in his teaching, and whom he identified with Aaron, while claiming himself to be Moses. He came to Rome, where he converted Epigonus and Cleomenes. He was summoned before the council of Roman presbyters, and interrogated about his doctrines. He denied at first that he had taught that "Christ was the Father, and that the Father was born and suffered and died," but his adherents increasing in number, he acknowledged before the same council, when summoned a second time, that he had taught the views attributed to him. "The blessed presbyters called him again before them and examined him. But he stood out against them, saying, What evil am I doing in glorifying one God? And the presbyters replied to him, We too know in truth one God, we know Christ, we know that the Son suffered even as He suffered, and died even as He died, and rose again on the third day, and is at the right hand of the Father, and cometh to judge the living and the dead; and these things which we have learned we allege." Then after examining him they expelled him from the church. And he was carried to such a pitch of pride, that he established a school." Cf. Routh's *Reliq. Sac.* t. iv. 243-248. As to the date of Noetus, Hippolytus tells us "he lived not long ago," in the opening words of his treatise against that heretic. Drs. Lipsius and Salmon think that this very treatise was used by Tertullian in his tract against Praxeas (Hippolytus Romanus in t. iii. p. 95 of this dictionary) while Hilgenfeld and Harnack date Tertullian's work between A.D. 206 and 210.

E

This would throw the treatise of Hippolytus back to A. D. 205, or thereabouts. From its language and tone, we would conclude that Noetus was then dead, a view which Epiphanius (*Hær.* 57, cap. 1) expressly confirms, saying that he and his brother both died soon after their excommunication, and were buried without Christian rites. The period of his teaching at Rome must then have been some few years previous to the year 205. But the Refutation of Heresies gives us a farther note of time. In ix. 2, Hippolytus tells us that it was when Zephyrinus was managing the affairs of the church that the school of Noetus was firmly established at Rome, and that Zephyrinus connived at its establishment through bribes. It is not possible, however, to approximate more closely to the precise date, than to fix his excommunication and death about the year 200. Hippolytus (*Refut.* x. 23) tells us that a portion of the Montanists adopted the views of Noetus. He seems to have written some works, from which Hippolytus often quotes. The original authority for Noetus is of course Hippolytus, the precise references to which we have already given. Cf. the Libellus Synodicus 20, concerning a pretended syndon under Victor, which excommunicated Noetus and Sabellius. *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte* von R. A. Lipsius, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 179-190. Harnack in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v. *Monarchianismus*. Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte*, p. 616 [PRAXEAS] [EPIGONUS] [CLEOMENES]. [G. T. S.]

NOMUS, one of the leading personages at Constantinople in the latter years of Theodosius II., with whom he was all-powerful—τὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν χειρὶν ἔχων πράγματα (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 407). Nomus filled in succession all the highest offices in the state. In 443 he was "magister officiorum" (*Cod. Theod.* nov. p. 14, 1); consul in 445; patrician in 449, the year of the infamous "Latrocinium." Nomus was the confidential friend of Chrysaphius the eunuch and shared with him the government of the emperor and the empire. Through their means Dioscorus of Alexandria and the Eutychian doctrines he supported were brought into favour with the court, while the adherents of the orthodox faith, and especially Theodoret, against whom Dioscorus had a personal pique, were systematically depressed. Through his influence the feeble Theodosius was induced to publish a decree in 448 confining Theodoret to the limits of his diocese. The interesting series of letters, to the principal men of the empire, in which Theodoret, while observing the mandate, protested against its arbitrary character, contains several addressed to Nomus. He had had a short interview with the great man, which was curtailed by the serious illness, and its renewal prevented by the death, of a member of the family of Nomus. This gave rise to a short courteous letter of respectful sympathy (*Theod. Ep.* 58), followed by one of considerable length (*Ep.* 81), in which, after expressing his surprise that neither of his two former letters had received any answer, he proceeds to defend himself from the charges which had been the ostensible ground of the emperor's decree, and to recount the services he had rendered to the church during a quarter of a century, which

had merited far different treatment, and closes with the earnest entreaty that as so much power rested in his hands, Nomus would take the trouble of acquainting himself with the real evils of the church, and use his authority to arrest them. Nomus still maintaining his former silence, Theodoret wrote again (*Ep.* 96), saying that he was quite unaware how he could have given him offence, and requesting him to tell him what his cause of complaint against him was, and thus give him an opportunity of clearing himself. With the death of Theodosius and the accession of Marcian and Pulcheria, Nomus's power sensibly waned. He took, however, a leading position as a high state official at the council of Chalcedon (Labbe, *iv.* 77, 475, &c.). During the session of this council a libel or petition against him was presented by a nephew of Cyril, Athanasius by name, a presbyter of Alexandria, who had come to Constantinople to seek redress for the ill-usage he and his family had sustained from Dioscorus, accusing Nomus of acts of violence and extortion by which he and his relatives had been reduced to beggary, and his brother had died of distress (Labbe, *iv.* 407-410). [E. V.]

NONNA (1), the mother of Gregory Nazianzen. She was a lady of good birth, the child of Christian parents, Philtatus and Gorgonia, brought up in the practice of the Christian virtues, of which she was so admirable an example. Her son describes in glowing terms the holiness of her life and the beautiful conformity of all her actions to the highest standards of Christian excellence. To her example, aided by her prayers, he ascribes the conversion of his father from the strange medley of paganism and Christianity which formed the tenets of the Hypsistarian sect, to which by birth he belonged (*Greg. Naz. Orat.* 11, 19; *Carin.* 1, 2). We know of two other children of the marriage besides Gregory; a sister named Gorgonia, probably older than himself, and a brother named Caesarius. It is unnecessary to repeat what has been already said of the influence of the pious example and instructions of such a mother in forming the character of the son whom she regarded as given in answer to her prayers, and whom before his birth she devoted to the service of God [GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSIS, ii. p. 742, col. 2]. Nonna's life was quiet and uneventful, though not devoid of the domestic sorrows which necessarily fall to the lot of the mother of a family (*Orat.* 19, p. 292). Her health was usually very robust, but in 371 the year preceding her son's reluctant elevation to the episcopate as bishop of Sasima, she suffered from a severe illness which caused the postponement of an intended visit of her son's to his friend Basil (*Greg. Naz. Ep.* 4). But on arriving at her house he found the crisis of her disorder passed, her recovery being ascribed by her to a vision, in which she had been fed by her son with cakes of bread marked with a cross, and blessed by him (*Greg. Naz. Orat.* 9, p. 306). Three years later, 374, the elder Gregory died, and his widow only survived him a very short time. The date of her death is placed with great probability on Aug. 5 (on which day Nonna is commemorated both by the Greek and Latin churches), in the year 374 (*Orat.*

19, p. 315; *Carm.* 1, p. 9). (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. ix. pp. 309-311; 317, 318, 322, 385, 397.) [E. V.]

NONNA (2), one of the three daughters of Gorgonia, the sister of Gregory Nazianzen, called after her maternal grandmother, whose virtues she appears to have been very far from imitating, as she and her sister Eugenia are spoken of by Gregory Nazianzen in his will as undeserving of notice from their reprehensible life. This may however mean no more than that, having been devoted to a life of virginity by their mother (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 11, p. 180), they declined to accept such a vocation, for which they were not fitted. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. ix. p. 704, note xvi.) [E. V.]

NONNA (3), ST. (NONNITA, NON, NONN), mother of St. David. A legendary life of her existed A.D. 1281, in the service book of her church at Alternun, in Cornwall. This is close by Davidstow, and St. David's Welsh name, Dewi, is preserved in the local pronunciation, Dewstow. Her feast day was 3rd March, two days after the date of her son's death. Several places in Cornish parishes, such as Creed and Pelynt, and in Bradstow, just across the Tamar in Devon, were sacred to her, and a mystery play written in her honour existed in Brittany before the 12th century (*Buhez Santez Nonn.* ed. Sionnet). St. Nun's pool in Alternun was famous for the cure of lunacy. An inscription at Tregony (Hübner's *Inscriptiones Britanniae Christianae*, No. 10) reads Nonnita, Ereili, Viricati, tris fili Ereilinci, which shews the existence of the name in Cornwall. As Cornwall and South Wales were evidently under the same dynasty, and kindred chiefs ruled in Brittany, the wandering Celtic saints found a home in each without difficulty. Rees gives the names of several churches in Wales dedicated to her, all in the immediate neighbourhood of churches ascribed to St. David. (Hadden and Stubbs, ii. 98; William of Worcester, 164; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 162-166, 180, 200, 341.) [C. W. B.]

NONNICHIVS, (NUNECHIVS), 10th bishop of Nantes, A.D. 472, signed the acts of the council of Vannes, and had a converted Jew specially recommended to him by Sidonius Apollinaris (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lviii. 611, *Ep.* 13; Binius, *Conc.* ii. 421; *Gall. Chr.* xiv. 797; Tillemont, xvi. 234; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 394.) [J. G.]

NONNICHIVS (2) II. (NUNNICHIVS MONNICHIVS, MONNICHIVS, MANOCHUS, DONICHIVS), bishop of Nantes, succeeding his cousin FELIX (117) in 582, and thought by the Sammarthani, but without grounds, to have been the count of Limoges in the following article (*Gall. Chr.* xiv. 800; Greg. Tur. *H. F.* vi. 15). Gregory of Tours (*Mirac. S. Martin.* iv. 27) relates that he brought his infirm servant to the church of St. Martin at Tours on a feast day of the saint, and after the services took him home cured. The same author (*H. F.* viii. 43) mentions that the son of Nonnichius was suspected of being concerned in the death of Domnola, the wife of Nectarius. Nonnichus is mentioned by Venantius Fortunatus in his *Life of Germanus* (cap. 60 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 472.) [C. H.]

NONNICHIVS (3), count of Limoges in the reign of Chilperic, occasioned the spread of false

accusations against Charterius bishop of Perigueux, 582. Two months afterwards he died (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* vi. 22; Aimoin, *G. F.* iii. 48 in Bouquet, iii. 89; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 1453).

[C. H.]

NONNITUS (1), bishop of Gerona, in Catalonia, succeeded Joannes Biclarensis, 621, and died 633 (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 32). He was a monk, and continued to rule by example rather than command (Ildefonsus, *De Vir.* iii. c. 10, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 203; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxvii. c. 46; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 699).

[J. G.]

NONNITUS (2), said to have been the first bishop of Seville after the Saracen conquest. (*Esp. Sag.* ix. 235.) [F. D.]

NONNOSUS (1), son of Abraham, a priest, was sent by the emperor Justinian on an embassy to Caisus king of the Saracens, to Elesbaan, king of the Auxumites, and to the Homerites. After many dangers he returned and wrote a history of his journey, but we now possess only an abridgment by Photius (*Cod.* 3; *Corp. Scrip. Hist. Byz.* Bonn, 1829, pt. i. 478, sq.; Hoeschelus, *Bibl. Photii*, Ant. 1611, pp. 6-7; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vi. 239), omitting the fabulous and condensing details. His father Abraham, and grandfather Nonnosus, had been sent on similar missions. He lived about A.D. 540 (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 519; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 280; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and R. Biog.* ii. 1208).

[J. G.]

NONNOSUS (2), provost of a monastery on Mount Soracte, to whom miracles were attributed. (Greg. Mag. *Dial.* i. 7; *Epp.* lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 51 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii.; Ceill. xi. 474; Dupin, i. 580, ed. 1722.) [C. H.]

NONNOSUS (3), a person of station, whose request for a certain possession in 591 pope Gregory the Great intends to comply with (lib. i. ind. ix. ep. 22; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 725).

[C. H.]

NONNUS (1), one of the leading inhabitants of the town of Zeugma, to whom, with others, Theodoret addressed a consolatory letter (*Ep.* 125) in the midst of the persecutions subsequent to the "Latrocinium," 449, encouraging them in their struggle for the maintenance of the orthodox faith, which for their instruction he sets forth distinctly, guarding them from the opposite errors of Nestorius and Eutyches.

[E. V.]

NONNUS (2) of Panopolis. The name is very common, being properly an Egyptian title equivalent to Saint. Consequently confusion has arisen between this writer and others of the same name. He has been identified, with some probability, with a Nonnus whose son is mentioned by Synesius (*Ep. ad Anastas.* 42, ad Pyl. 102); and, with very little probability, with the deacon Nonnus, secretary at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451; or Nonnus, the bishop of Edessa, elected at the synod of Ephesus, A.D. 449; or lastly with Nonnus the commentator on Gregory Nazianzen (vide Bentley, *Phalaris* ad in.).

Life.—Of his life we have no details. He was a native of Panopolis in Egypt; cf. Eudocia, s. v.

Agathias, iv. p. 128; and an epigram in *Anth. Graeca*, i. p. 140.

Νόννος ἐγὼ· Πανὸς μὲν ἐμὴ πόλις. Ἐν φαρίῃ δὲ
Ἔγχει φοιηρέντι γονὰς ἤμισα Γιγάντων.

He is classed by Agathias among *οἱ νέοι ποιηταί*, and this mention, supported by a comparison of his poems with the other late Epic writers, makes it probable that his date should be placed at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, A.D. Beyond this nothing is known for certain. The *Dionysiaca* shews frequently a knowledge of astronomy (cf. vi. 60, xxv. xxxviii. 4), and a special interest in Berytus (xli.), Tyre (xl.), and Athens (xlvii.), but whether this arises from a personal acquaintance with these towns is uncertain. In iv. 250, the discoveries of Cadmus are traced to Egypt, but otherwise there is no reference to his native country. The whole tone of the *Dionysiaca*, with its delight in the drunken immoralities of Dionysus, makes it hard to believe that the poem was written by a Christian. Consequently there is a probability that this was a work early in life, that after it Nonnus was converted to Christianity, and that the paraphrase of St. John was written after his conversion. Possibly, as has been suggested, it may have been intended as a contrast to the *Dionysiaca*, portraying the life and apotheosis of one more worthy than Dionysus of the name of GOD. Possibly too, as has also been suggested, Nonnus may have been one of the Greek philosophers who accepted Christianity at the time of the destruction of heathen temples under the decree of Theodosius (Soer. *Eccl. Hist.* v. 16).

Works.—Of his literary position it is possible to speak with more certainty. He was the centre, if not the founder, of the literary Egyptian school, which gave to Greek Epic poetry a new though short-lived brilliancy, and to which belonged Quintus of Smyrna, John of Gaza, Coluthus, Tryphiodorus, and Musaeus. This school revived the historical and mythological epic, but treated it in a style peculiar to itself, of which Nonnus is the best representative. While frequently proclaiming himself an imitator of Homer, and shewing traces of the influence of Callimachus and later writers, he yet created new metrical rules, which gave an entirely new effect to the general rhythm of the poem. This was effected by the avoidance of the combination of two spondees, a frequent use of long, especially dactylic, compounds, and of the trochaic caesura in the third foot; by a very sparing use of elision, contracted inflections, crasis and hiatus, which is very rare at the end of any foot, except the first and fourth, and rarer still in arsis. These rules are less strictly observed in the *Paraphrase* than in the *Dionysiaca*. The general effect is however in both that of an easy but rather monotonous flow, always pleasant, but never rising or falling with the tone of the narrative. The style is very florid, marked by a luxuriance of epithets and original compounds (often of very arbitrary formation), of elaborate periphrasis, and of metaphors often piled together in hopeless confusion; and many unusual forms are invented (e.g. δάκτυλα, ἄγγελα, θέρσα), by false analogy. Point is gained by a fondness for sharp antithesis (cf. *Paraph.* iii. 5, διδάσκαλον ἀνδρα διδάσκων, vi. 52, μεμφόμενοι Νικῆδμον ἀμέμφεα,

xi. 44, xviii. 31), and the repetition of an emphatic word or clause (cf. viii. 55; ix. 6, 9, 13; xiv. 8, xviii. 6, &c.). So that he seems to deserve the title of *λογιώτατος* applied to him by Eudocia (cf. Lehrs, *Quaest. Epicae*. p. 253; Ludwich, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Nonnus*. Regiomonti, 1873; and the references in Bernhardt, *Grundriss der Gr. Lit.* § 93, 4).

The *Dionysiaca* attributed to Nonnus by Agathias (*ubi s.*) is a history of the birth, conquests and apotheosis of Dionysus, spun out at such great length that the main thread is almost lost. The poem commences with a description of the chaos existing in the world and the sadness of human life before the birth of Dionysus, narrating incidentally (iv. 250 sqq.) the introduction of civilisation and the first elements of the worship of the first Dionysus into Greece from Egypt (i.–vi.); then comes an account of the birth and education of Dionysus, and his early connexion with the Satyrs (vii.–xii.); then, as the central point, his attack on India and conquest of its leaders and maidens (xiii.–xl.); then the return to Syria and Greece, the conquest of his foes there, and the apotheosis in Olympus after he has begotten a child to take his place on earth (xli.–xlvi.). The whole seems a fanciful treatment of the Dionysiac legend, altered partly by the poet's own imagination erecting Ampelus, Staphyle, Botrys, &c., into real personages; partly perhaps by the influence of Alexander's similar conquest of India. The idea of the triple incarnation of Dionysus and the fantastic shapes that he assumes may perhaps be due to an Oriental influence, and a careful examination of the Indian names might repay the efforts of Indian scholars. The whole poem has been regarded "as an allegory of the march of civilisation across the ancient world;" but it would be simpler, and we hope truer, to describe it as "the gradual establishment of the cultivation of the vine and the power of the Wine-God."

The chief editions are those of Falkenbourg, Antwerp, 1569; Lectius, with Latin transl. in *Corp. Poet. Gr.* ii. Gen. 1606. Cunaeus, Hanau, 1605; Graefe, Leipzig, 1819–26. Passow, Leipzig, 1834; Le Comte de Marcellus, with interesting introduction, French transl. and notes, in Didot's *Bibl. Graeca*, Paris, 1856. Köchly with apparatus criticus, Leipzig, 1857, cf. Ouwarow, St. Petersburg, 1817. Köhler, *über die Dion. des Nonnus*, Halle, 1853.

(2) *Paraphrase (Μεταβολή) of St. John's Gospel*, attributed to Nonnus by Eudocia (Viol. 311).

This is a fairly faithful paraphrase of the whole of the Gospel. It seems impossible to decide exactly what text was used by Nonnus. On the whole it seems to approximate most to that represented by C. and L. among the MSS., and by the Memphitic version (cf. i. 24, iii. 15, vi. 69, vii. 8, viii. 39, ix. 35, xii. 41). In i. 3 it seems to agree with the Memph. v., and St. Chrysostom as against all best uncials and the Alexandrine interpretation, while in i. 28, iii. 13, xix. 28 (?) it follows A.

The text is faithfully treated. The omissions, except when he has MSS. authority (e.g. v. 1, 4; vii. 53 sqq.), are rare (v. 1, 29; iv. 27, 41, 42; vi. 41, 53; viii. 38; xviii. 16, 18). The additions are chiefly those of poetical expansion, reminding us of modern attempts to make the scene graphic or portray the feelings of the actors.

Homeric epithets form a strange medley with the Palestinian surroundings, and in many cases the illustrations are drawn out into insipid details (cf. iv. 26, vii. 21, xviii. 3, xx. 7). At other times we have interpretations suggested, in most of which he agrees with the Alexandrine tradition as represented by Cyril and Origen, cf. i. 16, 24, 42 (Peter's name); vi. 71 (the motive of Judas); vii. 19 (the reference to the Sixth Commandment); viii. 40 (the hospitality of Abraham); xii. 6, 10; xviii. 15 (*ἰχθυόβολου παρὰ τέχνης*); xix. 7. In some of these interpretations he seems obviously wrong; e.g. ii. 12 (*δωδεκάριθμος*); ii. 20, x. 12 (the reference to Solomon); vii. 28 (*ὕψων*); xi. 44, *σουδάριον*, explained as a Syrian word; while in ii. 4. *τί μοι γίναι ἤε καὶ αὐτῆ*, looks like an attempt to avoid a slight to her who is constantly called *Θεοτόκος*.

He shews too a looseness in the use of theological terms (cf. i. 3, *μῦθος*; 1, 50, xi. 27, *λόγος*) which with the luxuriant use of periphrasis forms a striking contrast with the simplicity and accuracy of St. John.

The Paraphrase was frequently edited in the 16th century. The chief editions are those of Aldus, Venice, 1511; Nansius, Lugd. Bat., 1589-93; Sylburg, 1596; Heinsius, *Aristarchus Sacer*, Lugd. Bat. 1627; Passow, Leipzig, 1834; Le Comte de Marcellus, with French transl. and notes, 1860. It will also be found in Migne, vol. xliii. (with the notes of Heinsius and of Le Comte de Marcellus); De la Bigne, *Bibl. Patrum*, Appendix; Mansi, *Bibl. Patr.* vi. (ed. 1618), ix. (ed. 1677). For an account of the MSS., cf. Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* viii. p. 601; Kinkel, *die Uebersetzung des Ev. Joh. von Nonnus*, Zurich, 1870; Köchly, *de Ev. Joh. Paraphrasi a Nonno*, Zurich, 1860. See also a series of articles in the *Wiener Studien* for 1880 and 1881.

[W. L.]

Among the Greek MSS. lately discovered in the Fayûm in Egypt has been found a fragment of an Epic poem, which Dr. Stern, of Berlin, attributes to the circle of Greek poets in Egypt, of which Nonnus was the centre. [G. T. S.]

NONNUS (3), commentator on Gregory Nazianzen's *In Julianum Imp. invectiveae duae*: his Greek scholia are given in Montague's edition of that work, Eton, 1610, and Greg. Naz. *Opp.* ii. Paris, 1630. By Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* vii. 682, 690) he is called Palaestinus, and the period assigned to him is the middle of the 6th century. The commentary by Nonnus is full of mistakes and of little value (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 249; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* v. 247, here called an abbat in the 5th century; Bentley, *Diss. Phal.* i. 94 sq. Lond. 1836). [J. G.]

NONNUS (4), bishop of Edessa. On the deposition of Ibas by the "Latrocinium" of Ephesus, A.D. 449, Nonnus was put in his place, and as bishop of Edessa attended the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. His name appears in the first day's proceedings (Labbe, iv. 328, 373, 450, 467, 495, 553, 569), but after the eighth session, in which Ibas was reinstated in his see, his name disappears (Facund. *Herm.* lib. v. c. 3). Both however signed the decree of faith promulgated by the council, Nonnus as "bishop of the city of the Edessenes," Ibas as "bishop of Edessa"

(Labbe, iv. 582, 586). On the restoration of Ibas, the episcopal dignity was specially reserved to Nonnus, and the consideration of his case was committed to Maximus bishop of Antioch (*ibid.* 678). On the death of Ibas, Oct. 28, 457, Nonnus returned to the see of Edessa, and as metropolitan of Osrhoene headed the signatures to the reply to Leo's letter in that year (*ibid.* 891, 917). A difficult question has been raised whether Nonnus of Edessa was the same with Nonnus of Heliopolis, the converter of the notorious actress and courtesan Pelagia of Antioch, whose biography was written by James the deacon. The circumstances of this conversion are fully detailed elsewhere [JACOBUS (40); PELAGIA]. Baronius (*Martyrol.* Oct. 8), following Nicephorus (*H. E.* xiv. 30) and Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 79), regards them as the same. This is also accepted by Vossius (*de Hist. Graec.* lib. ii. c. 20) and by Gams (*Series Episc.*) on the view that after he was obliged to give way to Ibas he was translated to Heliopolis, which city he converted to the faith (Rosweid. *Vit. Patr.* p. 379), and thence on the death of Ibas returned to Edessa. This hypothesis is combated by Tillemont (*Mém. Ecclés.* tom. xii. p. 664, *Note sur Sainte Pelagie*). [E. V.]

NONNUS (5), bishop of Amid 505; appointed at the request of the people by the patriarch Flavian, in succession to John who had died before the city was taken (Jan. 503) by the Persians under Cavades. He had previously been a presbyter and oeconomus under John. He sent Thomas, his chorepiscopus, to Constantinople [THOMAS ()], as his deputy to the emperor Anastasius; but Thomas treacherously intrigued against him, procured his deposition, and was consecrated in his room, within the same year. Flavian thereupon sent Nonnus to fill the vacant see of Seleucia, which he held until he was expelled as a Severian in 519. He then returned to his native Amid, where, on the death of Thomas the same year, he was, against his will, reappointed to the throne, but held it only three months, dying 519-20. He was succeeded by Maras (a man of noble birth), also a Severian, who was soon after banished by Justin, and lived seven years in exile at Petra with his two virgin sisters. See farther, THOMAS HARKL. (*Chron.* of Joshua Styl., c. 83, Wright's edition; and ap. Assem. ii. 49.) [J. Gw.]

NONNUS (6), bishop of Circesium, a Monophysite and follower of Severus of Antioch. He was banished by the emperor Justin, A.D. 518-527. He survived till A.D. 532, at least he was one of the bishops attached to the party of Severus, who in that year had a conference at Constantinople with Hypatius of Ephesus and other Catholic prelates [HYPATIUS (8)]. [G. T. S.]

NOREA. According to an Ophite system reported by Irenaeus (i. 30) the sister of Seth; in another system the name of the wife of Noah (Epiph. *Haer.* 26, p. 82). [See HORAEA.] Epiphanius says that the real name of Noah's wife was not Norea but Parthenos, on which Lipsius ingeniously conjectures that in Norea the Hebrew נֹרָה is preserved of which *παρθένος* is a translation. [G. S.]

NOROBERT (NORBERT), a presbyter to whom, when on his travels, Alcuin gave a letter of introduction to his friends (*Alc. Ep.* 211, Migne, 161 Froben, in *Opp.* i. 221 Frob.). [C. H.]

NORSESES I., Catholicus of Armenia for thirty-four years towards the latter portion of 4th century. Ammianus Marcellinus (*lib.* xvii. 12) calls him Niorses, son of Athenagoras, nephew of Hesy chius, and grand-nephew of St. Gregory the Illuminator. He was present at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. He was poisoned by Pharne, son of king Arsaces. [ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 164.] (*Le Quien, Oriens Christ.* i. 1375; Galanus, *Hist. Armen.* iii. 109.) [G. T. S.]

NORSESES II., alias Niorses, twenty-fifth Catholicus of Armenia. He succeeded Leontius, and held the national council of Tiben, A.D. 535, which consummated the division between the orthodox Greek and the Armenian churches, as told under ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 165. [G. T. S.]

NORSESES III. alias Niorses, thirty-third Catholicus of Armenia. He made in the early half of the 7th century an attempt, successful for a time, to reunite the Armenian and orthodox churches as told under ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 165. [G. T. S.]

NOTBURG, ST. (NEITBURGA, NOTBURG, NOITBURGA, NOTBURGIS, NOTHBURG), niece of Plectrude the wife of Pepin of Heristal. She was brought up by Plectrude, and lived with her at Cologne, in the palace which Plectrude made into a monastery about 689. Notburg being threatened with a marriage suitable to her rank, prayed to be delivered by death from such a fate, and presently died, about A.D. 700. Supernatural lights are said to have appeared at her head and at her feet, in testimony to her holiness. She was venerated as a saint by the people of Cologne. Her day is Oct. 31. (*Surius, De Probatis Sanctorum Historiis*, v. 1006, 1007, edit. Col. Ag. 1570; *Le Cointe, Annales Ecclesiae Francorum*, iv. 213, 214, ann. 689; *Brower, Annales Trevirenses*, lib. vii. 362. Her name is in the *Auctaria* of Greven and Molanus to Usuard, Oct. 31, Migne, cxxiv. 641, 642.) [A. B. C. D.]

NOTHBALD (NORTHBALD, NODEBALDUS), the ninth abbat of St. Augustine's. The dates assigned to him are A.D. 732-748 (*Mon. Angl.* i. 120, 121; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 10, 302-316; Thorn, ap. Twysden, cc. 1772, 2235, 2236). According to the monastic authorities, Notbald received the benediction from archbishop Tatwin (Thorn, c. 1772), and the later historian, Elmham, adds that he was elected by the brethren after a proper licence had been obtained from the king of Kent, and in conformity with the decree of Augustine (p. 302). The same writer mentions the abbat's friendship with archbishop Nothelm (*ib.* p. 312). Nothing definite is recorded of his abbacy. The place of his burial was unknown, but Elmham gives a traditional epitaph (p. 316):

"Nothaldi mores rutilant inter seniores
Cujus erat vita subjectis norma polita."

[S.]

NOTHBERT (NORTHBERT), the second bishop of Elmham after the division of the East

Anglian dioceses (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 618; *W. Malmesbury, G. P.* p. 148). He is known only from the fact that his name occurs in the ancient lists, between those of Beadwin and Heatholac. The last trace of Beadwin's existence occurs in A.D. 693 (*Kemble, C. D.* 36), and Heatholac first appears in Bede's list of contemporary bishops in 731; (*H. E.* v. 23). Between these limits Nothbert's episcopate must have fallen, and accordingly his name is attached as subscribing to the grant of OsHERE to the monastery of Evesham, which is dated A.D. 706 (*Kemble, C. D.* 56); and to the decree of the council of Clovesho of A.D. 716, in which the privilege of king Wihtrud was confirmed (*Haddan and Stubbs*, iii. 300). [S.]

NOTHEARD, presbyter of the diocese of Winchester, present at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (*Kemble, C. D.* 1024). [C. H.]

NOTHELM (1), king of the South Saxons, known to us only from a charter by him in the chapter library at Chichester printed by *Kemble (C. D.* num. 995). He grants to his sister Nothgitha lands in Lydesige, Aldingburne, Genstedegate, Mundhame, for the erection of a monastery and church. The charter bears its own date "anno ab incarnatione Christi 692," and is subscribed by Nunna king of the South Saxons, Wattus king, Coenred king of the West Saxons, Ine, Eadberht bishop, Aldhelm and Haguna abbats. [*OSMUND (3)*]. [C. H.]

NOTHELM (2), tenth archbishop of Canterbury. He was a priest of the church of London, St. Paul's, and a common friend of Bede and Albinus, abbat of St. Augustine's, who communicated through him to the venerable historian all that he knew of the early history of the Kentish church. Nothelm himself, some time between 715 and 731, visited Rome, and searched the records of the holy see by permission of pope Gregory II.; bringing away copies of letters which were incorporated by Bede in his history. Thorn and Elmham, the historians of St. Augustine's, give Nothelm the title of arch-priest of St. Paul's (*Elmh.* p. 312; Thorn, c. 1772), and he probably was not a monk. Archbishop Tatwin died on the 30th of June, 734; the consecration of Nothelm as his successor is dated by the Continuator of Bede in 735, and possibly may have been performed by Egbert of York, who just at that crisis received his pall from Gregory III. In 736 he received his own pall from the same pope, and afterwards consecrated three bishops, Cuthbert of Hereford, Ethelfrith of Elmham, and Hereward of Sherborne. The same year he received a letter from St. Boniface, asking for the Responsiones of St. Gregory to Augustine, as to whether a man might marry a woman for whose son he had been sponsor, and in what year St. Gregory sent his mission to Britain (*Mon. Mogunt.* ed. Jaffé, no. 30; *Councils*, *Haddan and Stubbs*, iii. 335, 336). Nothelm certainly held one ecclesiastical council in 736 or 737, attended by nine bishops of the province; one act, by which he ordered the restoration of a charter concerning an estate at Withington to the abbess Hrotwari, is preserved in the Worcester Cartulary; (*Kemb. C. D.* no. 82, *Haddan and Stubbs*, iii. 338). This act is described as a decree of a sacred synod. Nothelm's

name appears in another charter as corroborating a record in April 738 (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 86).

He died after a pontificate of five years on the 17th of October, probably in the year 739: (Cont. Bed. *M. H. B.* 288; see Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 335), but as his successor was appointed in 740 his death is sometimes advanced a year. Cuthbert was certainly archbishop in 740.

A short poetical life of Nothelm containing ten lines only, and no particulars, is printed from a Lambeth MS. in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 71. The historians of St. Augustine's add to our information about him only that he was a patron of Abbat Northbald (Elmham, 312), and his epitaph in four lines of Latin verse. As he was not a monk he does not seem to have caught the fancy of the Benedictine Annalists: but in the Bollandist Acts, October, vol. iii. pp. 117-124, there is an article on his history.

His career as archbishop is unfortunately obscure; coinciding as it does with one of the darkest portions of Kentish history, and with the period of the greatest illumination in the church of York, any ray of historical light from Canterbury would have been doubly valuable. As it is, Bede's obligation to Nothelm during his tenure of office at St. Paul's is the most important point about his history.

The literary history of Nothelm elaborated by Leland (*Scriptores*, p. 131) and Bale (ed. 1559, p. 100) is imaginary, or, to say the least, apocryphal. [S.]

NOTHGITHA. [NOTHELM (1.)]

NOTHLAN, bishop. [NATHALAN.]

NOUS. In the Valentinian system [VALENTINUS], Nous is the first male Aeon. Together with his conjugate female Aeon, Aletheia, he emanates from the Propator Bythos and his coeternal Ennoia or Sige; and these four form the primordial Tetrad. Like the other male Aeons he is sometimes regarded as bisexual, including in himself the female Aeon who is paired with him. He is the Only Begotten; and is styled the Father, the Beginning of all, inasmuch as from him are derived immediately or mediately the remaining Aeons who complete the Ogdoad, thence the Decad, and thence the Dodecad; in all thirty, Aeons constituting the Pleroma. He alone is capable of knowing the Propator; but when he desired to impart like knowledge to the other Aeons, was withheld from so doing by Sige. When Sophia, youngest Aeon of the thirty, was brought into peril by her yearning after this knowledge, Nous was foremost of the Aeons in interceding for her. From him, or through him from the Propator, Horus was sent to restore her. After her restoration, Nous, according to the providence of the Propator, produced another pair, Christ and the Holy Spirit, "in order to give fixity and steadfastness (*εις πηξιν και στηριγμα*) to the Pleroma." For this Christ teaches the Aeons to be content to know that the Propator is in himself incomprehensible, and can be perceived only through the Only Begotten (Nous). (Iren. *Haeres.* I. i. 1-5; Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 29-31; Theod. *Haer. Fab.* i. 7.)

A similar conception of Nous appears in the

later teaching of the Basilidean School [BASILIDES], according to which he is the first begotten of the Unbegotten Father, and himself the parent of Logos, from whom emanate successively Phronesis, Sophia, and Dynamis. But in this teaching Nous is identified with Christ, is named Jesus, is sent to save those that believe, and returns to Him who sent him, after a passion which is apparent only,—Simon the Cyrenian being substituted for him on the cross (Iren. I. xxiv. 4; Theod. *H. E.* i. 4). It is probable, however, that Nous had a place in the original system of Basilides himself; for his Ogdoad, "the great Archon of the universe, the ineffable" (Hipp. vi. 25) is apparently made up of the five members named by Irenaeus (as above), together with two whom we find in Clement (*St. om.* iv. 25), Dikaiosyne and Eirene,—added to the originating Father.

The antecedent of these systems is that of Simon Magus (Hipp. vi. 12 ff.; Theod. I. i.), of whose six "roots" emanating from the Unbegotten Fire, Nous is first. The correspondence of these "roots" with the first six Aeons which Valentinus derives from Bythos, is noted by Hippolytus (vi. 20). Simon says in his *Ἀπόφασις μεγάλη* (ap. Hipp. vi. 18). "There are two offshoots of the entire ages, having neither beginning nor end. . . . Of these the one appears from above, the great power, the Nous of the universe, administering all things, male; the other from beneath, the great Epinoia, female, bringing forth all things." To Nous and Epinoia correspond Heaven and Earth, in the list given by Simon of the six material counterparts of his six emanations. The identity of this list with the six material objects alleged by Herodotus (i.) to be worshipped by the Persians, together with the supreme place given by Simon to Fire as the primordial power, leads us to look to Persia for the origin of these systems in one aspect. In another, they connect themselves with the teaching of Pythagoras and of Plato. In the subsequent developments of Neoplatonism, Nous is prominent. *Τὸ Ὀν, Νοῦς, and Ψυχὴ*, constitute the Trinity of Plotinus. [NEOPLATONISM, p. 20.] (Harvey's *Irenaeus*, Prelim. Obs.; Mansel's *Gnostic Heresies*.) [J. Gw.]

NOVATIANISM. The members of this sect were called by themselves *Καθαροί* (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43). They were called by others Novatiani (Pacian. *Ep.* i. sec. i.); Mundi (Ambr. *de Poenit.* lib. i. cap. i.); *Ναύαται*, *Ναυατιανοί*, *Ἀπιστεροί*, or *Ἀπίστοι* (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 28; Conc. CP. can. vii. in Hef. ii. 366, Clark's ed.; Timoth. CP. in Meursii *Var. Div. Lib.* pp. 121, 125); *Ναυατιανοί ἀπεισῆται* (Suidas), Montenses, *Μοντησαιοί* (Noris, *Hist. Donat. Opp.* iv. 301, ed. 1732, and Hef. ii. 387, ed. Clark; cf. however *Cod. Theod.* ed. Haenel, p. 1550, which applies this name to Donatists); Sinistri, Scaevi (Bened. ed. in Ambr. *de Poenit.* l. c.). Offshoots of the sect are called Sabbatiani or *Σαββατιανοί* in *Cod. Theod.* ed. Haen. pp. 1566, 1570, and *Protospaschitae* in *Cod. Theod.* p. 1581.

Novatianism was the first great schism in the church on a pure question of discipline. In Montanism questions of discipline were involved as side issues, but did not constitute its essential

difference. All sects previous to Novatianism had erred on the doctrine of the Trinity. The Novatians alone were orthodox thereupon. The church therefore baptized even Montanists, while admitting Novatians by imposition of hands alone (Conc. Laodic. can. vii. viii.; Hef. *Councils*, ed. Clark, t. ii. 303, 332; Conc. CP. can. vii. in Hef. *l. c. ut sup.*; Pitra, *Jur. Eccles. Graec. Hist.* i. 430, 576). The reader will find in the articles on CYPRIAN, NOVATIAN, and NOVATUS the circumstances which gave rise in A.D. 251 to the so-called Novatian sect. The principles, however, which Novatian formulated into a system, and to which he gave a name, took not their rise from him; they existed and flourished long before. The origin of the Novatian schism must be sought in the struggle which, originating with *The Shepherd of Hermas* (Baur, *Church Hist.* trans. Menzies, 1879, t. ii. p. 50, note; cf. Ritschl, *Entstehung der Althath. Kirche*, 2nd ed. p. 529), had been raging at Rome for seventy years, at first with the Montanists and the followers of Tertullian, and then between Hippolytus and Callistus. Every one of the distinctive principles of Novatianism will be found advocated by some or all of them (Baur, *l. c.* p. 270, note). The Montanists rejected the lapsed, and in fact all who were guilty of mortal sins, Tertullian second marriages, as also did the strict discipline of the 2nd century (Ambr. *de Viduis*, p. ii.; Lumper, *Hist. SS. PP.* iii. 95. *De S. Athenaj.*; Aug. *Ep. ad Julian. de Viduit.*). Hippolytus held, in a great degree, the same stern views. This identity in principle between Montanism and Novatianism has been noted by many; both of the ancients and moderns, e.g. Epiph. *Haer.* 59; Hieron. *Opp. Migne, Pat. Lat.* t. i. 188, *Ep. ad Marcellum*, 457, *Ep. ad Oceanum*; t. vii. 697 *cont. Jovinian.* lib. ii.; Gieseler, *H. E.* t. i. pp. 213-215, 284, ed. Clark; Neander, *Anti-Gnostic*, t. ii. p. 362; Bunsen, *Christ. and Mankind*, t. i. 395, 428; Pressensé, *Life and Pract. of Early Ch.* lib. i. cap. 6, 7; Baur, *l. c.* pp. 124-126. Not with Montanism only, but also with Donatism is Novatianism allied, for it is the same question, viz. the treatment of the lapsed, which underlay that schism as well. Other points of similarity between the three may just be noted. They all sprung up, or else found their most enthusiastic supporters in Africa. They each arose simultaneously with great persecutions. They were separated by periods of about fifty years. The two earliest of them at least, as we shall have occasion to notice, proved their essential oneness, uniting their ranks in Phrygia in the course of the 4th century. Novatianism may indeed be regarded as a conservative protest on behalf of the ancient discipline against the prevalent liberalism of the Roman church (Baur, *l. c.* p. 271). The sterner treatment of the lapsed naturally found favour with the more enthusiastic party, who usually give the tone to any religious society. Thus Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, in latter part of 2nd century was inclined to take the Puritan view (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. v. cap. 3). Ozanam, in his *History of Civilization in 5th Cent.* t. ii. p. 214, Eng. trans., has noted an interesting proof of the prevalence at that time of this view in Rome. Archaeologists have often been puzzled by the symbol of a Good

Shepherd, carrying a kid, not a lamb, on his shoulders, found in the cemetery of St. Callistus. Ozanam explains it as a reference by the excavators of the cemetery to the prevalent Montanist doctrine, which denied the possibility of a goat being brought back in this life. Novatianism thus fell upon ground prepared for it, and found in every quarter a body of adherents with whose views it coincided. At the same time it must be observed that Novatian was the first who made the treatment of the lapsed the express ground of schism. In fact many continued to hold the same view within the church during the next one hundred and fifty years (cf. Hef. *Councils*, t. i. p. 134, Clark's ed.; Innocent I. *Ep. iii. ad Euxuperium*, in Mansi, iii. 1039). This fact accounts for the rapid spread of the sect. In Africa they established themselves in many cities within the course of the two years subsequent to Novatian's consecration in the spring of A.D. 251 (CYPRIAN, Vol. I. p. 746 of this Dict.). In Southern Gaul Marcian, bishop of Arles, joined them (Cyp. *Ep.* lxviii.; Greg. Turon. *Hist. Francor.* lib. i. in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 175). In the East they made great progress, as we conclude from the state of affairs presented to us by Socrates. Between A.D. 260 and the council of Nice we hear scarcely anything about them. The controversies about Sabellianism and Paul of Samosata, together with the rising tide of Arianism, occupied the church during the concluding years of the 3rd century, while the peace which it enjoyed prevented the question of the lapsed becoming a practical one. We may, however, trace the influence of this period on Novatian doctrine. It became harder and sterner. Obligated to vindicate their position, they drew the reins tighter than Novatian had done. With him idolatry was the one crying sin which excluded from communion. During the long peace there was no temptation to this sin, therefore his followers were obliged to add all other deadly sins to the list (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 25; Ambr. *de Poenit.* lib. i. capp. 2, 3; Ceill. v. 466, 467). At the council of Nice we find them established far and wide, with a regular succession of bishops at the principal cities of the empire and in the highest reputation for piety. The monk Eutychean, one of their number, was a celebrated miracle-worker, revered by Constantine himself, who also endeavoured at the same time to lead one of their bishops, Acesius, to unite with the Catholics (Soc. *H. E.* i. 10, 13) [ACESIUS]. During the 4th century we can trace their history much more clearly in the East than in the West, as Socrates gives such copious details about them, as have led some (Nicephorus, Baronius, and P. Labbaeus) to suspect that he was a member of the sect. In the East their fortunes were very varying. Under Constantine they were tolerated and even favoured (*Cod. Theod.* ed. Haenel, lib. xvi. tit. v. p. 1522). Under Constantius they were violently persecuted, together with the rest of the Homoousian party, by the patriarch Macedonius. Socrates (ii. 38) mentions several martyrs for the Catholic faith whom they then furnished, specially one Alexander a Paphlagonian, to whose memory they built a church at Constantinople existing in his own day. Several of their churches, too, were destroyed at Constantinople and Cyzicus, but were restored by Julian

upon his accession, and Agelius their bishop was banished. "But Macedonius consummated his wickedness in the following manner. Hearing there was a great number of the Novatian sect in the province of Paphlagonia, and especially at Mantinium, and perceiving that such a numerous body could not be driven from their homes by ecclesiastics alone, he caused, by the emperor's permission, four companies of soldiers to be sent into Paphlagonia that, through dread of the military, they might receive the Arian opinion. But those who inhabited Mantinium, animated to desperation by zeal for their religion, armed themselves with long reaping-hooks, hatchets, and whatever weapons came to hand, and went forth to meet the troops, on which, a conflict ensuing, many indeed of the Paphlagonians were slain, but nearly all the soldiers were destroyed." This persecution well-nigh brought about a union between the Catholics and the Novatians, as the former frequented the churches of the latter party during the Arian supremacy. The Novatians again, however, as in Constantine's time, were obstinate in refusing to unite with those whose church-theory was different from their own, though their faith was alike. Under Valens, seven years later, A.D. 366, they suffered another persecution, and Agelius was again exiled. Under Theodosius, bishop at Constantinople, Agelius appeared in conjunction with the orthodox patriarch Nectarius as joint-defenders of the Homoousian doctrine at the synod of A.D. 383, on which account the emperor conferred on their churches equal privileges with those of the establishment (Soc. H. E. v. 10, 20). John Chrysostom's severe zeal for church discipline led him to persecute them. When visiting Ephesus to consecrate a bishop, A.D. 401, he deprived them of their churches, an act to which many attributed John's subsequent misfortunes. An expression uttered by Chrysostom in reference to their peculiar views about sin after baptism, "Approach (the altar) though you may have repented a thousand times," led to a literary controversy between him and the learned and witty Sisinnius, Novatian bishop of Constantinople (Soc. H. E. vi. 21, 22). Two or three other points of interest may be noted in their history during the 4th century. About the year 374 there occurred a schism in their ranks concerning the true time of Easter. Hitherto the Novatians had strictly observed the Catholic rule. A few obscure Phrygian bishops however convened a synod at Pazum or Pazacoma, where they agreed to celebrate the same day as that on which the Jews keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread. This canon was passed in the absence of Agelius of Constantinople, Maximus of Nice, and the bishops of Nicomedia and Cotyaem, their leading men (Soc. H. E. iv. 28). Jewish influence was also at work, as Sozomen (vii. 18) tells us that a number of priests were converted by the Novatians at Pazum during the reign of Valens, who still retained their Jewish ideas about Easter. To this sect was given the name *Protopaschitae* (Cod. Theod. ed. Haenel, p. 1581), where severe penalties are denounced against them as worshippers of a different Christ because observing Easter otherwise than the orthodox. This question, when raised by a presbyter of Jewish birth, named Sabbatius, some twenty years later, caused a further schism

among the Novatians, at Constantinople, under the episcopate of Marcian, A.D. 391, whence the name Sabbatiani (*Σαββατιανοί*). This division of the Novatians finally coalesced with the Montanists, though we can trace its distinct existence till the middle of the 5th century [SABBATIUS]. (Soc. H. E. v. 21; Soz. H. E. vii. 18; Cod. Theod. ed. Haenel, pp. 1566, 1570, 1581). The curious student will find many particulars about the various customs of the Eastern Novatians and concerning the reflex influence of the sect on the church in the matter of auricular confession in Soc. H. E. v. 19, 22. The historian in cap. 19 ascribes the original establishment of the office of penitentiary presbyter and secret confession to the Novatian schism. To prevent scrupulous persons knowing who had lapsed, the bishops appointed a presbyter to receive privately the confession of penitents. This office continued in Constantinople till the time of the patriarch Nectarius, A.D. 391, when it was abolished owing to a grave scandal which arose therefrom. Thenceforward it was determined "to leave every one to his own conscience with regard to participation in the sacred mysteries." The succession of Novatian patriarchs of Constantinople during the 4th century was Acesius, Agelius Marcianus, Sisinnius (Soc. H. E. v. 21; vi. 22; Soz. H. E. vii. 14). During the 5th century the Novatians continued to flourish notwithstanding occasional troubles. In Constantinople their bishops during the first half of the century were Sisinnius, died in A.D. 412, Chrysanthus in 419, Paul in 438 and Marcian. They lived on amicable terms with the orthodox patriarch Atticus, who, remembering their fidelity under the Arian persecution, protected them from their enemies. Paul even enjoyed the reputation of a miracle-worker, and died in the odour of universal sanctity, all sects and parties uniting in singing psalms at his funeral (Soc. H. E. vii. 46). In Alexandria, however, they were persecuted by Cyril, their bishop Theopemptus and their churches plundered, notwithstanding which they continued to exist in large numbers in that city till the 7th century, when Eulogius, Catholic patriarch of Alexandria, wrote a treatise against them (Phot. Cod. 182, 208; Ceill. xi. 589). Even in Scythia their churches existed, as we find Marcus, a bishop from that country, present at the death of Paul, Novatian bishop of Constantinople in July 21, 438. In Asia Minor, again, we find them as widely dispersed as the Catholics. In parts of it, indeed, the orthodox party seem for long to have been completely absorbed by those who took the Puritan view. Epiphanius tells us, for instance, there were no Catholics for 112 years in the city of Thyatira (*Haer.* li.; Lumper, *Hist. SS. PP.* viii. 259). They had established a regular parochial system. Thus (in Boeckh, *Corp. Gr. Inscriptt.* iv. 9268) we find at Laodicea in Lycaonia an inscription on a tombstone erected by one Aurelia Domna to her husband Paul, deacon of the holy church of the Novatians (*Ναβάριαν*),*

* The learned Editor of Boeckh, not recognising the name of the sect, speculates about some unknown town of *Naba* to which the holy deacon might be assigned. Amid the corruptions of the Greek language *Ναβάριαν* was a frequent form assumed by the larger *Ναβαριανός*. See references at beginning of article.

while even towards the end of the preceding century St. Basil, though hesitating on grounds similar to those of Cyprian, to recognize their baptism, concludes in its favour on the express ground that it was for the advantage and profit of the populace that it should be received (Basil, *Ep. clxxxviii. ad Amphilocho.*; cf. R. T. Smith's *Basil the Great*, p. 119). After the close of the 5th century we find but few notices of their history. As the times of persecution receded into the distance of antiquity, their protest about the lapsed seemed obsolete and their adherents fell away, on the one side to the church, on the other to sects like the Montanists. The last formal notice of their existence in the East within our period will be found in the ninety-fifth canon of the Trullan (Quinisext) council A.D. 692. In the West we have no such particular details of the history of the Novatian schism as in the East. Yet we can perceive clear evidence of their widespread and long-continued influence. Already we have noted their extension into Southern Gaul and Africa in the very earliest days of its history. In Alexandria also, whose church-life, however, belongs more to the East than the West, we have noted its last historical manifestation. Between the middle of the 3rd century, when it arose, and the close of the 5th, we find repeated notices of its existence and power. Constantine's decree (*Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 2*, with Gothofred's comment), for instance, giving them a certain restricted liberty, was directed to Bassus, probably vicarius of Italy. Towards the close of the same 4th century we find a regular succession of Novatian bishops existing—doubtless from Novatian's time—at Rome, and held in such high repute for piety that the emperor Theodosius granted his life to the celebrated orator Symmachus on the prayer of the Novatian pope Leontius, A.D. 388. In the beginning of the 5th century, however, pope Celestine persecuted them, deprived them of their churches, and compelled Rusticulus their bishop to hold his meetings in private, an act which Socrates considers as another proof of the overweening and unchristian insolence of the Roman see (*H. E. vii. 11*). In the Code we find about the same time several severe edicts directed against the Novatians (*Cod. Theod. ed. Haenel, lib. xvi. tit. v. legg. 59, 65, cf. vi. 6*). In the south of Gaul and north of Italy and Spain the Novatian sect seems to have taken as firm root as in Phrygia and central Asia Minor. Whether the original religious teaching of the people whose Christianity may have been imported from Africa but a short time before by Marcellinus [MARCELLINUS, (2)], or the physical features—the mountainous character, for instance, of these countries—may not have inclined them towards its stern discipline is a fair question. The fact, however, is proved by the treatises which Pacian of Barcelona and Ambrose of Milan felt necessary to direct against them. They are couched in language which proves the sect to have been then an aggressive one and a real danger to the church by the assertion of its superior sanctity and purity. The work of the Milanese bishop was evidently in answer to some work lately produced by them (*De Poenit. lib. ii. cap. x.*). The Separatist tendency begotten of Novatianism in this district and continued through Priscillianism, Adoptionism, and Clau-

dus of Turin (Neander, *H. E. t. vi. 119-130*, ed. Bohn; cf. specially note on p. 119) may be a point of contact between the Novatians of primitive times and the Waldenses and Albigenses of the Middle Ages. Their wide spread in Africa in Augustine's time is attested by Augustine, *cont. Gaudent. in Opp. ed. Bened. Paris, ix. 642, 794*.

The principal controversial works directed against the sect which remain to us, beside those of Cyprian noted under his name, are the epistles of St. Pacian of Barcelona, the *de Poenitentia* of St. Ambrose, and the *Quaestiones in Nov. Testam.* num. cii. wrongly attributed to St. Augustine and found in the Parisian Ben. edit. t. iii. pars ii. 2942-2958, assigned by the editor to Hilary the deacon who lived under pope Damasus. The work of Pacian contains many interesting historical notices of the sect. From it we find they refused to the Catholics the name of a church, calling them *Apostaticum, Capitolinum, or Synedrium*, and, on the other hand, rejected the name Novatians and styled themselves simply Christians (*Ep. ii. sec. 3*). The following were some of the texts relied on by the Novatians, and to the consideration of which the writers on the Catholic side applied themselves (1 Sam. ii. 25; Matt. x. 33; xii. 31; xiii. 47-49; 1 Cor. vi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 20; Heb. vi. 4-7; 1 John v. 15). Novatianism in the tests which it used, its efforts after a perfectly pure communion, its crotchety interpretations of Scripture, and many other features, presents a striking parallel to many modern sects. In addition to the original authorities already quoted, there may be consulted Ceillier, ii. 427, *et passim*; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* ii. 185; Natal. Alex. ed. Mansi, saec. iii. cap. iii. art. iv.; Till. *Mém.*; Bingham, *Opp. t. vi. 248, 570*; viii. 233, ed. Lond. 1840; Gieseler, *H. E. i. 284*, ed. Clark; Neander, *H. E. ed. Bohn, i. 330-345*.

[G. T. S.]

NOVATIANUS (NOVATIANUS, Cyprian, *Ep. xlv.*; *Noováros*, Euseb. *H. E. vi. 43*; *Návros*, Soc. *H. E. iv. 28*. Lardner has appended a lengthened note to the 47th chapter of his *Credibility* to prove that Eusebius and the Greeks in general were correct in calling the Roman presbyter Novatus, not Novatianus. He attributes the origin of the latter name to Cyprian, who called the Roman presbyter Novatianus, as being a follower of his own rebellious priest, Novatus of Carthage). Novatian, the founder of Novatianism, is said by Philostorgius to have been a Phrygian by birth, a notion which may have originated in the popularity of his system in Phrygia and its neighbourhood (Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 98). He was, before his conversion, a philosopher, but we cannot certainly determine the sect to which he belonged, though from a comparison of the language of Cyprian in *Epist. Iv. sec. 13*, ad Antonian., with the Novatian system itself, we should be inclined to fix upon the Stoic. The circumstances of his conversion and baptism are stated by Pope Cornelius in his letter to Fabius of Antioch (Eusebius, *l. c.*), but we must accept his statements with much caution. He was a very tetchy man, and his narration was evidently coloured by his feelings. The facts of the case appear to be thus. He was converted after he

had come to manhood, and received clinical baptism, but was never confirmed, which furnishes Cornelius with one of his principal accusations. Notwithstanding this defect he was admitted to the clerical order, and, according to a tradition preserved in the treatise of Eulogius of Alexandria against his followers, he was for a time archdeacon of Rome, and was ordained presbyter to deprive him of that position and its customary claim to succeed to the see when vacant (cf. Neander, *H. E.* v. 158). This tradition, however, is contradicted by the statement of Cornelius, who, though an enemy, admits that his predecessor Fabianus had considered him so worthy of the office of presbyter as to have ordained him thereto in opposition to the whole body of the clergy who were opposed to the ordination of clerics. Novatian's talents, especially his eloquence, to which even Cyprian witnesses (*Ep.* lx. 3), rapidly brought him to the front, and he became the most influential presbyter of the Roman church. In this character, the see being vacant, he wrote *Ep.* xxx., to the Carthaginian church, touching the treatment of the lapsed, while the anonymous author of the treatise against Novatian, written A.D. 255, and included by Erasmus among Cyprian's works, describes him while remaining in the church as "having been a precious vessel, an house of the Lord, who, as long as he was in the church, bewailed the faults of other men as his own, bore the burdens of his brethren as the apostle directs, and by his exhortations strengthened such as were weak in the faith." This testimony sufficiently disposes of the accusation of Cornelius that Novatianus denied the faith in time of persecution, declaring himself "an admirer of a different philosophy." In the earlier part of A.D. 250 he approved of a moderate policy towards the lapsed, but towards the close of the year he changed his mind, and seems to have taken up such extreme views that the martyr Moses, who probably suffered on the last day of 250, condemned his course (see Art. on CYPRIAN, Vol. I. p. 743 of this Dictionary). The chronology of this period, which presents many difficulties, will be found amply discussed there and in Lipsius (*Chronol. d. Röm. Bisch.* pp. 200-210). In March, 251, Cornelius was consecrated bishop (Lipsius, *l. c.* p. 205). This roused the stricter party to action (Cyprian, *Ep.* xlvi.). Novatus, the Carthaginian agitator, having meanwhile arrived at Rome, flung himself into their ranks, urging them to take the final step of setting up an opposition bishop. For this purpose he made a journey into distant parts of Italy, whence he brought back three bishops who consecrated Novatian [NOVATUS]. Their names may possibly have been Marcellus, Alexander of Aquileia, and Agamemnon of Tibur (cf. Eulogii *Cont. Novatianos*, in Phot. *Cod.* 182, 208; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43; Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* iii. 5). On the other hand Bingham suggests *Opp.* Lond. 1840, t. viii. p. 235, that Trophimus was the name of the leading consecrator, quoting Cyprian (*Ep.* lv. sec. 8). After his consecration he despatched the usual epistles announcing it to the bishops of the chief sees, to Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, Fabius of Antioch. Cyprian rejected his communion at once. Dionysius wrote exhorting him to retire from his schismatical position (Euseb. *H. E.* vi.

45). Fabius, however, so inclined to his side that Dionysius addressed to him a letter on the subject; and two bishops, Firmilianus of Cappadocia and Theoctistus of Palestine, wrote to Dionysius requesting his presence at the council of Antioch to restrain tendencies in that direction (Euseb. vi. 44, 46). In the latter part of the same year Novatian was formally excommunicated by a synod of sixty bishops at Rome. He then threw himself into the work of organising a distinct church, rebaptizing all who came over to his side (Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiii. 2), and despatching letters and emissaries to the most distant parts of the East and West (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 28). His subsequent career is buried in darkness, save that Socrates informs us that he suffered martyrdom under Valerian (Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 28; cf. the apocryphal Acts of Novatian included in the treatise of Eulogius noticed above). Novatian was a copious writer, as we learn from Jerome (*de Vir. Illust.* c. lxx.), where we have the following list of his works: "De Pascha, de Sabbato, de Circumcisione, de Sacerdote, de Oratione, de Instantia, de Attalo, de Cibis Judaicis, et de Trinitate," only the two last of which are now extant. That on Jewish meats was written at some place of retreat from persecution. The Jewish controversy seems to have been very hot just then at Rome, and Novatian wrote his treatise to refute their contention about distinction of meats. He points out that the old law prohibited certain meats to restrain Jewish intemperance, and to reprove in man certain vices mystically depicted in animals (cf. cap. iii. with Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 18). He shews, however, that all such shadows have been done away in Christ, and that Christians have now liberty to eat everything save what is offered to idols. Jerome describes his work on the Trinity as an epitome of Tertullian's, and as attributed by some to Cyprian (Hieron. *Apol. cont. Rufin.* lib. ii. *Opp.* t. iv. p. 415). It proves Novatian to have been a diligent student, as its arguments are identical with those of Justin Martyr in his *Dialog. cum Tryph.* cap. cxxvii.; Tertull. *adv. Prax.* cap. xiv.-xxv.; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 16; v. 11, 12. He deals first with the absolute perfection of the Father, His invisibility, &c., then discusses the anthropomorphic expressions of the Scriptures, laying down that "such things were said about God indeed, but they are not to be imputed to God but to the people. It is not God who is limited, but the perception of the people." In cap. vii. he declares that even the terms Spirit, Light, Love, are only in an imperfect degree applicable to God. In cap. ix.-xxviii. he discusses the true doctrine of the Incarnation, explaining, like Clement and others, the theophanies of the Old Testament as manifestations of Christ, and refuting the doctrine of the Sabellians, or Artemonites, according to Neander (*H. E.* ii. 298), which had just then developed itself. He ends the discussion by explaining the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, wherein he is thought by some to have fallen into error. He was quoted indeed by the Macedonians of the next century as supporting their view (cf. Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* xii. 565 and references noted there; Bull's *Def. of Nicene Creed*, ii. 476, Oxon. 1852; *Judg. of Cath. Ch.* pp. 9, 137, 291, Oxon. 1855). Lardner (*Credib.* cap. 47, t. iii. p. 242) shews that Novatian did not accept the

Epistle to the Hebrews as Scripture, since he never quotes any texts out of it, though there were several which favoured his cause, notably Heb. vi. 4-8. His followers, however, in the next century, did use them. Some have even thought that Novatian was the author of the *Refutation of all Heresies* (Bunsen, *Christ. and Mankind*, i. 480). The works of Novatian were published by Welchmann, Oxon, 1724; by Jackson, London, 1728, and in Galland. *Bib. PP.* t. iii. They have been also translated in the volume of Clark's Ante-Nicene Lib. containing the second part of St. Cyprian's writings, Edinburgh, 1869. Jackson's edition is the best. It was severely criticised by S. Crellius in a work styled *Artemonii defensio emendat. in Novatiano factar. cont. J. Jackson*, Lond. 1729. [FORTUNATUS; MAXIMUS; MOSES; EVARISTUS; DIONYSIUS; FABIVS; NICOSTRATUS (1).] (Forbesii *Instruct. Histor. Theolog.* p. 666; Lumper, *Hist. SS. PP.* viii. 259; Natal. Alex. ed. Mansi, saec. iii. cap. i. art. iv.; Welch's *Ketzerhist.* ii. 185; Neander, *H. E.* ed. Bohn, pp. 330-335; Ceillier, ii. 426; Gieseler, *H. E.* i. 284, ed. Clark.) [G. T. S.]

NOVATUS (1), presbyter of Carthage. He seems to have been an original opponent of Cyprian's election, but is first mentioned by him in *Ep.* xiv. sec. 5, with three other presbyters—Donatus, Fortunatus, and Gordius—as having written about some question to Cyprian then in retirement. This was, doubtless, touching the request of the confessors, to have peace granted to certain of the lapsed which, in *Ep.* 50, Cyprian refuses until he had taken counsel with the presbyters and faithful laity. Cyprian, in this latter epistle, reproves certain presbyters, evidently Novatus and his companions, who, "considering neither the fear of God nor the honour of the bishop," had already granted peace to the lapsed. In *Ep.* xliii., writing to the church of Carthage, he compares Novatus and his associates to the five chief commissioners entrusted with the conduct of the persecution, and, as it seems, intimates that they threatened to raise a riot upon his appearance from his place of retirement. In *Ep.* lii. 3 Cyprian, writing to Cornelius, gives a very bad character of Novatus. He describes him as one "ever eager for innovation, of insatiable avarice, puffed up with pride, always known for evil to the bishops here, a heretic, and perfidious," again, as "having robbed orphans, defrauded the church, permitted his father to die of hunger, having kicked his wife when pregnant, and having thus become the murderer of his own child." The critic will be apt to think that Cyprian's feelings must have here coloured his judgment, as such a bishop as he was could scarcely have tolerated such a bad man in the presbyterate. He, in the same epistle, describes him as having made his follower Felicissimus a deacon, and then "at Rome committing greater and more grievous crimes. He who at Carthage made a deacon against the church, there made a bishop." The Liberian catalogue in like manner describes Novatus as ordaining Novatian in Rome and Nicostratus in Africa, though Cornelius (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43) tells us Novatian was ordained by three bishops from distant parts of Italy. Neander (*H. E.* i. 313, ed. Bohn), concluding on

the contrary, from Cyprian's words, that Novatus, "spurning the yoke of episcopal monarchy," himself ordained Felicissimus. Cyprian evidently merely means that Novatus brought about the ordination of both the deacon and bishop. At the same time, *Ep.* xliii. sec. 2, proves that Cyprian's wrath was specially stirred by some anti-episcopal innovations of Novatus and his party. What their character was it would be now impossible to determine (cf. Bingham, *Dissert.* on 8th Nicene canon in *Opp.* London, 1840, t. viii. p. 417). After the consecration of Novatian, Novatus was sent by him, together with Evaristus, Nicostratus, Primus and Dionysius to organize his party in Africa (Cyprian, *Ep.* l.). After this he disappears from our sight. (Compare Dr. Pusey's note upon him, appended to Cyprian, *Ep.* lii. in Oxford, *Lib. of Fathers.* See also Milman, *Lat. Christ.* t. i. pp. 60-62, ed. Lond. 1867. On the latter page he remarks in a note, "We are on historical ground, or what a myth might be made out of these two innovators—Novatus and Novatian.") [NOVATIANS; CYPRIAN.] [G. T. S.]

NOVATUS (2), bp. of Thamogade (Hartel—as also some Inscriptions; Thamugade, more common (*hod. Tingád*), near Lambaesis in Numidia, afterwards a headquarters of Donatism (vid. Morcelli) *Sentt. Episcoporum.* 4 in *Syn. Carth.* sub *Cyp. de Bap.* 3). His expressions as one of the oldest of the eighty-seven bishops seem to affect our estimate of the date of the Agrippinensian council. He could scarcely have called its members "sanctissimae memoriae" had not the generation passed, nor "collegae" if they had been beyond his memory. [E. W. B.]

NOVATUS (3), called CATHOLICUS, a monk probably of the 4th century, author of a short Latin piece, *Sententia de Humilitate et Obedientia et de Calcauda Superbia.* (*Patr. Lat.* xviii. 67; Ceillier, vi. 331.) [C. H.]

NOVATUS of Sitifa. [NAVATUS.]

NOVELLUS, bishop of Thyzica, a small town of Proconsular Africa, Thyzica of Ptolemy, between Tabraca and the river Bagradas (Ptol. iv. 3-31). The see appears to have lasted as late as A.D. 449, for a bishop of Tizzica was present at the Lateran council held in that year (Böcking, *Not. Dign.* i. p. 642). Novellus is mentioned by Augustine as being, together with Faustinus of Tuburbo, open to a charge from the Donatist point of view, of the same kind as Caecilianus, yet not condemned by his party on that account, probably because both he and Faustinus adopted Donatist views. Augustine does not mention the charge, but it was no doubt one of having received consecration from a "trador." (*Aug. ad Don. post Coll.* xxii. 38; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 342.) FAUSTINUS (4). [H. W. P.]

NOVELLUS, bishop of Complutum, is mentioned in A.D. 579 by J. Biclarenensis (*Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 866) as an illustrious person. Nothing more is known of him. At the third council of Toledo in A.D. 589 the see was vacant (*Esp. Sag.* vii. 179). [F. D.]

NUADHA (NUAD, -DATUS, -DUS, NUAT, NODTAT), abbat, classed in recent times among

the bishops and archbishops, of Armagh, has a memoir by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 373), *De S. Nvadato archiepiscopo Ardmachano*; is noticed by O'Hanlon (*Ir. SS.* ii. 637-8). He was probably an anchorite at Lechuamha in Lower Breffny, and succeeded Torbach in the primacy at Armagh A.D. 812 (*Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 419; Cotton, *Fast.* iii. 7). The Irish Annals record that in A.D. 815 (*Ann. Ult.* and *Four Mast.* A.D. 810) he went to Connaught, for the rectification apparently of some abuses. He died A.D. 816. His feast is Feb. 19. [J. G.]

NUB. [ANUPH, PAESIS, POEMEN.]

NUDD (1) ap Ceidio, Welsh saint of the 6th century, member of St. Illtyd's college (Rees, *W. SS.* 208; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 503, 530). [J. G.]

NUDD (2), bishop of Llandaff early in the 9th century (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 626), perhaps Nudd the "reader," and clerical witness of many charters, but probably Novis or Nywys, who died A.D. 873 (*ib.*). [J. G.]

NUDD (3) (HAEL), classed sometimes among the Welsh saints, one of the men of the North in the beginning of the 6th century, a member of St. Illtyd's college, and perhaps founder of Llysvronudd (*Triads in Myv. Arch.* ii. 3, 14, 70; Skene, *Four Anc. B. Wal.* ii. 457; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 542 et al.). [J. G.]

NUMENIUS (1), philosopher; *vid. Dict. G. & R. Biog.*

NUMENIUS (2), a disciple of Lucian the martyr. He was one of a brilliant band who imbibed from him Arian principles. Among them was Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, and Leontius of Antioch. They were like the rest of the Arian party rather weak in Christian principle. "They yielded to the violence of tyrants so far as to offer sacrifice to the gods of the heathen; but afterwards made amends for their lapse, Lucian their master himself assisting to bring them to repentance." (Philostorgii *E. H.* ii. 14; Tillem. v. 770). [G. T. S.]

NUMENIUS (3), a primate addressed by the famous ascetic Nilus on the benefit of studying Holy Scripture, *Ep. lib. ii.* 198, where Nilus shews that he favoured the mystical mode of interpreting Holy Scripture. [NILUS (3)]. [G. T. S.]

NUMERIA (Cyp. *Ep.* 31, 32), sister of CELERINUS, unless her real name was ETECUSA, q. v. [E. W. B.]

NUMERIANUS (1), emperor, A.D. 284. M. Aurelius Numerianus, the younger son of the emperor Carus, was associated with his father in the war against the Sarmatians and Persians, which was the one conspicuous event in his short reign. He and his brother Carinus received the title of Caesar, and while the latter was left at Rome outraging the feelings of the senate and of all the decent citizens by a licentiousness like that of Elagabalus and a cruelty like that of Domitian, and attracting the admiration of the populace by spectacles of unprecedented magnificence, the former accompanied his father in his Eastern expedition. On the death of Carus, as it was reported, struck by lightning, the two brothers

were acknowledged as emperors both by the army and the senate. The superstition of the troops saw however, in the manner of the emperor's death, an indication of the wrath of the gods at the attempted extension of the empire beyond the Tigris, and clamorously called on Numerian to lead them home. The young emperor, amiable, cultivated, with the tastes of a poet and an orator, had not strength to resist them, and they began their march. During their eight months' march to Heraclea on the European side of the Propontis, he was scarcely seen, and was carried in a litter, suffering from an inflammation of the eyes, brought on by exposure to the sun, or by his ceaseless weeping for his father's death. All business was transacted in his name by his father-in-law, Annius Aper, who held the office of praetorian prefect. Before long a report spread that the emperor was dead. The soldiers rushed into the imperial tent and found his corpse. Suspicion fell on Aper, who was arrested and taken in chains to Chalcedon. The generals and tribunes of the army held a council, in which DIOCLETIAN was elected emperor. Addressing the legions, he appealed to the "all-seeing Sun" as witness that he was guiltless of the death of Numerianus, and ordering Aper to be brought before his tribunal, pointed him out as the murderer, and, without waiting for his defence against the charge, plunged his sword into his breast. Carinus, still at Rome, prepared for resistance, and the two armies met in Moesia, near the banks of the Danube. The conflict, fought at Margus, was for a time doubtful as to its issue, but the murder of Carinus on the field of battle, by a tribune whose wife he had seduced, left the victory with Diocletian (*Vopisc. Numer.*; *Aurel. Vict. Epit.* 38; *De Caes.* 38; *Eutrop.* ix. 12; *Zonar.* xii. 30; *Gibbon*, c. xii.). [E. H. P.]

NUMERIANUS (2), praeses of Cilicia, in the early part of the Diocletian persecution, His full name, according to the Greek version of the Acts of Tarachus, was Flavius Gaius Numerianus Maximus (*Ruinart, Acta Sinc.* p. 422). The action of this official has given M. Ed. le Blant some of his best instances, shewing the use we can make of the acts of the martyrs to illustrate Roman legal procedure. (Le Blant, *Les Actes des Mart.* pp. 27-29, cf. p. 121, Paris, 1882.) [G. T. S.]

NUMERIANUS (3), bishop in the district of Constantinople, bearer of a letter from pope Zosimus (*Ep. et Decr.* No. 16) to the bishops throughout Byzacene A.D. 418 (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vii. 538). [J. G.]

NUMERIANUS (4), ST. (MEMORIANUS, MUNERIANUS), July 5, bishop of Trèves (Browerus, *Antiq. Trevirens.* i. 355, ii. Chr. Index p. 8; *Boll. Acta SS.* 5 Jul. ii. 231; *Gall. Chr.* xiii. 385), his period being c. 657-670 (Brow.) or c. 640-666 (*G. C.*), while as to his exact position in the series, authorities are not agreed (cf. Mabillon, *Annal. O. B. t.* i. pp. 487, 507, 604 and art. HILDULFUS). Browerus can find nothing of him except his monumental inscription recording his day in the church of St. Helen at Trèves founded in the 11th century. But there are likewise charters mentioning him. One attributed to himself, c. 664 or 677, grant-

ing a privilegium to abbat Deodatus (*Gall. Chr. xiii. Instrum. p. 291*; Mabillon, *Annal. O. B. i. 696*; Brequigny, *Diplom. num. 360*, ed. Pardessus) is spurious as shewn at length by Brequigny (t. i. Proleg. pp. 100, 298). A charter of Sigebert II. to abbat Remaclus, 648, mentions him in one recension (Breq. num. 313), and omits him in another (*Acta SS. 1 Feb. i. 235 A*). A charter of Childeric II., 667, mentions him (Breq. 359; *Acta SS. 1 Feb. i. 235 B*) as Memorianus. [C. H.]

NUMERIUS, a deacon of Nuceria, into whose fitness for the episcopal office (sacerdotium) the subdeacon Peter was requested by pope Gregory the Great to examine, A.D. 593 (Greg. lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 40 in *Pat. Lat. lxxvii.*; Jaffé, *R. P. num. 880*). [C. H.]

NUMIDICUS, African confessor in Decian persecution, left for dead after stoning and burning, but recovered by his daughter. His wife perished. He was a presbyter, and Cyprian enrols him in the Carthaginian Clerus as an honour, assigning him a seat in the circle, promises his elevation (to episcopate), and, *Ep. 41*, associates him with his former commissary ROGATIAN and the bishops CALDONIUS, HERCULANUS, and VICTOR in the commission for relief of Carthaginian sufferers which led to the open schism of FELICISSIMUS. In *Ep. 43* he is one of the main stays while Cyprian is away. [E. W. B.]

NUMIDIUS, bishop present as an African deputy at the council of Aquileia, A.D. 381. (Ambros. *Opp. ii. 786*, in Migne's *Pat. Lat. xvi. 916, 934*.) The acts of this council as there set forth have been challenged as spurious, but are accepted by the Benedictine editor and by Hefele, *Counc. ii. 376*, Clark's translation. [G. T. S.]

He and his colleague Felix, who was no doubt the bishop of Selemsela [FELIX (150)], spoke in favour of the Nicene faith. This bishop was no doubt Numidius I. of Maxula, who, together with Felix of Selemsela, was a prominent speaker at the council of Carthage in 390 (Hard. i. 951). He appears also at the conference of 411, where his Donatist opponent is one Felix (*Collat. Carth. cognit. i. 112*, in Hard. i. 1077). He may be assumed to have been the Numidius who stands first in the address to pope Innocent at the council of Carthage in 416 (Hard. i. 1215) against the Pelagians (Tillem. vi. 157, xiii. 304, 393, 690; Morcelli i. 220; Ceill. iv. 648). A second Numidius of Maxula was present at the council of Carthage in 525 (Hard. ii. 1082; Morcelli, i. 220). [C. H.]

NUMULENUS (MUMULENUS), Gallic noble, father of Bobo and Bodegisilus, was called Suesionicus by Greg. Tur. (*Hist. Franc. vi. c. 45, x. c. 45*, ap. *Pat. Lat. lxxi.*), is highly praised by Fortunatus Venantius (*Miscell. vii. c. 14, x. c. 2*), who addresses a poem and consolatory letter to him on the death of his daughter (*Pat. Lat. lxxxviii. 251, 322, sq.*; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr. xi. 409*). [J. G.]

NUNCUPATUS, a presbyter who carried information to Charibert king of Paris of the deposition of Emerius bishop of Saintes and was banished (Greg. Tur. *H. F. iv. 26*). [C. H.]

NUNDINARIUS (1), a deacon who for some cause unknown was degraded by Silvanus bishop of Cirta. He endeavoured to obtain restoration through the influence of Purpurius bishop of Limata, Fortis, and Sabinus, who each of them wrote letters to Silvanus and to the church of Cirta, exhorting reconciliation, but recommending secrecy in the matter. The dangerous facts to be thus concealed were (1) the act of "tradition" on the part of Silvanus, (2) the bribery by means of which Victor obtained his ordination, whose proceeds, 20 folles, he said were divided among themselves by the bishops, (3) the corrupt means used by Purpurius and Silvanus to obtain their bishoprics, and (4) the money given by Lucilla for obtaining the appointment of Majorinus. Of the truth of all these charges Nundinarius gave evidence before Zenophilus, and was supported by other witnesses, A.D. 320. (Aug. *Unit. Eccl. 18, 46*; c. *Cresc. iii. 28, 32*; 29, 33; *Ep. 53, 3*; *Opt. i. 14*; *Mon. Vet. Don. iv. ed. Oberthür.*) [LUCILLA, FORTIS, CRESCENTIANUS, SATURNINUS, SILVANUS.] [H. W. P.]

NUNDINARIUS (2), bishop of Barcelona, c. A.D. 465, by appointing Irenaeus his successor, caused an appeal to be made to pope Hilary and the enactment of five disciplinary canons [IRENÆUS (10)] (Hilarius, *Epp. i. ii. ap. Pat. Lat. lviii.*; Hard. ii. 801; Florez, *Esp. Sag. xxix. 114*; Tillem. xvi. 45; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr. x. 339*). [J. G.]

NUNNA (NUN), a king of the South Saxons, who in concert with his kinsman Ine king of the West Saxons carried on a successful war in 710 against Gerent (called Uuthgirete by Ethelwerd) king of the Britons (*A. S. C. ann. 710*; Flor. Wig. ann. 710; Ethelwerd, *Chron. ii. 12*; Hen. Hunt. lib. iv.; *L'Estorie des Anglois*, ver. 1629; for which passages see *M. H. B. 326, 507, 540 c. 724 a, 784*). In the charters of Kemble's *Cod. Dipl.* he is found subscribing in 692 as king of the South Saxons a charter of Nothelm king of the South Saxons (num. 995); as king of the South Saxons he grants land to Beadufird and his brethren dwelling in the island of Selsey, where Nunna desires to be buried (999); he grants land in 725 to bishop Eadbert (1000); in an undated charter (1001) he grants to Berhfrid a servant of God lands in the place called Pipingas, near the river Tarente [OSMUND]. [C. H.]

NUNNECHIUS. [NONNICHIIUS.]

NUNNINUS (NUMNIUS), a tribune of Auvergne in the time of queen Teudechildis, said to have been preternaturally punished for chipping the tomb of St. Germanus of Auxerre (Greg. Tur. *Glor. Conf. cap. 41*). [C. H.]

NUNNIO, a courtier of Childebert I. king of Paris (Greg. Tur. *Vit. Pat. cap. ix. 1*). [PATROCULUS.] [C. H.]

NURSINUS, a priest said to have seen in the hour of his death the apostles Peter and Paul (Greg. Mag. *Dial. iv. 11*; Ceill. xi. 478). [C. H.]

NYCTAGES, heretics described by Isidorus Hispal., as opposing vigils on the ground that God made the day for work and the night for sleep. They took up merely the same ground as Vigilantius against Jerome and the subdeacon Timotheus against St. Nilus, cf. *Nili Epist.* i. 26. (Isidor. Hispal. *de Eccles. Offic.* i. 22, in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. 83, col. 759.) [G. T. S.]

NYMPHA, a virgin saint of about the fifth century, honoured in Tuscany and at Rome (Peter Natalis, lib. x., c. 42, p. 197; Tillem. iii. 342, 343, 709). [C. H.]

NYMPHIDIANUS, FLAVIANUS, a scholastic of Philadelphia, who renounced Quartodecimanism at the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1355, v. 610, vi. 893). [C. H.]

NYMPHODORA, martyr in Bithynia in the reign of Maximian, with her sisters Menodora and Metrodora (*vid.* those names in *D. C. A.* and Tillem. v. 160). [C. H.]

NYNIA, NYNYANE. [NINIAN.]

O

OAN, princeps, that is, abbat, of Egg in the Hebrides, died A.D. 724. (*Ann. Ul.*; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 307, 382.) [J. G.]

OBINUS (OUINUS), the fourth name in the mythical list of the British bishops or archbishops of London (Godwin, *de Praesulibus*, ed. Richardson, p. 170; Ussher, *Antiq.* ed. 1639, p. 67.) The compiler of the list in which the name occurs was Joscelin of Furnes, a monk of the 12th century, of whose life and materials nothing satisfactory seems to be ascertained; and the MS. from which Ussher and the other writers excerpted it has not been recognised (Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 64; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. s. v.*) [S.]

OCCLIANUS, addressed by Gregory the Great in A.D. 599, on his appointment as tribune of Hydruntum or Otranto by the exarch, requesting him to redress the wrongs done by his predecessor Viator to the inhabitants of Gallipoli, by exacting forced services from them, and otherwise oppressing them, about which Sabinus, or Sabinianus, bishop of the place, had written to complain. From another letter it appears that Occlianus had personally visited Gregory (*Epp.* ix. 99, 100, 102). [F. D.]

OCEANUS, a Roman of noble birth in the 4th and 5th centuries, connected by birth with Fabiola (q. v.) and the Julian family, and by friendship with Jerome, Augustine and Pammachius. Jerome speaks of him as his son (*Ep.* lxxvii. 1, ed. Vall. and lxxix. 10), but as the spiritual father of Marcellinus, the Roman governor (*Ep.* lxxvi. 1, A.D. 411). He was, perhaps, like his friend Pammachius, a senator (comp. their letter among Jerome's lxxxiii. with his expression, *Ep.* xcvi. 3, Vos Christiani Senatus lumina). He probably became known to Jerome during his stay in Rome in 383-5. He

was a zealous upholder of orthodoxy and strict discipline, and first comes to our knowledge by a public protest which he made against Carterius, a Spanish bishop who, having married before his baptism and lost his wife, had, as a Christian, married a second wife. Jerome points out that there is no law or principle condemning such marriages, and urges him to silence. This was about the year 397. Either in that or the previous year, Oceanus, in company with Fabiola, visited Jerome at Bethlehem, whence they were driven by the fear of the invasion of the Huns. While there, he appears to have made acquaintance with Rufinus, who, according to Jerome's insinuation (*Adv. Ruf.* iii. 4), had an Origenistic document placed in Oceanus's room in Fabiola's house, with a view to identify him with that tendency. Rufinus having gone to Rome the same year (397), and having published shortly afterwards his edition of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, Oceanus and Pammachius watched his actions with critical eyes, and, on the appearance of the work, wrote to Jerome (*Jer. Ep.* 83) requesting him to deny the insinuation of Rufinus that he was only completing a work begun by Jerome, and to furnish them with a translation of Origen's work as it really was. Oceanus, no doubt, took part in the subsequent proceedings which led to the condemnation of Origenism at Rome. On the death of Fabiola, about 399, Jerome wrote to Oceanus his Epitaphium of her (*Ep.* 77), accompanied by his exposition, which had been intended for her, of the 42 resting-places of the Israelites in the desert. At a later time, in 411, Oceanus, who had maintained his correspondence with Jerome, and possessed his books against Rufinus and other of his works, interested himself specially in the questions which arose in connexion with the Pelagian controversy, on the origin of souls. Jerome writes to Marcellinus and Anapsychius (*Ep.* 126) who had consulted him on this subject, referring them to Oceanus as one thoroughly "learned in the law of the Lord" and capable of instructing them. Oceanus was also in correspondence with Augustine, who writes to him in the year 416 on the two subjects on which he had differed from Jerome, the origin of souls, and the passage in Galatians relating to the reproof of St. Peter by St. Paul at Antioch. Augustine speaks also of another work of Jerome's on the resurrection which had been brought by Orosius to Oceanus, and of letters which he had received from him. The tenor of his letter indicates his deep respect and consideration. Oceanus is placed by Migne with Pammachius, among the ecclesiastical writers (*Patrologia*, vol. 20); but no writing of his has come down to us except the letter to Jerome (*Ep.* 83). [W. H. F.]

OCIALDUS, disciple of St. Richarius, whom c. 645 he succeeded as abbat of Centula or St. Riquier in Picardy. (Alcuin, *Vit. S. Richar.* § 14, in *Pat. Lat.* ci. 691; *Gall. Chr.* x. 1243.) [C. H.]

OCLEATINUS, forbidden by Gregory the Great in A.D. 591, in letters to Severus, bishop of Ficulum, and to the governor and inhabitants of Ariminum (*Epp.* 1, 57, 58), on what grounds it is not stated, to be chosen bishop of that city. [F. D.]